



Effect of Teamwork on Organizational Productivity in Table Water Producing Firms in Port Harcourt

Dr. Obinna B.E. Geoffrey, CPM, CPA,

Department of Employment Relations and Human Resource Management, Faculty of Administration and Management, Rivers State University, Nkpolu-Oroworukwo, Port Harcourt, Rivers State Nigeria

Dr. Akpe Churchill Ikechukwu (NASA,CIPMA,ASIPM,MTRCN,JP)

Faculty of Administration and Management Sciences. Dept of Employee Relations and Human Resources Management, Rivers -State University Nkpolu Port Harcourt

Abstract: *When a team works well together, everyone benefits. Teamwork explains how a team acts and helps people feel more secure in themselves, more confident in their abilities, and better able to work together to solve problems. Nevertheless, the advantages of collaboration for workers are sometimes less concrete and harder to identify, which could reduce organisational output. In an effort to fill a gap in the research, this study aims to examine the impact of cooperation on organisational productivity in companies that produce table water. The purpose of this article is to look at how table water generating companies in Port Harcourt deal with cooperation and how it affects their organisational efficiency. Although 500 people from 27 different table water production companies were asked to fill out structured questionnaires, only 350 of those people really did so. Organisational productivity is the dependent variable, while the link between collaboration, trust within the team, the working environment, training and development, and esprit de corps are the independent factors that are investigated using descriptive and casual comparative study designs. Various regression models and descriptive statistics have been used to examine the data. The regression findings show that there is a substantial and positive association between organisational productivity and all of the independent variables. When compared to other elements, training and development have the least impact on organisational productivity and employee happiness, while the working environment is the most potent. Companies in Port Harcourt that make table water also think about how cooperation, esprit de corps, and trust in one another affect organisational productivity. Companies in Port Harcourt that produce table water would do well to prioritise faster responses to team trust signals, improved working conditions, more training and development opportunities, and effective collaboration if they want to boost production.*

Keywords: *Team work, team trust, working environment, training and development, esprit de corps.*

Introduction

For decades, experts in the field have studied organisational productivity, which is defined as an organization's capacity to produce the desired result with a relatively little quantity of inputs. Productivity, as defined by Dorgan (1994), is the potential for maximising organisational and functional performance (including quality) while minimising effort. The effect of environment, technology, organisation, and human characteristics on organisational productivity has been the subject of much research (Thompson, 1967; Lawrence & Lorsch, 1969; Scott, 1987). One definition of teamwork given by Morgan, Ben, Eduardo, and Albert (1994) is "group work with a common purpose for the achievement of goals." The emphasis is on the team's shared attitudes, cognitions, and behaviours that are essential to their job completion and overall functioning. It is critical to understand the relationship between cooperation and

performance because, according to certain researchers (Jones, Richard, Paul, Sloane, & Peter, 2007; Agrawal & Adjirackor, 2016), collaboration is a key component in an organization's capacity to perform better. Mbinya (2013) asserts that in order to succeed in today's cutthroat business environment, most global businesses have embraced a culture of collaboration. The ability to effectively build and lead a team is crucial to achieving organisational and personal success (Ulabor, Akande, & Abiodun, 2020).

According to Mickan and Sylvia (2000), trust within a team is favourably associated with the team's performance and serves as its foundation for effective collaboration. Team members are more likely to open up about their feelings, admit when they're wrong, and accept constructive criticism when they trust one another, which in turn leads to more collaboration (Edmondson, 1999). Similarly, Hamonangan, Asmawi, and Widodo (2020) found that trust positively affects organisational commitment. There are positive and negative effects of the workplace on workers' motivation, engagement, and output. In a good workplace, employees are able to carry out their responsibilities in a way that is both safe and enjoyable (Sedarmayanti, 2003). Working circumstances are the most important element affecting organisational output, according to Nepal (2016). In instance, McGuire and McLaren (2009) found that the physical layout of a company has an effect on employee conduct on the job. A conducive work environment is positively correlated with employee job motivation (Rajiq and Maulabakhsh, 2015). Organisations should acknowledge the importance of a well-designed workplace to maximise employee job happiness, according to their short study. Workplace factors, such as employees' social networks and skill sets, also have a major role in determining productivity (Rasool, Maqbool, Samma, Zhao, & Anjum, 2019).

Training and development refers to the measures taken by companies to enhance the performance of their employees within the context of their workplace. Development prepares employees for possible future jobs, whereas training focuses on present activities (Sims, 2002). Nikandrou and Tsachouridi (2015), Chaudhary and Sharma (2012), and Ahmad and Din (2009) all found strong correlations between training and development and the performance of companies. A strong feeling of team spirit, or esprit de corps, is crucial to any organization's success and may significantly affect its bottom line (Reisel, Chia, & Maloes, 2005; Manzoor, Vllah, Hussain, & Ahmad, 2011; Boyt, Lusch, Naylor, 2001). However, most employees put their own needs ahead of team efforts, say Tirmizi and Shahzad (2009). Doctors also have a negative impression of esprit de corps, according to studies conducted in Korean hospitals (Hwang & Chang, 2009). In addition, although many studies have focused on western context issues, industrial sector issues, especially those pertaining to the table water producing businesses in Port Harcourt, have received very less attention. In light of that, this paper sets out to examine the impact of cooperation on the organisational productivity of table water production enterprises in Port Harcourt. The article's next part delves into the research hypotheses that informed this study, while the third piece focuses on the research methods that underpinned this work. The paper concludes in the final portion, and section four covers the findings and comments.

Research Hypotheses

This paper has set the following alternative hypotheses:

H₁: There is a positive relationship between teamwork and the organizational productivity.

H₂: There is a positive relationship between team trust and the organizational productivity.

H₃: There is a positive relationship between working environment and the organizational productivity.

H₄: There is a positive relationship of training and development with the organizational productivity.

H₅: There is a positive relationship of esprit de corps with the organizational productivity.

Methodology

Descriptive research designs that simplify data into an understandable format have been used to tackle the fundamental issues with organisational productivity caused by the collaborative character of commercial banks. The link between teamwork and output has also been explored using ad hoc comparative research methods. Three hundred and fifty people from twenty-seven different table water producing enterprises were surveyed using a two-part structured questionnaire. Part one of the survey inquires about demographic details, whereas part two zeroes in on five specific In order to measure the quality elements that impact organisational productivity, researchers utilise Likert-type questions on a scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). Organisational effectiveness is said to be influenced by factors such as trust, collaboration, esprit de corps, working environment, training & development, and training and development. Organisational productivity is determined by the following factors: collaboration, trust within the team, the working environment, opportunities for training and growth, and esprit de corps.

In order to investigate how collaboration affects organisational productivity, this study presents an estimated regression model, which reads as:

$$OP = \alpha + \beta_1 TW + \beta_2 TT + \beta_3 WE + \beta_4 TD + \beta_5 EC + \epsilon_i$$

Where, OP = Organizational productivity; TW = Teamwork, TT =Team trust; WE = Working environment, TD = Training and development, EC = Esprit de corps; α = constant term; $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \beta_5$ = beta coefficients and ϵ_i = error term.

Reliability Test

All of the chosen variables' Cronbach alpha values are more than 0.70, as shown in Table 1, which indicates that the primary data obtained is genuine and reliable.

Table 1:
Coefficient of Cronbach's alpha

Variables	Cronbach's alpha	No. of item
Teamwork	0.712	5
Team trust	0.762	5
Working environment	0.792	5
Training & development	0.739	5
Esprit de corps	0.741	5
Organizational productivity	0.773	5
Overall	0.742	30

Results and Discussions

Descriptive analysis

A weighted average of 1.665 and a mean value of 1.836, respectively, show that the employees of table water production enterprises are eager to collaborate in order to increase organisational efficiency. Team trust follows a similar pattern, with a weighted average of 1.513 and a range of 1.251 to 1.676. This proves that trust within a team is a key component that impacts output in any given business. The mean value of the working environment also ranges from 1.181 to 1.735. A happy work environment enhances organisational productivity, as shown by the weighted average score of 1.469. On top of that, training and development is vital for organisational production (weighted average = 1.498). Additionally, there is a range for the mean value of development and

training, from 1,636 to a low of 1.119. Furthermore, the average value of esprit de corps ranges from 1.280 to 2.123. Companies producing table water in Port Harcourt benefit from esprit de corps, according to the weighted average of 1.627.

Correlation analysis

Table 2 Correlation Matrix

In this table, we can see the correlation coefficients between organisational productivity (the dependent variable) and the independent variables (e.g., spirit de corps, working environment, cooperation, trust within the team, and training and development).

Variables	Mean	SD	OP	TW	TT	WE	TD	EC
OP	1.279	0.326	1					
TW	1.665	0.244	0.198*	1				
TT	1.513	0.290	0.201*	0.399*	1			
WE	1.469	0.262	0.553**	0.222*	0.314**	1		
TD	1.498	0.243	0.081	0.321**	0.301**	0.167	1	
EC	1.627	0.376	0.111	0.324**	0.223*	0.031	0.531**	1

Note *significant at 1% level

**significant at 5% level

Table 2 shows that there is a positive association between organisational productivity and all independent variables. It also shows that the keys to greater organisational output are increased collaboration and team trust. Organisational productivity is enhanced when a better work environment is maintained. Both esprit de corps and employee training contribute to increased organisational productivity.

Regression analysis

Table 3 Regression results

This table displays the results of a standard linear regression model applied on 350 data points. The equation reads as follows: $OP = \alpha + \beta_1TW + \beta_2TT + \beta_3 WE + \beta_4TD + \beta_5EC + \epsilon_i$. Here, OP denotes organisational productivity, β_1 , β_2 , β_3 , β_4 , and β_5 are beta coefficients. TT stands for team trust, WE for working environment, TD for training and development, EC for esprit de corps, and ϵ_i for error term.

Model Interception Regression coefficients of Adj. SEE F-

		TW	TT	WE	TD	EC	R ²		Value
1	0.896 (4.659)**	0.291 (2.223)*					0.042	0.387	4.912
2	1.102 (6.198)**		0.245 (2.212)*				0.044	0.365	4.982
3	0.316 (2.132)*			0.721 (7.332)**			0.318	0.303	53.421
4	1.324 (6.201)**				0.121 (0.869)		0.001	0.389	0.901
5	1.632 (11.124)**					0.097 (1.187)	0.002	0.387	1.421
6	0.901 (3.811)**	0.192 (1.512)	0.217 (1.514)				0.041	0.372	3.668
7	0.215 (0.798)	0.714 (6.719)**	0.116 (0.941)	0.00 (0.001)			0.321	0.334	17.875
8	0.201 (0.876)	0.102 (0.411)	0.101 (1.066)	0.009 (0.072)	0.676 (6.675)**		0.342	0.301	13.445
9	0.315 (1.165)	0.114 (0.651)	0.197 (1.428)	0.015 (0.158)	0.631 (6.468)**	0.152 (2.204)*	0.376	0.317	12.245

Notes:

Figures in parenthesis are t-values

The asterisk signs (*) and (**) indicate that the results are significant at 1 percent and 5 percent level respectively.

Dependent variable is organizational productivity

The teamwork intercept value is 0.896, as shown in Table 3, which means that when teamwork is zero, organisational productivity is 0.896 units. When studying organisational productivity with cooperation as the only variable, a one-unit shift in teamwork will lead to a 0.291-unit shift in organisational productivity. With an adjusted R2 value of 0.042, we can see that other variables contribute to organisational productivity to the tune of 4.2%, whereas cooperation contributes 4.2%. Working conditions explain 31.8% of the variance in organisational productivity, making them the most important factor influencing productivity in this research. Working conditions also have an intercept value of 0.721, which indicates that organisational productivity will shift by 0.721 units for every one unit change in working conditions. Training and development also has a negligible impact on

organisational productivity—just 0.121 percent. In addition, additional variables account for the remaining percentage; the overall effect of the five aspects has an impact on organisational productivity of 37.6%. The beta coefficient for cooperation is positive and statistically significant (Table 3), suggesting that it has a beneficial effect on organisational productivity. According to Mingchang and Ya-Hsueh (2014), this is the correct conclusion. In a similar vein to what Mickan and Sylvia found, a positive and statistically significant beta indicates that team trust positively affects organisational productivity (2000). A large and positive beta value for the workplace environment suggests that it boosts organisational efficiency. These outcomes are in line with what Nepal (2016) found. It is in line with the results from Nikandrou and Tsachourid (2015) that development and training have a beneficial influence on organisational productivity, as shown by positive beta. In addition, the positive beta value of esprit de corps suggests that it has a beneficial influence on organisational productivity. Reisel et al. (2005) would agree with these findings.

5. Conclusion

Training and development, esprit de corps, trust, and teamwork all impact organisational productivity. The most crucial of these is the environment in the workplace. When factors like training and growth, esprit de corps, trust, and collaboration are included, workplace satisfaction rises. A strong and positive correlation suggests that businesses in Port Harcourt that produce table water should prioritise improving teamwork, offering adequate training and development, making the workplace more pleasant, and promptly responding to team trust issues in order to boost organisational productivity.

References

- Agrawal, S., & Adjirackor, T. (2016). Impact of teamwork on organizational productivity in some selected basic schools in the ACCRA Metropolitan Assembly. *European Journal of Business, Economics and Accountancy*, 4(6), 40-52.
- Ahmad, I., & Din, S. (2009). Evaluating training and development. *Gomal Journal of Medical Sciences*, 7, 165-166.
- Boyt, T. E., Lusch, R. F., & Naylor, G. (2001). The role of professionalism in determining job satisfaction in professional services: A study of marketing researchers. *Journal of Service Research*, 3 (4), 321-330.
- Chaudhary, N., & Sharma, B. (2012). Impact of employee motivation on performance (productivity) in Private organization. *International Journal of Business Trends and Technology*, 2(4), 25-31.
- Dorgan, C. E. (1994). Productivity link to the indoor environment estimated relative to ASHRAE 62-1989 proceedings of health buildings. *Budapest*, 461-472.
- Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350-383.
- Hamonangan, I. D., Asmawi, M., & Widodo, S. E. (2020). The effect of organizational culture, leadership style, and trust to organizational commitments of LP31 Polytechnic Jakarta lecturers. *International Journal of Human Capital Management*, 4(1), 16-25.

Hwang, J. I., & Chang, H. (2009). Work climate perception and turnover intention among Korean Hospital Staff. *International Nursing Review*, 56 (1), 73-80.

Jones, A., Richard, B., Paul, D., Sloane, K., and Peter, F. (2007). Effectiveness of teambuilding in organization. *Journal of Management*, 5(3), 35-37.

Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. (1969). *Organization and environment*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School, Division of Research.

Manzoor, S. R., Vllah, H., Hussain, M., & Ahmad, Z. M. (2011). Effect of teamwork on employee performance. *International Journal of Learning and Development*, 1 (1), 110-126.

Mbinya, M. E. (2013). Factors affecting teamwork in export processing zones in Kenya: *A Case of Indigo Garments Export Processing Zone LTD* (Master's dissertation, Kenyatta University).

McGuire, D., & McLaren, L. (2009). The impact of physical environment on employee commitment in call centres: The mediating role of employee well-being. *Team Performance Management*, 15(1/2), 35-48.

Mickan, S., & Sylvia, R. (2000). The organizational context for teamwork: Comparing health care and business literature. *Australian Health Review*, 23 (1), 179-192.

Mingchang, W., Ya-Hsueh, C. (2014). A factor analysis on teamwork performance: An empirical study of inter-instituted collaboration. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 55, 37-54.

Morgan, Jr., Ben, B., Eduardo, S., & Albert, G. (1993). An analysis of team evolution and maturation. *Journal of General Psychology*, 120(July), 277-291.

Nepal, P. (2016). Relationship between job satisfaction and performance of Nepalese commercial banks. *Nepalese Journal of Management Journal*, 34(1), 487-516.

Nikandrou, I., & Tsachouridi, I. (2015). Towards a better understanding of the buffering effects of organizational virtuousness' perceptions on employee outcomes. *Management Decision*, 53(8), 1823-1842.

Rasool, S. F., Maqbool, R., Samma, M., Zhao, Y., & Anjum, A. (2019). Positioning depression as a critical factor in creating a toxic workplace environment for diminishing worker productivity. *Sustainability*, 11(9), 1-18.

Raziq, A., & Maulabakhsh, R. (2015). Impact of working environment on job satisfaction. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 23, 717-725.

Reisel, W. D., Chia, S. L., & Maloles, C. M. (2005). Job insecurity spillover to key account management: Negative effect on performance, effectiveness, adaptiveness, and esprit de corps. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 19*(4), 483-503.

Scott, W. R. (1987). The adolescence of Institutional theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 32*(4), 493-511.

Sedarmayanti, A. (2003). Working procedures and work productivity an overview of aspects of ergonomics or the link between man and work environment. Bandung: *Mandar Maju, 1*(2), 67-80.

Sims, R. (2002). *Organizational success through effective human resources management*. Westport
CT: Quorum Books

Thompson, J. D. (1967). *Organizations in action: Social science bases of administrative theory*. New
York: McGraw-Hill.

Tirmizi, M. A., & Shazad, M. H. S. (2009). Is it industry productive: A performance base investigation of IT sector firms operating in Pakistan? *International Journal of Business management, 4*(5), 207-221.

Ulabor, E. A., Akande, S. O., & Abiodun, O. B. (2020). Investing impacts of team –building and organizational leadership on corporate productivity: Case study of selected employees in Osun state Nigeria. *Business, management, and Economics Research, 6*(2), 21-29.