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ABSTRACT
This study on team work approach to the management of change in selected manufacturing organisations in Nigeria: challenges, strategies and prospects focused on establishing the extent to which strategies for change management are compatible with teamwork approach to change, ascertaining the extent to which teamwork approach to change management holds good prospects for sustenance and viability in Nigerian manufacturing organizations, identifying the relationship between teamwork and organizational performance, determining the level of acceptance of organizational change among employees and finding out if the management of organizational change is hindered by the inability to cope with the challenges of teamwork approach. The study adopted the survey research design, in which ten (10) manufacturing companies in the South-Eastern Nigeria were studied. The population of the study was 13,623 and the sample size was calculated to be 598 using the Taro Yamane’s formula. The sampling selection was the stratified sampling method. A structured questionnaire and oral interview guide were the research instruments used for the study. Data collected were presented descriptively using charts, simple frequency and percentage distribution, mean and standard deviation. Hypotheses one and four were tested using the Chi-Square test statistic, the hypotheses two and five were tested using the Z-test statistic and the hypothesis three was tested using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient. The major findings of the study were that strategies for change management are significantly compatible with teamwork approach to change management in Nigerian manufacturing organizations ($X^2_{cal} = 13.78 > X^2_{critical} = 9.49, p < 0.05$); teamwork approach to change management in Nigeria manufacturing organizations to a large extent holds good prospects for sustenance and viability ($Z_{cal} = 5.76 > Z_{critical} = 1.96, p < 0.05$); there is significant positive relationship between teamwork and organizational performance in the management of manufacturing organisations ($r_{cal} = 0.89 > r_{critical} = 0.09, p < 0.05$); the employees of Nigerian manufacturing organizations to a large extent accept organizational change ($X^2_{cal} = 9.76 > X^2_{critical} = 9.49, p < 0.05$) and management of organizational change is severely hindered by inability to cope with the challenges of teamwork approach in Nigerian manufacturing organizations ($Z_{cal} = 4.55 > Z_{critical} = 1.96, p < 0.05$). The work concludes that teamwork approach to the management of change has the prospect of making the manufacturing organisations very effective, viable and sustainable. Specifically, it has the benefits of improved productivity and product quality, innovativeness and manpower development. Based on the findings, the study recommended among others that teamwork approach should be adopted by manufacturing organizations as an integral concept within their organizations, particularly as interventionist strategy to the management of change; an effective team should be built by applying practical skills/strategies to maximize team performance and development; and Manufacturing organizations leaders should encourage their organizations to anticipate change, to understand the nature of change and to manage change well.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Groups and teams are a major feature of organizational life. To Katzenbach and Smith (1993:111-120), a work team is a group of people with complementary skills who are committed to a common mission, performance goals, and approach for which they hold themselves mutually accountable. Work is a group-based activity and if the organization is to function effectively, it requires collaboration and co-operation among its members (Mullins, 2010:307). However, Nelson and Quick (2005:178) go further to differentiate between groups and teams, they affirm that all work teams are groups, but not all groups are work team, groups emphasize individual leadership, individual accountability, and individual work products. Work teams emphasize shared leadership, mutual accountability, and collective work products.

Teams are increasingly becoming the primary means for organizing work in contemporary business firms (Robins and Judge, 2007:338). Most activities of the organization require at least some degree of co-ordination through the operation of groups and team work. Mullins (2010:306) goes further to explain that an understanding of the nature of groups is vital if the manager is to influence the behavior of people in the work situation. The manager must be aware of the impact of groups and teams and their effects on organization performance. Organizations are increasingly making use of teams to achieve their objectives. Teams occur when a number of people have common goal and recognize that their personal success is dependent on the success of others (Ugbam, 2011:336). Organizational teams need to accomplish corporate goals. While the organization is a hub of all activities, teams are the spokes, which generate output. Teamwork can yield much more than a sum of individual
efforts simply due to organized effort and streamlined work processes. Work efficiency is enhanced and needless multiplication of processes is eliminated (Nzewi, 2006:14).

Decades ago, when companies like W.L. Gore, Volvo, and General Foods introduced teams into their production processes, it made news because no one else was doing it. Today, it’s just the opposite; it’s the organization that does not use teams that has become news worthy (Robins and Judge, 2007:338). From late 1990’s, approximately 80 percent of Fortune 500 companies now have half or more of their employers on teams. And 68 percent of small U.S. manufacturers are using teams in their production areas (Strozniak, 2000:47). How do we explain the current popularity of teams? The evidence suggests that teams typically outperform individuals when the task being done requires multiple skills, judgment, and experience (Glassop, 2002:225-250).

As organizations have restructured themselves to compete more effectively and efficiently, they have turned to teams as a better way to use employees’ talents. Robins and Judge (2007:338) are of the opinion that teams have the capability to quickly assemble, deploy, refocus and disband. As a result, management has found that teams are more flexible and responsive to changing events than are traditional departments or other forms of permanent groupings. Teams can compete, wrestle, succeed or fail. A good organizational team can be an invaluable asset to the organization. A bad team can break the internal structure of the organization (Nzewi, 2006:14). Also Coles (2002:19) in his own opinion says that it is also important that teams enjoy reasonable autonomy. When teams enjoy autonomy they are empowered (Gibson, 1996:23).

Onodugo and Igwe (2010:95) maintain that, team building is one of the key imperatives for a successful organization. Team-building is seen as one aspect of organizational development strategy that makes or helps organizational change to be successfully employed in many
manufacturing organizations. By definition, Team-building is an organizational development strategy that is often used in organization to make work groups more cohesive, committed, satisfied, and productive (Parker, 1990:146-147). When interaction among group member is critical to group success, effective team building is always useful. Moorhead and Griffin (1995:481) see team building as members working together in a spirit of cooperation and generally has one or more of the following, goals;

- To set team goals, priorities, or both
- To analyze or allocate the way work is performed
- To examine the way a group is working, that is to examine processes such as norms, decision-making and communications.
- To examine relationships among the people doing their work.

Change is an inevitable and constant feature. It is an inescapable part of both social and organizational life and we are all subject to continual change of one form or another. Akarele and Akarele (2000:794) opine that, change is an inevitable part of human beings, the institutions they establish, as well as their environment. Organizational change could be a reaction to the internal or external environment. An organization is subject to many pressures for change from a variety of sources. Moreover, because the complexity of events and the rapidity of change are increasing, predicting what type of pressure for change will be most meaningful in the next decades is difficult (Moorhead and Griffin, 1995:468). A central feature of the successful organization is the diagnosis of its culture, health and performance, and the ability of the organization to adapt to change (Mullins, 2010:736). In any case, the change presupposes that management assumes or believes that the values and goals of the proposed system are preferable to any other system (Afarele, 1998). Changes are meant to cope with emerging situation in the organization.
Today’s business environment requires manufacturing organizations to undergo changes almost constantly if they are to remain competitive. Dubey and Sanjeev Bansal (2012:49) posit that, radical changes or incremental changes can be characterized as the implementation of deliberate and fundamental changes in business process to achieve breakthrough improvements in performance. Organizations must change because their environments change, managers must not rush in introducing a change. The process must be slow, steady and thorough (Fajana, 2002). Dessler (2011:316) maintains that organizational turn around often starts with a change in the firm’ strategy, mission, and vision-with strategic change.

Adeyeye (2009:15) says that, nowadays business environment produce change in the workplace more suddenly and frequently than ever before. Mergers, acquisitions, new technology, restructuring, downsizing and economic meltdown are all factors that contribute to a growing climate of uncertainty. The ability to adapt to changing work conditions is key for individual and organizational survival. Change will be ever present and learning to manage and lead change includes not only understanding human factors, but also skill to manage and lead change effectively (Pettigrew and Whipp, 1991:323-336). Change is the only element of human phenomena that is constant.

Organizational change occurs when a manufacturing organization makes a transition from its current state to some desired future state. Managing change is important in today’s challenging environment (Dessler, 2011:315). In other words, managing organizational change is the process of planning and implementing change in organizations in such a way as to minimize employee resistance and cost to the organization, while also maximizing the effectiveness of the change effort (Fajana, 2002). Also organizational development is concerned with the planning and implementation of programs designed to enhance the effectiveness with which an organization functions and responds to change (Armstrong, 2006:337).
The greatest nightmare facing organizations and their managers today is the series of rapid and complex changes which they have to contend with on a continuous basis (Muo, 2004:1198). He goes further to clarify that some of these changes are externally propelled by forces which the organization has little control over: International forces like the Gulf war and the Israeli-Palestinian face-off; rapid changes in technology leading to frightening rates of obsolescence, unforeseen changes in the demographic configuration of societies which automatically changes customers tastes and desires and even what constitutes the target market; globalization and internationalization, increasing competitive pressures, regulatory and legal environment and new types of risks after September 2011. The forces for change may come from the environment external to the firm, from within the organization or from the individuals themselves (Weighrich and Koontz, 2005:337). Irrespective of any force that influences change in any organization, the change must be planned. McAfee and Champagne (1983) define planned changes as any deliberate attempt to modify the functioning of the total organization, or one of its major components, in order to improve effectiveness. The planned change efforts can focus on individual, group, or organizational behavior. Change and change management are concepts that have come to assume greater importance in the discussions of top executives of most manufacturing organizations.

McKee (2005) suggests that one most significant essential for success during transition is team-building and maintains that leaders that can challenge, motivate, and empower their teams through change are successful. He went further to state that, leaders who can keep their work teams focused during changes will have organization and business which thrive. McAfee and Champagne (1983) assert that forces of change, also known as change drives or change initiators, can either be external or internal. The external change drives are those forces that are outside the control of management, but have made change imperative. These include government policies, political development, technology, competition, changing
consumer behavior, industrial practices, external stake holder interests, socio-economic environment, and customer capabilities. Mullins (2010:752) opines that change also originates within the organization itself, of which the organization have reasonable measure of control for example, as material resources such as building, equipment or machinery deteriorate or loss of efficiency, or as human resources get older, or as skills and abilities become outdated. Mullins goes further to state that both external and internal forces for change, are not found in isolation, they are interrelated. More often than not, external change drives create internal change drives, which lead to organizational change.

The successful management of change is clearly essential for continued economic performance and competitiveness and is the life-blood of business success (Mullins, 2010:759). If change is important, then more important is its management. When change is not properly managed, the result can be disastrous, because of the possibilities of resistance among people. To successfully manage change, one needs to understand basic concepts and strategies to build commitment and acceptance to change in all levels of the organization. Robbins and Judge (2007:646) maintain that, if an organization is to survive, it must respond to changes in its environment. Efforts to stimulate innovation, empower employees, and introduce work teams are examples of planned-change activities directed at responding to changes in the environment. Judge (2000:216-226) concludes that change agents like managers or non-managers, current employees of the organization, newly hired employees, or outside consultants are responsible for managing change activities.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Business environment today produces change in the workplace more suddenly and frequently than ever before. Yet the process of change is difficult and implementing it successfully makes considerable demands on the managers involved. In most manufacturing
organizations, changes occur because the existing situations and conditions are unfavorable for optimal realization of goals and objectives. The organization may experience unwholesome, undesirable, and wasteful practice from their members, which usually retard progress. These undesirable practices manifest in various forms, such as inter-personal and inter-group conflicts, general hostility, strikes, decreased performances, mismanagement of resources, and Luke-warmness. It has become apparent that for manufacturing organizations to remain in business and to weather the many challenges underpinning their efforts in this direction they must look for creative solutions, they must change.

A major feature of organizational life is team, and it can have significant influence on the successful implementation of change. Most change can disrupt teamwork. Unless people are involved, committed and prepared to adapt and learn; if not, objectives, plans, and future desired state may likely be resisted. The danger of domination of the team by some powerful members, the difficulty in placing responsibility for a bad team decision, the effects of selecting poorly qualified persons as members and team decisions may result from compromise; poses great challenges to team approach to change management. A major team problem may be that of conformity, which raises its head in a number of cases, ranging from groupthink to social loafing. With the wide use of teams, personal and inter-group conflict may arise. The ability of the leader to persuade and influence his followers, which in turn, depends largely on how much power the leader possesses, will determine how effective team-oriented approach to change management will succeed.

Kola Jamodu president of MAN in his opening address during 2011 40th Annual Report and Accounts recognizes the federal government initiative of vision 20:2020. He however identifies some urgent national issues bordering on; National Security, Power Sector Road Map, Tariff Issues and Government Fiscal Operation. Specifically, there are major challenges facing manufacturing organizations in Nigeria today, existing evidence shows that every
economic sector across the country appears to be facing similar challenges and threats. While in other countries, in Africa, major infrastructural facilities, example water, electricity and transportation system work efficiently and taken for granted, Nigerians and indeed manufacturing industry have the problem of basic necessities of life, poor transportation system, currency devaluation, deregulation, globalization and collapse of the Nigerian stock exchange. Obviously most of the aforementioned challenges have compounded and escalated the cost of doing business in Nigeria. Today, each manufacturer in this country provides its own water via borehole, transportation needs by having fleet of vehicles, spends heavily outside normal overhead for security at personal and organizational levels, grades the roads leading to factories, buys and runs generators for a dedicated power supply, and so on.

Furthermore, a survey carried out by Nigerian Association of Chambers of Commerce, Industry, Mines and Agriculture (NACCIMA) has shown that only six percent of industrialist in the country has been able to access the various intervention funds made available by the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN). Also, Branch Chairman of Imo/Abia branch of MAN, G.C. Ekenma in his address during the branch 25th Annual General Meeting highlighted the following as part of the major issues that confront them; challenging business/operating environment, imposition of a fixed charge for energy by National Electricity Regulatory Commission (NERC), Collapse of public infrastructure, local patronage, Scarcity of Gas and security of lives and property. Another survey conducted by MAN revealed that out of about 2,500 member-companies of MAN, 30% of them had closed down, 60% are ailing and only 10% are operating at sustainable level. The cost of manufacturing in Nigeria therefore is nine times that of China, four times that of Europe, four times above the figure in South African and twice the figure in Ghana.

In order to address the crisis facing manufacturing organizations in Nigeria, many of them have turned to teamwork approach to change management in order to reinvent themselves.
Another reason for using team approach to change management is due to the fact that it brings about innovation in the design of products and quality. To this end, it would be pertinent to investigate the challenges, strategies and prospects of team work approach to management of change in Nigerian manufacturing organizations. This will enable one to say with some air of confidence the extent to which managers of these organizations can cope with change using the team approach.

1.3 Objectives of the Study
The study has the overall objective of examining how team work approach could be employed in management of change in Nigerian manufacturing organizations. The specific objectives of the study are:

1. To establish the extent to which strategies for change management are compatible with teamwork approach to change.
2. To ascertain the extent to which teamwork approach to change management holds good prospects for sustenance and viability in Nigerian Manufacturing organisations.
3. To identify the relationship between teamwork and organizational performance in management of manufacturing organisations under study.
4. To determine the level of acceptance of organizational change among employees in the manufacturing organizations under study.
5. To find out if the management of organizational change is hindered by the inability to cope with the challenges of teamwork approach

1.4 Research Questions
1. To what extent are strategies for change management compatible with teamwork approach to change management in Nigeria Manufacturing organizations?
2. To what extent does teamwork approach to change management hold good prospects for sustenance and viability in Nigerian manufacturing organizations?

3. What is the nature of the relationship between teamwork and organizational performance in management of manufacturing organisations under study?

4. To what extent do the employees of Nigerian manufacturing organizations accept organizational changes?

5. To what extent is the management of organizational change hindered by inability to cope with the challenges of teamwork approach to change management.

1.5 Research Hypotheses

To achieve the objectives of this study and provide answers to the research questions, the following hypotheses have been formulated to guide the conduct of the study:

(i) Strategies for change management are significantly compatible with teamwork approach to change management in Nigerian manufacturing organizations.

(ii) Teamwork approach to change management in Nigeria manufacturing organizations to a large extent holds good prospects for sustenance and viability.

(iii) There is significant positive relationship between teamwork and organizational performance in the management of manufacturing organisations.

(iv) The employees of Nigerian manufacturing organizations to a large extent accept organizational change.

(v) Management of organizational change is significantly hindered by inability to cope with the challenges of teamwork approach in Nigerian manufacturing organizations.

1.6 Significance of the Study

The significance of the study is of great importance to the following:
1. To the manufacturing organizations: This study will help the organizations to understand the need and reason for change and how to use the teamwork approach to change management better to achieve their goals.

2. To the Government officials and Policymaker: The discussions carried out in this study will enlighten them more on how their policies, rules and regulations affect negatively the manufacturing organizations in Nigeria. These help them make better policies and rules that will be favourable to these organizations in order to improve their productivity and the economy in general.

3. To practicing managers and General Public: This study exposes the challenges, strategies and prospects of change management in manufacturing organizations. The revelation in this study will help to enlighten managers and the public on how to manage and reduce resistance to change in all their organizations and in all aspect of life in general.

4. To Future Researchers: This study will help future researchers in carrying out their own study, especially those that are related to this topic. It will serve as source of reference materials, in this regards by providing secondary data to them.

1.7 The Scope of the Study

Choice of Organizations Selected: Ten manufacturing organizations in the South-Eastern part of Nigeria which are duly registered members of MAN, doing business in Nigeria, must have up to 40 individuals working in the organization and specialize in the production of household products were purposively selected from 225 organisations in the Southeast.
**Time Scope:** From 2007 to 2014.

**Area Scope:** The study is limited in scope to ten manufacturing organizations with reference to the examination of the challenges, strategies and prospects of teamwork approach to change management in Nigerian manufacturing organizations in the South Eastern state of Nigeria.

**Geographical Scope:** Two organizations were picked from each South Eastern state. The Manufacturers Association of Nigeria (MAN) has two branches in the South-Eastern States. These are:

1. Anambra /Enugu/Ebonyi States branch
2. Imo/Abia States branch

**Table 1.1 Names of organizations studied.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>ORGANIZATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Innoson Technical and Industries Company Limited Enugu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unilever Onitsha Plc. Anambra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>P.Z Cussons Nigeria Plc Aba, Abia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rokana Industries Plc Owerri, Imo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Crushed Rock Industries (Nigeria) Limited Ishiagu, Ebonyi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hardis and Dromedas Ltd Enugu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pokobros Food and Chemical Industries Ltd Onitsha Anambra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Chellarams Plc Aba, Abia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rice Mill Company Nigeria Ltd, Ebonyi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Camela Vegetable Oil Co Ltd, Imo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fieldwork., 2014.

**1.8 Delimitations of the Study**

In carrying out a study of this nature, the following constraints were encountered;

**The Attitude of some Respondents:** Some of the respondents claimed that they were too busy and refused to accept our questionnaire. Even some that accepted the questionnaire refused to answer some questions in the instrument.
Data: All the materials needed for this work could not be gotten because as the respondent was gathering information for the work, new materials were been rolled out. Notwithstanding, the respondent visited many libraries both locally and internationally, organizations under study and made use of the internet; to gather enough data needed for this work. However, in all, we obtained responses which we consider adequate for the study.

1.9 Operational Definition of Terms.

In the course of the study, we set out below operational definition in respect of terms which we have used.

**Change**: Is a pervasive influence, it is an inevitable and constant feature. It is an inescapable part of both social and organizational life and we all subject to continual change of one form or another. (Mullins, 2005:909)

**Change Agents**: These are persons who act as catalysts and assume the responsibility for managing change activities. They are individuals or groups of individuals whose task is to effect the desired change in an organization. (Robbins and Judge, 2007: 647)

**Change Management**: Change management is a structured approach to transitioning individuals, teams, and organizations from a current state to a desired future state.

**Group**: A group is two or more people having common interests, objectives and continuing interaction (Nelson and Quick, 2005: 178).

**Groupthink**: Groupthink occurs when group member have very similar experiences and frame of references, particularly when they have relatively long tenures in the group. (Hambrick, 2001:289)

**Organizational Culture**: Organizational culture helps to explain how things are performed in different organizations. (Mullins, 2010:764).
**Organizational Development**: Is concerned with planning and implementation of programs designed to enhance the effectiveness with which an organization functions and responds to change. (Armstrong, 2006: 337).

**Planned Change**: A planned change is a deliberate attempt to modify the functioning of the total organization, or one of its major components, in order to improve effectiveness. Planned change represents an intentional attempt to improve in some important way, the operational effectiveness of the organization. (Mullins, 2010:753)

**Social Loafing**: Social Loafing is defined by Mullins (2010:354-355) as the tendency for individuals to expend less effort when working as a member of a group than as an individual.

**Team**: Team is a group of people with complementary skills who work toward common goals for which they hold themselves mutually accountable. (Robert and David, 2001:60)

**Team Norm**: This refers to established standard to which all members of the team must conform. (Malcolm, 1997:90)

**Work Team**: A work team is a group whose individual effort results in a performance that is greater than the sum of the individual inputs. (Robbins and Judges, 2007: 339)

**Team Approach**: This concerns the direction in which human and material resources will be applied in order to increase the chances of achieving selected objectives.

**Team-building**: Team-building activities aim to improve and develop the effectiveness of a group of people who work (permanently or temporarily) together. (Armstrong, 2006:355). It is also a high interaction among team members to increase trust and openness. (Robbins and Judge, 2007:657).
1.10 Profile of Selected Manufacturing Organizations

1.10.1 Innoson Technical and Industries Company Limited Enugu

Innoson Technical and Industrial Co. Ltd produce the best plastic products in the country. Innoson Technical and Industrial Limited is a subsidiary of Innoson group of companies and were incorporated in 2002 with its Head Office/Factory situated at Plot W/L Industrial Layout, Emene Enugu in Enugu State, Nigeria. The Chairman/Founder is Chief (Dr) Innocent Chukwuma (OFR). The Company has received so many corporate Awards. The company started in 1976 as a motorcycle manufacturing / assembly plants located in Nnewi, Anmbra state. Full scale operations and production of Innoson Technical & Industrial Co. Ltd commenced in October 2002. Since inception, this company ranks the biggest plastic industry in Nigeria. It produces the highest quality range of the plastic products of international standard and has a production over 10,000 pieces of chairs and tables per day.

Due to the rapid demand of these products, the company's twelve production lines of injection moulds have since been increased with tremendous and near perfect production lines of international standard. It was also established to further consolidate their leading position in the Motorcycle industry by producing the motorcycle plastic requirement of Innoson Nigeria Limited which is a sister company. This effort was in direct response to the Federal Government policy direction towards encouraging private sector as the engine of growth for the economy. Over six hundred indigenous employees and few expatriate staff are working in the company. The company has an annual turnover of 3.6 billion naira. Their foreign partners are CRETEC INDUSTRIES CO., LTD (China) whose wealth of experience is unquantifiable. Innoson Technical and Industrial Company utilize the latest technology and machinery together with its technical partners to produce high quality products at affordable prices within the market place. It is an indigenous blue chip company engaged in the manufacturing of Plastic Chairs, Tables, Trays, Plates, Spoons, Cups, Jerry Cans of different
sizes, drums, and motorcycle parts, toys, PVC Hoses, dust bins, Ammeter boxes and many other allied products.

1.10.2 Unilever Onitsha Plc.

Unilever Nigeria Plc., was incorporated as Lever Brothers (West Africa) Ltd on 11th April, 1923 by Lord Leverhulme, but the company’s antecedents have to be traced back to his existing trading interests in Nigeria and West Africa generally, and to the fact that he had since the 19th century been greatly involved with the soap business in Britain. Unilever Nigeria Plc. started as a soap manufacturing company, and is today one of the oldest surviving manufacturing organizations in Nigeria. Its Headquarters is at no 1 Billings Way Oregun, Ikeja Lagos, Nigeria; Ikeja; Lagos. Lever Brothers (WA) Ltd went public in 1973. Lever Brothers of Nigeria Plc. strengthened its foothold in the foods and personal product business by merger with Lipton (Nigeria) Limited in 1984 and Chaseborough products in 1988. The Lever brothers and Lipton merger is an epitome of a synergistic merger especially for the shareholders of Lipton who hitherto had been holding unquoted shares. The lever brother/Lipton merger led to increase in net asset per share for Lipton shareholders who in the immediate post-merger period have a net asset per share of N173.34 as compared to the 1983 Lipton net asset per share of N70.28, which was its largest ever. Lever Brothers of Nigeria (LBN) in the post-merger period had per share of N61.30, which far exceeded the Lipton’s earning per share peak of 20k in 1982.

Lever brothers of Nigeria Plc. merged with Unilever Nigeria Ltd (Former A. J. Steward) in 1995, the name Lever Brothers Nigeria Plc. Was changed to Unilever Nigeria Plc. in October, 2001. Currently, Unilever Nigeria Plc. Operates factories which are located in Apapa, Aba and Agbara in Ogun State. There is another factory producing tea in the Mambilla. The Company started with the business of producing of bar soap using palm oil in Apapa factory,
which was commissioned in 1924. Aba factory which was commissioned in 1985 was producing sunlight and key laundry soaps initially, but in 1990 an additional plant was installed for production of Omo, Surf Detergent as well as Vim powder. Agbara factory in Ogun State is the company’s third factory, which was commissioned for the manufacturing of edible products. Some of the products of Unilever Nigeria Plc. Include; multi-action Detergent (Improved), Lux beauty soap (with oil and moisturizer), Vaseline blue seal, Vaseline Baby jelly, Pears Baby jelly, Pears Petroleum jelly, Pears moisturizer baby cream, Close-up toothpaste, Pears baby powder and oil and so on.

1.10.3 P.Z Cussons Nigeria Plc Aba

PZ Cussons Plc. Aba is located along Glass Industry Road, Ogbor Hill, Aba, Aba North LGA in Abia State. It is engaged in the manufacturing and distribution of soaps, detergents, toiletries, pharmaceuticals, electrical goods, edible oils and nutritional products. The segments of the Company are toiletries and household; food and nutrition, and electrical goods. The geographical segments of the Company are Africa, Asia and Europe. On January 29, 2008, the Company completed the acquisition of The Sanctuary Spa Holdings Limited and its wholly owned subsidiaries. The Company’s Headquarters is at PZ Cussons Nigeria Plc. 45/47 Town Planning Way Ilupeju Industrial Estate PMB 21132 Ikeja Lagos Nigeria; Lagos; Lagos PZ Cussons Plc. is a leading manufacturer and distributor of a variety of products, especially soaps and other personal care items, including shampoo, baby power, and the like. These are marketed under PZ Cussons flagship imperial Leather brand and others, including Ordinary Source and Cares. The company also manufactures refrigerators and other white goods, including freezers and air conditioners; detergents and cleaners; feminine hygiene products; olive oil; packaging materials; and even pharmaceuticals. In 2003, PZ Cussons formed a joint venture with Ireland’s Glanbia to supply evaporated milk and milk powder in Nigeria. The company also acquired U.K. hair brand Charles
Worthington in Listed on the London Stock Exchange, the Zochonis family, which includes Chairman A. J. Green controls as much as 80 percent of the company’s stock. 2005. Although based in Manchester, PZ Cussons has long been controlled by the founding Zochonis family, from Greece, and has carved a niche for itself by focusing on various markets in Africa, especially Nigeria, Ghana, Cameroon, and East Africa. Known as Paterson Zochonis until its name change in 2002, the company’s history reached all the way back to the late 19th century. When it was founded as a trading post, called West African Merchants, in Sierra Leone by two partners, George Paterson, originally from England, and George Zochonis, from Greece, Paterson and Zochonis started out by shipping palm oil and other produce, such as palm kernels, cocoa, groundnuts, and seed cottons, as well as animal hides and skins, to the United Kingdom, and bringing back goods from England, such as cloth from Manchester. The business proved strong, and in 1884 Paterson and Zochonis incorporated the company as Paterson Zochonis (PZ). PZ gradually expanded its range of goods, establishing a degree of expertise in what was considered a difficult trading market. This expertise enabled the company to being expanding into other African markets and, most important, into Nigeria. PZ set up its Nigeria subsidiary in Lagos in 1899. Like its Sierra Leone brand, the Nigeria subsidiary at first operated as a trading merchant. George Paterson died in 1934, leaving George Zochonis in control of the company. The Zochonis family was by then already highly involved in the company’s expansion, and company traditions become the placing of members of the extended Zochonis family in key management positions. Indeed, by the beginning of the 21st century, the Zochonis family was said to represent about half of the group’s total payroll.

1.10.4 Rokana Industries Plc Owerri

Rokana Industries Plc was incorporated on the 11th September 1978 as a Private Limited Liability Company with the objectives of manufacturing toiletries, household’s products and
key personal hygiene products for the health-care market. The company maintains its head office at No 4 Ajayi Street, off 52 Allen Avenue (Next door to Lagos Hilton Hotel), Ikeja-Lagos, while its factory is located at Plot 5 Mission Road, Umualum-Nekede, Owerri. It also maintains sales office and depots in Kano and Aba. The company started as a wholly indigenous private enterprise. Upon its admission, in 1991 to the Second-Tier Securities Market of the Nigeria Stock Exchange, the company’s shares are now being held by the Nigerian public individuals, associations and corporate organizations. The general policy of the company is determined by the Board of Directors of which Engineer Charles C. Ugwuh is the Chairman and Managing Director. Ugwuh holds a Masters Degree in engineering thermodynamics and described in business circles as “The Man with a Vision” due to his dynamism in management and entrepreneurial projections. Assisting the Managing Director in the daily administration and management of the company also maintains the technical advisory services of her foreign suppliers and product brand owners. Rokana Industries Plc has its ultra-modern, purpose-built factory complex strategically located on the vast acre of land at Nekede on the outskirts of Owerri in Imo State. The complex presently houses four separate manufacturing plants, complete with quality control facilities. The factory also accommodates the company’s raw materials and finished products warehouses, utility service plants, liquefied Petroleum Gas Tank Farm and Factory Administration Office. The Four Existing Manufacturing Units at the Factory Are as Follows; 1. The Plastic unit; currently producing toothbrushes, dental stick/plague removers; plastic folders, cardholders and some plastic components for the aerosol production line. The aerosol unit is responsible for the production of insecticides, Air-fresheners, perfumes, furniture polish, deodorants, etc. 2. The LPG unit; refills domestic cooking gas cylinders for its various customers it also provides unstencched gas as propellant to the aerosol production line. 3. The cosmetic unit has modern facilities for the production of toothpastes, baby-care cosmetics, hair shampoo, skin lotions,
cream and ointments. Rokana has adequate capacity for all its products and other complimentary productions on contract basis. In both existing and new products developments, the overriding objective is high quality and functional excellence hence all of Rokana’s products classify in the premium products segment. 4. Jordan tooth brush which is one of Rokana’s quality products is a household name in dental care and probably the most widely recognized brand throughout the world. The best toothbrush is the one you feel most comfortable using. Jordan has specially designed toothbrush that are most efficient, effective and a pleasure to use. Jordan brushes come in a large variety of head sizes, bristle stiffness and types. Rokana currently holds the fames of the FIRST and the BEST toothbrush manufacturer in Nigeria for Africa. Other Products of the Company Include; Rokana dry airfreshner, Number 1. Insecticide, sparkle furniture polish, Natusan baby oils, lotion and ointment. Rokana dental stick/plaque-remover and Sparkle Toothpaste. At Rokana they believe in Success through Excellence.

1.10.5 Crushed Rock Industries (Nigeria) Limited Ishiagu, Ebonyi This company is a Nigerian-German outfit Incorporated on 13th May 1976 to carry on business as quarry masters and stone merchants. As Pacesetters in the Industry, Crushed Rock Industries like any other company passed through several developmental stages and surmounted so many obstacles, after which C.R.I. explored, drilled, excavated and finally developed the stone technology in Nigeria. The chairman is Chief Evans Enwerem and the Managing Director/CEO is Mr. Cord Pophankin Over the years, Crushed Rock Industries (Nigeria) Limited has developed into Nigeria's major producer and supplier of crushed granite aggregates, the sizes of which range from (0 - 50)mm and above depending on our customer's requirements. We also produce unique polished Granite Tiles with International reputation. Crushed Rock Industries has many
Quarries around the nation. Our products are in high demand for roads, bridges, runways and building construction. The Granite Chippings are in various sizes as shown below: 0 - 5mm (Dust), 5 - 15mm (1/2 Inch), 15 - 22mm (3/4 Inch), 36 - 55mm (Extra Large), 55Xmm (Hard Core), 100 - 300mm (Hard Core). The Granite Tiles are in various designs, colours and sizes as shown below: Ivory White, Ivory Gold, Ivory Silver, Supare Zebra, Supare Tiger, Supare Grey. Intended Use: Floor and walls in aesthetic and captivating designs of luxury residential homes. Exclusive outfit of first class hotels. Work tops, floors and walls for luxury kitchens. Vanity tops for bathrooms. Halls and staircases of multi-storey houses. Representative facades and internal outfit of sophisticated offices and administration buildings. We can be reached on the following contacts: Head Office; Address: Km16 PH/Aba Expressway, Eleme Junction. Port Harcourt, Rivers State. Nigeria. And Ishiagu Quarry Address: Ishiagu, Ebonyi State. Nigeria. We also have branches at Lagos, Abuja, Cross River state and Ondo states in Nigeria.

1.10.6 Hardis and Dromedas Limited Emene Enugu, Enugu State

Hardis is located at Hardis Industrial Estate, Airport Road, Emene Enugu in Nigeria. The company offers services in manufacturing, sale of household toiletries and hygienical products. Also produced at Hardis are plastics, cosmetics and health products in addition to waste recycling and research. The Chairman and Chief Executive Officer/ Managing Director of Hardis and Dromedas Limited is Dr Chike Obidigbo. He is also the Chairman of Manufacturers Association of Nigeria (MAN) Anambra/Enugu/Ebonyi states branch with effect from 15th December, 2012 till date.

Hardis & Dromedas Ltd is a known name in Nigeria as a reputable Manufacturing Company. Over the past 20 years, they have carefully developed and launched into the Nigerian market
several fine products including Isol Germicide; Isol is the only replica of erstwhile famous IZAL Germicide which is 6 times stronger than other disinfectants. Hardis also produces Isol Soap, Divitolf Antiseptic Disinfectant, Ekko Rosewater (Odour control and Air freshener), Akacha Natural Soap, Akacha Heat Balm, Royallux Range of Beauty products, Household Bleach, Hadromed Methylated Spirit, among several other good quality products.

All their products are carefully prepared from choice ingredients, by highly knowledgeable and dedicated staff to give their numerous customers good quality products at highly competitive prices. Most of their products are available both as high concentrates in bulk quantity for local dilution, and whenever required, as ready-for-use products labeled to clients specification.

1.10.7 Pokobros Foods and Chemical Industries Limited Onitsha, Anambra State

The Chairman, Chief (Dr.) Paul Amanchukwu Okonkwor's unrelenting attitude towards hard work is what metamorphosed in the conglomerate known as Pokobros® Group [W.A] Limited. Located at no 4 Pokobros Industrial Avenue Off Atani Road Onitsha Anambra State in Nigeria the parent company housing over twenty two (22) viable subsidiary companies charged with the responsibility of active ergonomics in the Nigerian economy. In 1961, our amiable chairman, Chief Paul Okonkwor as a young person who believed in industrialization. He proved his mettle beyond imagination. He introduced various vehicle parts and accessories into the Nigerian automobile sector; he also introduced Austin Fan Blades amongst others, he had the penchant for real-time business. A goal-getter, in 1982 Chief Okonkwor set to establish a food industry with negotiation between Simon Foods of England and his good self. This dream materialized in 1985 with the commissioning of POKOBROS® FOODS & CHEMICAL IND. LTD concerned with the conversion of rice to rice flour. It is obvious that business seemed good under his managerial experience and expertise then he decided to crown his automobile care care products ambition. Owing to his
wealth of experience in automobile dated back before the war he incorporated the most adorned WHIZ® OIL LIMITED. When we started in 1965 it was like a crawling baby, but determination and knack for hard-work have seen us grow each day. We have over the years developed high quality products in these areas and our name has become synonymous with quality. In Pokobros® Group, they sponsor up to twelve functional & viable factories with over 2000 employees. The success of America & Britain today cannot be mentioned without attribute to private-sector industrialists, hence the government knows and appreciates the role of industrialists in economic sustenance that is towards alleviating & ameliorating the plight of the teeming unemployed young people, which naturally should have been a burden to the government. Pokobros® Group is made up of people with high entrepreneurial, managerial & business-oriented professionals whose team spirit plays an important role in sustaining the group high-ranking profile & her operations.

1.10.8 Chellarams Plc Aba, Abia State

Chellarams Plc is a well known and trusted provider for both the consumer and industrial goods markets in Nigeria. Established in 1923, Chellarams possesses immense experience in manufacturing, distribution, sales and marketing in Nigeria. The Chairman of the company is Otumba Solomom Kayode Onafowokan and the company is located at no 10 Osisioma Road AbA North Abia State, Nigeria. The company’s strong international reputation and professional infrastructure makes it a preferred business partner and place of employment. Chellarams plc is a leading Nigerian conglomerate with capabilities that span a diverse array of industries including manufacturing, retail, distribution, marketing and power generation. Chellarams has been successfully operating in Nigeria for almost 90 years. Chellarams uses its in-depth market knowledge and extensive local connections to effectively facilitate efficient, result-driven operations across the country. Chellarams strives to not only to provide Nigeria with quality products but also to create total solutions and services for the
growth of their appeal and market share. Well staffed and capable departments ensure that all fiscal transactions and procedures, from the supplier through to the end-user, are professional, prompt and efficient. Their products includes; Air Compressor, Chemical, Motorcycles, Foam Machinery, Forklift.

1.10.9 Rice Mill Company Nigeria Limited Abakaliki, Ebonyi State

The Rice Mill Company Nigeria Limited, Abakaliki, Ebonyi State is always a beehive of activity. Currently, the mill boasts of over 5,000 workers, 2,500 rice milling machines and a production capacity of more than 11,000 tons. The company started as Abakaliki Rice Mill in 1967 on No. 60-65 Gunning Road Abakaliki. The first milling engine procured for milling of Abakaliki rice was bought by one Mr. Anekwe Bestman. The relocation of the mill to its present site was done under one Hon. P. O. Nwike, who was then the Executive Chairman, Abakaliki Local Government Area in the then Anambra State. Signatories to the statement include the Chairman, Joseph Ununu; Administrative Secretary, Nwede Richard; Secretary, Usulo Emmanuel and Fidelis Igwe. However, on November 15, 1977, the land used for the construction of the rice mill was leased by the Abakaliki local council to rice mill association, Abakaliki for 99 years upon payment of valuable consideration. In September, 1989, the Rice Mill Association Abakaliki was registered as a company with the incorporation name – Rice Mill Company Nig. Ltd with registration number RC. 136,800. But on January 1, 2000, customary right of occupancy with respect to the entire area of land measuring 1938.464 square metres occupied by the company was issued by the Government of Ebonyi State. Inside the rice mill established in 1957 lies an expanse of land measuring 1938.464 square metres, various workers abound – machine operators, dust carriers, bag stickers, off loaders, barrow pushers, on-loaders, accountants, water suppliers, security men and a host of others. Every month, the industry presently pays N55,000 as revenue to the Abakaliki local government council and another N55,000 as payment for business premises to the state.
government monthly. It is interesting to note that over 50% of the mill is owned by non-indigenes of Ebonyi State, many of whom have been active stakeholders in the rice mill for decades. There is a thriving market within the mill, run by several petty traders of foodstuffs, provisions, and other daily needs. There are restaurants, warehouses, and a petrol station. Interestingly too, the filling station, Rice Mill Oil, is run by the Rice Mill Owners’ Association. The Rice Mill Owners’ Association is an umbrella of several smaller groups which all peacefully co-exist together. These groups meet from time to time and they have their various leaders. The groups include the Rice Blowers, the Rice Millers, the Rice Blenders, the Rice De-stoners, the Dust/Rice Husk Carriers, the Bag Stitchers, the Barrow Pushers, the Loaders, the Off-loaders, the Vehicle Owners/Drivers, and the Mammy Market Traders, amongst others. The increasing popularity of local products like ‘Ofada rice’, ‘Badegi rice’, and ‘Abakaliki rice’, attests to the fact that the populace will readily embrace locally grown produce. The Ebonyi Rice Mill’s capacity is 35,000 metric tonnes of paddy, and the rice is fantastic.

1.10. Camela Vegetable Oil Company Ltd, Owerri, Imo State

Camela Vegetable Oil Company Ltd formerly known as R.O Ikoro and Sons Ltd was incorporated in June 1960 as a Limited Liability Company dealing in Agricultural Produce and Palm Oil Milling. Camela Vegetable Oil Company Ltd is located on 16,045,596 square meter of land at the Onitsha Road Industrial Layout, the foremost layout in Owerri Imo State of Nigeria. It lies strategically along Onitsha-Owerri express way at approximately five kilometers from Owerri town. Their corporate head quarter is located at 126 Okigwe Road, Owerri, Imo State Nigeria, while its factory is at Plot C1/24 Onitsha Road Industrial Layout, Owerri, Imo State, Nigeria. In 1985, the company expanded into Palm Kernel Nut Crushing for the extraction of Palm Kernel Oil (PKO) and Palm Kernel Cake (PKC). The next major expansion was in 1998 which was the installation of the Vegetable Oil Refining for the
processing of palm kernel oil (PKO) into vegetable oil and fatty acid. The vegetable oil was branded Camela Vegetable Oil and hence the new name of the company in August 2000. then Camela Vegetable Oil Co. Ltd. The company having met all requirements of National Agency for Food, Drug and Alcohol Control (NAFDAC) and the Standard Organization of Nigeria (SON) have since been issued a NAFDAC number 01-2016L and a Mandatory Conformity Assessment Certificate Programme (MANCAP) Number: FT-697. Camela Vegetable Oil Co. Ltd in 2007 expanded into fish farming and fish feed production. Presently it has an installed feed production capacity of 2metric tons per day and utilizes only 30% of it. The company has a 150MT per day palm kernel oil extraction plant and a 60MT per day vegetable oil refining plant. The company vegetable oil refining uses an ultra modern state of art physical refining to achieve bleaching and deodorizing of palm kernel oil. The Board of Directors and management of Camela Vegetable Oil Company Limited has concluded necessary plans with all parties to float a private placement based on the successful installation of its N800 million Ultra-modern Palm Oil Refining and Fractionation Plant. The new Plant which is due to commence operation by March 2014, according to the Chairman of the Company, Chief Okey Ikoro will complement the company’s 120 metric tonnes per day palm kernel oil extraction plant and its 60 metric tonnes per day palm kernel oil refining plant. According to Ikoro, with the conclusion of this project, Camela Vegetable Oil is now positioned to take a chunk of the Nigeria Vegetable Oil market, which is currently experiencing a serious gap between demand and supply, adding that it is estimated that there is a shortfall of 300,000 metric tonnes gap annually between demand and supply of vegetable oil. He added the company through its financial advisers; Futureview Financial Services Limited would by next week put an offer through private placement of 444,444,444 Ordinary Shares of N1 each at N1.80k.
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CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 INTRODUCTION
This chapter reviews the work of past scholars and authorities relevant to this research work "Team Work Approach to Management of Change in Selected Manufacturing Organizations in Nigeria, For the purpose of this study the literature is reviewed along the following major headings; Conceptual Framework, Theoretical Framework, Empirical Review and Summary of Related Literature

2.2 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK
2.2.1 Concept of teamwork approach to change management
Nicky (1997:10), sees teams as sporting metaphors used frequently by managers and consultants. It stressed both inclusive and similarity of members sharing common values and co-operating to achieve, common goals. Katzenbach and Smith (2002:325), are of the opinion that team is a small number of people with complementary skill that are committed to a common purpose, performance, goal and approach for which they hold themselves mutually accountable. Teams depend on its own members to provide leadership and direction. Teams can also be organized as departments. Nelson and Quick (2005:188) are of the opinion that work teams are very useful in performing work that is complicated, complex, interrelated, and/or more voluminous than one person can handle.

The modern concept of teamwork goes back to Eric and Ken (1990:39) who analyzed the psychological and emotional response to underground working by miners. The socio – technical paradigm was developed in the late 1960’s and 1970’s. It was upon this basis that team working was established. Therefore, according to Allcock (1999:18), a true team is a living, constantly changing, dynamic force in which a number of people come together to
work. Team member discuss their objectives, assess their ideas, and make decisions and work towards their target together. A true team cannot exist if there is no agreement or unity. Hooper and Potter (2003:3) enumerate team strategy, which should include these:

- A climate of trust, where mistakes and failures are viewed as learning experiences not occasion for blame.
- Free flow of information to team members
- Individual responsibility to integrate their work into organizational objectives.
- Training in communication, interpersonal and negotiation skills, and to handle the tasks required, and to adopt responsibilities for team ownership.

Armstrong (1993:39) opines that team management is the process of improving the quality of teams working throughout the organization. Team working becomes more significant when the technology or operating process require ‘cellular’ working or considerable interaction between people carrying out different functions, but with a common purpose. However, he further states that team structure is used for non-continuing functions. In other words, organizations are increasingly making use of teams to achieve their objectives (Ugbam, 2011:336), because team working must have clearly defined objectives, feedback mechanism and leadership that is either permanent or limited to specific tasks or phases.

Adair (1986:67) posits that, a team is more than just a group with a common aim. It is a group in which the contributions of individuals are seen as complementary. In collaboration, Ezigbo (2011:466) sees a work team as consisting of a small number of identifiable, interdependent employees who are held accountable for performing tasks that contribute to achieving an organization’s goals. Members of a work team have a shared goal and they must interact with each other to achieve it. Working together is the keynote of team activity.
Jos and Hootegem (1999:113) too feel that after decades of experimentation, teams had finally achieved that status of good management practice in western organizations. Adair (1986:67) suggest that the test of good team is “whether its members can work as a team while they are apart, contributing to a sequence of activities rather than to a common task, which requires the presence in one place and at one time. Jones, George and Hill (1998:435) note that team is a group whose members work intensely with each other to achieve a specific common goal or objectives. As these imply, all teams are group, but not all groups are teams. To Harkins (2008:1-2) organizations should encourage team leader to operate in an organized, systematic way to build successful teams, and that this formula not only involves what leaders should say and do, but also what they should not say and do. Brull (1996:498) and Baker (1988:101) highlight the importance of the organizing of teams, promotion of good communication skills and training in other words, team members share some common perception, ideology, values, beliefs, and norms, and these common interests contribute to this predictability.

2.2.1.1 Reasons for the formation of teams

Team work originates with and builds relationships among a group of people who share a common interest or purpose. By allocating the proper resources and support, human resource managers can ensure that the development of effective work teams increases group performance and help an organization to thrive in the most competitive markets (Khan, 2007). A well functional team can bring out the best in its members through mutual support that increases morale. According to Efi, (2010:66) work team encourages free expression of ideas in a manner that engages each member of the team. A team therefore, brings together individuals with similar interests and objectives.
According to Lantz (2010:75), teamwork can benefit the innovation process and give a return on the investment that it takes, provided the groups have a complex task, considerable freedom, and group processes that are characterized by reflectivity. A good argument for investing in teamwork is that it can promote self-organization.

**Reflectivity** is defined as “the extent to which team members collectively reflect upon the team’s objectives, strategies, and processes as well as their wider objectives” (West, Hirst, Richter and Shipton, 2004:285). Meanwhile Alderfer (1977) opines that one important thing to note is that teams are formed to meet objectives that can best be met collectively, thus teams help organizations to overcome the limitations of individuals.

According to Efi (2010:66), Mullins (2010:313-314), Weighrich and Koontz (2005:426 - 268), there are number of reasons why individuals are grouped into work teams. These reasons include the following:

- To keep employees and reduce costs related to employee turnover (severance costs, living, training expenses).
- To hold on to valuable organizational knowledge that comes with the continuity of staff and sharing of information.
- To enhance the power and feeling of satisfaction of individuals working on the team.
- To build organizational competence and stability.
- To enhance trust relationships that lead to better sharing of knowledge and understanding.
- To achieve objectives, because individuals are working together.
- To reduce too much authority in a single person, for wider spread of authority within the work team leaders.
- To enhance group deliberation and judgment because two good heads are better than one.
• To increase motivation through participation, people who take part in planning a program or making a decision usually feel more enthusiastic about accepting and executing it.

• To increase accomplishment of task through the combined efforts of a number of individuals working together.

• To provide collusion between members in order to modify formal working arrangement more to their liking. Membership therefore provides the individual with opportunities for initiative and creativity.

• To enhance companionship and a source of mutual understanding and support from colleagues.

• To provide members of the group a sense of belonging

• To provide guidelines on generally acceptable behavior by making sure that members adhere to official rules and regulations.

• To provide proper protection for its members from outside pressures or threats.

Individuals have varying expectations of the benefits from group membership, relating to both work performance, and social process. However, working in groups may mean that members spend too much time talking among themselves rather than doing (Mullins, 2010:314). It is important therefore, that the manager understands the reasons for the formation of work teams and is able to recognize likely advantageous or adverse consequences for the organization.

2.2.1.2 General Typology of Teams

Weighrich and Koontz (2005:435), maintain that team members should be selected according to the skills needed to achieve the purpose. Teams should have the right mix of skills, such as functional or technical skill, problem-solving and decision-making skills and of course human relations skills. Meanwhile, for Sunstrom, Demeuse and Futrell, (1990:120 -
in Robbins and Judge (2007:340) they are of the opinion that teams can do a variety of things, like making products, providing services, negotiating deals, coordinating projects, offering advice and making decisions.

There are different types of teams found in an organization, they include;

(a) **Problem-Solving Teams** Problem-solving teams consist of employees from the same department who voluntarily meet to discuss ways of improving quality, efficiency, and the work environment (Ezigbo 2011:472). In problem-solving, teams, members share ideas or offer suggestions on how work processes and methods can be improved; although they rarely have the authority to unilaterally implement any of their suggested action (Bodinson and Bunch, 2003:37-42). They consist of volunteers from a unit or department who meet one or two hours per week to discuss quality improvement, cost reduction, or improvement in the work environments. The most widely known application is quality circles, initiated by the Japanese. These teams exist for only a limited period; they are usually disbanded after they have achieved their objective.

(b) **Self-Managed Teams** Self-managed teams are teams that make decision that were once reserved for managers. They are also called self-directed teams or autonomous work groups (Nelson and Quick, 2005:193-194). Self-managed teams are permanent teams, they often perform various managerial tasks, and consist of five to twenty multi-skilled employees who rotate jobs and produce an entire product or service (Ezigbo, 2011:475). Self-managed teams have power to determine what needs to be done, how it will be done, when it needs to be completed, and who is going to do it. Weighrich and Koontz (2005:436) conclude that when the team has a great deal of power; it may be called a high-performance team or even a super team. According to Robbins and Judge (2007:341) a self-managed work team even select their own
members and have the members evaluate each other’s performance, as a result, supervisory positions take on decreased importance and may even be eliminated.

(c) **Virtual Teams** Virtual team use computer technology to tie together physically dispersed members in order to achieve a common goal (Martins, Gilson and Maynard, 2004:805:835). They allow people to collaborate online-using communication links like wide-area networks, video conferencing, or e-mail whether they are only a room away or continents apart. According to Cascio (2000:81-90), a virtual team is described as the ability to run a team whose members aren’t in the same location, don’t report to you, and may not even work for your organization. Therefore, it is important to have a clear purpose, to define clearly the tasks and assumptions, and to communicate effectively by such means as e-mail, fax, telephone, and perhaps even project website (Weighrich and Koontz, 2005:436). Virtual teams are similar to problem-solving teams because they do not require full-time commitment from team members. The difference is that virtual team members interact with one another electronically, rather than face-to-face as obtained in problem-solving teams.

(d) **Cross-Functional Teams** These are teams made up of employees from about the same hierarchical level, but from different work areas, who come together to accomplish a task (Robbins and Judge 2007:341-342). A good example of cross-functional team is the Boeing Company when it created a team made up of employees from production, planning, quality, tooling, design engineering and information system to automate shims on the company’s C-17 program. The team’s suggestions resulted in drastically reduced cycle time, cost and improved quality on the C-17 program (Bodinson and Bunch 2003:37-42). Cross-functional teams are an effective means for allowing people from diverse areas within an organization (or
even between organizations) to exchange information, develop new ideas and solve
problems, and coordinate complex projects.

(e) Committee According to Ezigbo (2011:472) a committee is a formal organizational
team usually relatively long-lived, created to carry out specific organizational tasks
and deal with recurrent problems and decisions. Also a committee is a group of
persons to whom, as a group, some matter is committed (Weighrich and Koontz,
2005:424). Committee may also be formal or informal, permanent or temporary, but
one would expect formal committees to be more permanent than the informal ones,
although this is not necessarily so. Committees can be permanent (standing) or
temporary (adhoc) and are usually in charge of, or supplementary to the line and staff
functions (Ezigbo 2011:472-473).

(f) Project Teams A project team consists of individuals who have been brought
together for a limited period of time from different parts of the organization to
contribute towards a management specified task. (Ezigbo 2011:473). The task may
be developing a product, refining a service or commissioning a new plant. Once this
has been completed, the team is either disbanded or its members are given new
assignments. Gerrahan and Steward (1992:88) state that “every university has
hundreds of project teams conducting research. Most of their members are on two or
three year contract, which span the period of the research project team. Members are
recruited on the basis of their specialist knowledge and their output in a research
report book and journal publications”.

(g) Advice Teams Advice team is a team created primarily to provide a flow of
information to management to be used in its own decision making. Robins
((2005:270) opines that advice team may also be called problem-solving teams, and
composed of employees from the same department who met for few house each
week to discuss ways of improving quality, efficiency and the work environment. Also, David (1985:53) states that an advice team may be given authority to implement solutions to the problems that it has identified. Following a major accident or disaster, government often set up committees of experts and eminent people to advise it on future action.

(h) Production Team According to Sterlin (2001:193) production team is responsible for performing day-to-day operations, typically this include planning and scheduling of work, assigning task to members and collective control. Production teams are groups of employees who perform highly related or interdependent jobs and take many of the responsibilities of their former supervisors.

(i) Action Team The performance of action team is brief and repeated under new conditions each time. Additionally, both the specialized inputs of the various team members and the need for individuals to co-ordinate with other team members are high. Ginneth (1993:57) states that action team is best exemplified by sport team, airline, cockpit, crews, hospitals surgery team, mountain climbing expeditions, film crew management and trade union negotiating committee and police special intervention teams. In the light of the above, Hutchims (1992:38) state that, action team members are specialized in terms of knowledge and skill they possess and contribute to achieving the team’s objective.

2.2.1.3 Team Characteristics and Team-Building Objectives

To Trevor (1999:123), team is a term used widely today for group of people coming together for a common purpose. Teams must be able to bring added value as a team to the organization. Co-operation is essential for team success. Meanwhile Mullin (2010:321) opines that the characteristics of an effective work team are not always easy to isolate clearly. He went further by advising that the underlying feature is a spirit of co-operation in which
members work well together as a united team and with harmonious and supportive relationships. To Athanasaw (2003:1172) the criteria for effectiveness of cross-functional teams are many and varied, but the success of any project may require that all criteria be met if the project is to be successful. However, according to Stevens (1993:54-109), much of the literature categorizes self-management and interpersonal skills. Self-management involves the team collectively managing the team’s basic managerial and or supervisory function. These include; goal-setting, performance management and task coordination. Meanwhile Denison, Hart and Kahn (1996:1005-1023) explained interpersonal skills to include, conflict resolution, collaborative problem solving and communication.

**Team Characteristics**

In an elaborate form, Adair (1986:67) also suggests the following characteristics of effective work team to include;

- Clear objectives and agreed goals
- Openness and confrontation
- Support and trust
- Cooperation and conflict
- Sound procedures
- Appropriate leadership
- Regular review relations

In addition, he emphasized the importance of careful selection of team members. Team members are not only expected to be technically or professionally competent, but also the ability to work as a team members and the possession of desirable personal attributes such as willingness to listen, flexibility of outlook and capacity to give and accept trust. Meanwhile Mullins (2010:321) isolated the following as characteristics evidence that members of a team are working as an effective team members, they include:
- A belief in shared aims and objective.
- A sense of commitment to the team.
- Acceptance of team values and norms.
- A feeling of mutual trust and dependency.
- Full participation by all members and decision making by consensus.
- A free flow of information and communication.
- The open expression of feelings and disagreements.
- The resolution of conflict by the members themselves.
- A lower level of staff turnover, absenteeism, accidents, errors and complaints.

However, as Brooks (2006:99) points out, that teams operate at the higher order of group dynamics that it is more reflective of “effective work teams” rather than work groups. Finally, Athanasaw (2003:1172) considers these factors necessary for teams to be effective, listening, giving performance feedback, making one’s point at a team meeting, group problem-solving, leaning a new job, peer counseling, conducting team meetings, resolving conflict and working collaboratively.

**Team Building Objectives**

In the last fifteen years, organizations structure has undergone a shift from the individual climb of corporate ladder, to an increasing emphasis on work teams and groups. The shift to work teams is largely due to factors such as globalization, downsizing and the need for technological efficiency. As companies expand and tasks become more complex, more and more specialists are needed within organizations to work as a team. In addition, the convergence of products, services and technology from around the world has forced companies to work in cross functional environment for which the best original design is often working in teams.
Other reasons for the emergence of work teams are stiff competition, and shifting authority down to members of work teams, which increase productivity (Ezigbo, 2011:467-468). She concludes that a well-functioning team can bring out the best in its members because problem solving skills and creativity increase with mutual support that builds morale in teams. Teams occur when a number of people have a common goal and recognize that their personal success is dependent on the success of others (Crainer, 1998:237). Team building is not just a good idea; it is a necessity of biological life. A belief in teamwork actually results in a major reduction of medical symptom for managers (Barry and Rhonda, 1990:321-344). This style is the one most positively associated with performance and profitability career success and satisfaction and physical and mental health.

Teamwork is important in any organization but may be especially significant in service industries such as hospitality organization, where there is a direct effect on customer satisfaction. In essence team working involves a reorganization of the way work is carried out (ACAS, 2007:6). Teamwork can increase competiveness by:

- Improving productivity.
- Improving quality and encouraging innovation.
- Taking advantage of the opportunities provided by technological advances.
- Improving employee motivation and commitment.
- Being proactive rather than reactive.

As Lucas (2001:10) rightly puts it, there is no doubt that effective teamwork is crucial to an organization’s efforts to perform better, faster and more profitably than their competitors. To Adams (2008:21), teamwork is not an option for a successful organization, it is a necessity. Teamwork can lead to achievement, creativity and energy levels that someone working alone or perhaps with just one other person could hardly imagine. In a more elaborate way (Center for Management and Organizational Effectiveness, 2010) stress that team is designed to
provide skills and promote high levels of team performance and team member satisfaction. They highlighted the following as team building objectives:

- Learning how to unleash the team’s power and potential.
- Discovering new solutions to help team members enhance their teams effectiveness and cohesiveness.
- Exploring ways to build team motivation and commitment to teams objectives.
- Discovering the tools and resources that can help strengthen the team and building whole-hearted cooperation among team members.
- Gaining personal insight about how individual actions and behaviors either add to or detract from teamwork and team building.
- Understanding the role of each team member.
- Creating an exciting team-building learning experience that will raise their level of interest in, and commitment to teamwork in their organization.

In a concluding note, Ezigbo (2011:236) highlights the factors that make for effective teamwork competency, they include; Designing teams properly, creating a supportive team environment and managing team dynamics appropriately.

2.2.1.4 Skills Required for Effective Team Working in Organizations

More and more task of contemporary organizations, particularly those in high technology and services business, require teamwork. According to Guirdham (2002:12), teamwork depends not just on technical competence of the individuals composing the team, but on their ability to ‘gel’.

To work well together, the team members must have more than just team spirit. They also need collaborative skills—they must be able to support one another and handle conflict in such a way that it becomes constructive rather than destructive. Ashmos and Nathan (2002:198) also state that, the use of teams have expanded dramatically in response to competitive
challenges. In fact, one of the most common skills required by new work practices is the ability to work as a team.

Robbins and Judge (2007:344-345), maintain that the key components -making up effective teams can be subsumed into four general categories. First are the resources and other contextual influences that make teams effective. The second relates to the team’s composition. The third category is work design. Finally, process variables reflect those things that go on in the team that influences effectiveness, as indicated in the diagram below.
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**Figure 2.1: Team Effectiveness Model**
To Heller (1997:229), he opines that the best culture for an organization is a team culture and that any large organization is a team of teams, so people who have to work together as a team, must also think together as a team. In other words Peeling (2005:129-130) has it that the important thing in teams is for team member to respect team personalities and use their different skills properly. However, Gomez-Mejia (2001) in his study on team, in relation to productivity, identifies the skills necessary for team members to increase productivity as being technical skills, Administrative skills and interpersonal skills.

Furthermore, Douglas (2003:32-35) points out that as we all interact with people to a greater or lesser extent in our everyday lives, there is a tendency to assume that people management skills are merely an extension of our natural abilities. In fact people management skills are the most difficult and rare type of skills but to a large extent, it can be learned. Cloke and Goldsmith (2002) refer to the special skills required for successful teamwork and listed ten skills team members can develop in order to build innovative self – managing teams. All these skills are interrelated, mutually reinforcing and dependent upon each other, and they include;

- **Skill of Self-Management** Overcoming obstacles together and in the process building a sense of ownership, responsibility, commitment and efficiency within each team member.

- **Skills of Communication** Collaboratively developing their skills in becoming better listeners, commiserating with others, reframing communications so they can be heard, and communicating honestly about things that really matter.

- **Skill of Leadership** Creating opportunities for each member to serve as leader. Employees need to be skilled in linking, organizing, coordinating, collaborating, planning, facilitating, coaching and mentoring.
• **Skill of Responsibility** Everyone is personally responsible not only for their own work, but for the work of every other member of the team. Team members have to exercise responsibility in order to become self-managing.

• **Skill of Supportive Diversity** Collaborative experiences allow team members to overcome prejudices and biases and not create winners and losers, reject outsiders or mistrust people who are different.

• **Skills of Feedback and Evaluation** Essential to improving learning, team communication and the quality of products, processes and relationships. In a true team environment, self-critical perspectives are expected, welcomed, acknowledged and rewarded.

• **Skill of Strategic Planning** To identify challenges and opportunities collaboratively and influence the environment in which problems emerge. Strategic planning encourages employees to think long-term, be proactive and preventative and focus on solutions rather than problems.

• **Skill of Shaping Successful Meetings** Team meetings can be streamlined and made shorter, more satisfying and more productive, and result in expanded consensus.

• **Skill of Resolving Conflicts** Encouraging team members to improve skills in problem-solving, collaborative negotiation, responding to difficult behavior and conflict resolution.

• **Skill of Enjoyment** Most team members enjoy working together to accomplish difficult tasks. Their pleasure derives from meeting high performance challenges and producing results that benefit themselves and their teams, organizations and communities.

In a concluding note O’Rourke (2009:20-29) advocate team communication framework, that provide tools for developing the communication skills people need in order to be effective
team members and achieve results. Team communication incorporate and emphasizes the cultural context – both internal and external for teams. He advised that teams need a communication protocol (rules for managing team or communication) that they understand and use. He developed a system model for team communication. The system model below shows that communication in teams start within individuals and incorporates team members, which will now expand to the organization. Finally, the communication emphasizes the cultural context of the team.
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**Figure 2.2: A system model for Team Comm**

**2.2.1.5 Leadership in Teams**
Leadership can make or break a good team. According to O’Rourke (2009:31) the teams potential centers on whether or not the leadership suits the team’s project, the members, and the organization. He advises that if teams are allowed to determine their own internal leadership, success rates usually skyrocket. To ACAS (2007:31) building successful teams also requires effective leadership with an emphasis on trust, clear communication, full participation and self-management. He stresses that, the influence and usefulness of team leaders comes, not from their delivery of traditional supervisory and control methods, but
from their ability to lead from the front and in training, coaching and counseling their team members to his standards of performance.

In other words, Gratton (2004) is of the opinion that leaders of the team across the organization that make the company vision a reality on a day to day basis. For Powell (2007:41), “if you want to see the efficacy of a leader and his or her leadership style then you need to look no further than the team he or she leads”. This follows that, in organizations, attention is typically directed towards leaders within the group (Parker1990:148). Strozniak (2000) argue that leadership must shift from the traditional command and control mode to a coach and collaborative style that supports a team environment. However, Beekun (1989:877-897) argues that leaders isn’t always needed in teams, because evidence has shown that self-managed work teams often perform better than teams with formally appointed leaders. And leaders can obstruct high performance when they interfere with self-managing teams (Druskat and Wheeler, 2003:435-457). This is so because on self-managed teams, team members absorb many of the duties typically assumed by managers.

In addition, studies have found that leaders who exhibit a positive mood get better team performance and lower turnover (Brief and Weiss, 2002:279-307). Leaders can help “bring forth that which is already there within individuals” (Foster, 1991), he elaborates on leaders working with team members to help make the connection between their personal vision and goals and the vision of the organization become aligned, through motivating and inspiring them in their work setting. Also Lee (1991:33) takes this idea even further and argues that often the best leaders are the best followers. Leaders can create an environment in which followers can develop their own goals (in other words, a culture of empowerment), as well as provide the training to develop competence. It then becomes the leaders’ task to sense where followers want to go, align their goals with the larger goals of the organization, and invite them to follow.
(A) Definition of Leadership and Leadership Styles

Leadership is the process of inspiring people to do their best to achieve a desired result. It can also be defined as the ability to persuade others willingly to behave differently (Armstrong, 2009:376). The function of team leaders is to achieve the task set for them with the help of the group. Leaders and their groups are therefore interdependent. Leaders have two main roles; they must achieve the task and they have to maintain effective relationship between themselves and the groups. Most people believe that sound leadership is the key to an effective team work (Kolfschoten, Niederman, Briggs and De-Vreede, 2012). Teams tend to be a mirror image of their leaders. The form of management and style of leadership adopted will influence the relationship between the group and the organization and are major determinant of group cohesiveness (Mullins, 2010:317). McKenna and Maister (2002:51-53) draw attention to the importance of the team leader establishing a level of trust among the team by helping them understand the behaviors that builds trust. To Efi (2010:68) for team efforts to be successful, leaders must change their behaviors.

Leadership style, often called “management style” describes the approach management use to deal with people in their teams. There are many styles of leadership. Armstrong (2007:377) classifies leaders as follows;

1. **Charismatic/Non-charismatic** Charismatic leader rely on their personality, their inspirational qualities and their “aura”: they are visionary leaders who as charismatic leaders rely mainly on their know-how (authority goes to the person who knows) their quiet confidence, and their cool, analytical approach to dealing with problems.

2. **Autocratic/Democratic** Autocratic Leaders impose their decision, using their position to force people to do as they are told. Democratic Leaders encourage people to participate and involve themselves in decision making.
3. **Enabler/Controller** Enablers inspire people with their vision of the future and empower them to accomplish team goals. Controller manipulates people to obtain their compliance.

4. **Transactional/ Transformational** Transactional Leaders trade money, jobs and security for compliance. Transformational Leaders motivate people to strive for higher-level goals.

In a concluding note, Goleman (2000:78-90) produces an alternative list of six leadership styles which are; Coercive, authoritative, affiliative, democratic, pacesetting and coaching leaders.

(B)Top Ten Leadership Techniques for Building High Performing Teams

Effective, leadership is a key ingredient for high performing teams and organizations. According to Dessler (2011:45), a high performance work team is a set of human resources management policies and practices that together produce superior employee performance. Anion (2005:195) opines that whether leaders of team are managers or appointed by team members, the leaders play an important roles in ensuring that team performs up to their potential. Gullet and Hick (1981:27) state that effective team leaders should give directions and empower all team members in accomplishing the goals of the organization. Without leadership or guidance, the link between individual and organizational goals may become tenuous. That is why Fielder (1964:25) sees leadership effectiveness as the success of the leader in achieving the organization’s goals. Against this backdrop, it becomes imperative for us to list leadership techniques for building a high performance teams. (Harkins, 2008:4-5)

1. **Define a Very Clear Picture of the Future- a Vision for the Team.** This is crucial because, teams search desperately for specific targets. Journeys without a clear destination leave groups feeling flat and lost. Keeping teams informed on where
they’re headed and how best to get there means leaders must be prepared to acknowledge and adapt to changes in operational conditions and even objectives.

(2) **Be genuine; even if it means lowering your guard** Leaders who create “Click” have an uncanny sense about how and when to express their inner selves. They will even reveal their own vulnerabilities at the right time to gain the respect of those around them. They are not so concerned about projecting a perfect image: they know that high-impact leaders get results by laughing at their own flaws. They don’t play make-believe, knowing it’s more important “to be” than to “seem to be.”

(3) **Ask good questions:** They use enquiry and advocacy in such a way as to keep them abreast of what is really going on. They seem to use a simple formula of the 70% listening, 20% enquiring, with just the right amount of advocacy, and 10% tracking (i.e. summarizing and synthesizing information, and providing possible courses of action).

(4) **Talk about things—even the hard things:** A leader who gets their team to click is not afraid to talk about the tough stuff. They find ways to have the difficult conversation in the knowledge that burying problems doesn’t make them go away. They also know that if they, as leaders, don’t talk about things, no one will and, pretty soon, a culture will develop in which too many things are left unsaid. (I can always tell when teams are dysfunctional by measuring the amount of stuff not talked about, or what I call the “let’s not go there” issues).

(5) **Follow through on commitments:** Leaders of high-performing teams find ways to build trust and maintain it, especially by making teams hold to their commitments and keeping the team’s view of its goal clear. However, they also know how to distinguish professional trust from blind loyalty.
Let others speak first: In high-performing teams, members see themselves as equal in terms of communication. Leaders should therefore encourage this by putting the other persons need to express their agenda ahead of their own.

Listen: High-performing teams comprise people who have mastered the art of listening without fear, of allowing others to speak without reacting strongly or negatively to what is being said, or what they anticipate will be said. The leader fosters and honors this attribute within the team by quickly putting a stop to bad conversational behavior that cuts other people off and implies that their ideas are not valued. The leader knows that achieving higher levels of innovation requires team members to be unafraid to express unusual ideas and advocate experimental processes. They emphasize this by publicly thanking those who take risks and by making sure that sharp-shooters put their guns away.

Face up to non-performing players: This brings us to a very important characteristic of high performance teams, which is their leaders; do not tolerate players who pull the team apart. Interestingly, experienced leaders frequently maintain unity and discipline through third parties in the form of people we call “passionate champions”. A leader may surround his or herself with several passionate champions, who have established an understanding and close working relationship with one another, and who are totally focused on, and committed to, the team’s objectives. They are capable of getting the jobs done – and not afraid to remove people who are falling to help them do so.

Having fun, but never at others’ expense: High impact leaders’ stair clear of sarcasm: they always take the high road. If they do make fun of someone, it’s usually themselves. They have learned the lesson that reckless humor can be misinterpreted and backfire. They know that critics of the organization can turn inappropriate remarks back on a leader who makes them.
(10) **Be confident and dependable:** Somehow, over and above the daily struggle, leaders who get teams to click project confidence. They do this by preparing their conversations and not backing away from, or skimming over, real issues and problems, even difficult or confronting ones. They always address “what’s up? And “what’s so? In the organization. They don’t try to be spin doctors because they know that, ultimately, this doesn’t work. Rather, they are known as straight shooters – people who play hard, fight fair, and never, - never give up. At the end of the day, team members know that they will be standing too. They also know that, should things get really bad, their leaders will not desert them or try to shift the blame, but seek to protect them, even if it means standing in the line of fire.

### 2.2.1.6 Strategies for Managing Change through Teamwork Approach

To Kolfschoten et al (2012:145) the literature on developing more cohesive teams is vast. However, in addition to the organizational strategies to encourage a team culture, there are some strategies that team leaders can use to help build effective teams. Specific team-building strategies vary depending upon a number of variables, including the nature of the team, its duration, the task at hand, and the organizational culture. According to Parker (1990:108-110), successful team-building strategies for team leaders are;

- Get to know the team
- Define the team’s purpose
- Clarify roles
- Establish norms
- Draw up a game play
- Encourage questions
- Share the limelight
- Be participatory
- Celebrate accomplishments
• Assess team effectiveness

In his book “fifth discipline” Senge (1990:3) advocates for a learning organizations where people learn new and expansive patterns of thinking, where collective aspiration is set free and where people are continually learning how to learn together. He went further by discussing how unaligned teams produce a great amount of wasted energy, but by contrast, when a team becomes more aligned a commonality of direction emerges, and individuals’ energies harmonized, therefore there is less wastage of energy he concludes. Kolfschoten et al (2012:160), see team-building as an organizational development strategy that is often used in organizations to make work groups more cohesive, committed, satisfied, and productive. It is the work of team leaders to create an environment, where team members develop their own goals and align their goals with the larger goals of the organization and invite them to follow (Lee, 1991:33).

Edmondson (1999:350-383), Kolzlowski and Bell (2003:333-375), maintain that a climate characterized by trust, psychological safety and social support facilitates communication about task-related issues. Also West et al (2004:269-299), are of the opinion that cooperative teams are more likely to be effective, and can allow more time for discussions than less effective teams. Meanwhile, interpersonal understanding, informal interactions, psychological safety and a generally amicable climate, where people feel free from pressure, have shown to be related to collective reflectivity and learning (Claxton, 1998:217-220, Lantz and Brav, 2007:269-285). More also, Somech, Desivilya and Lidogoster (2009:359-378), maintains that good and proper conflict management in teams is an important phenomenon to team effectiveness.

Furthermore, Landale (2007:24) believes that for team skills such as inclusive and collaborative working, being open to new opportunities, adaptability to change and direct and
honest communication as being important for effective team performance. Meanwhile Robbins and Judge (2007:348) posit that, teams have different needs, and people should be selected for a team to ensure that all various roles are filled. Margerison and McCann (1990), identify nine potential team roles which successful work team have people to fill based on their skills and preferences. The key roles of teams are; Linker, Creator, Promoter, Adviser, Maintainer, Controller, Producer, Assessor and Organizer.

Meanwhile, Mullins (2010:361) has it that, building a successful team demands that the manager must be aware of and pay attention to a number of interrelated factors including; Clarification of objectives and available resources, organizational processes and the clarification of roles, empowerment, decision-making and channels of communication, patterns of interaction, social processes, management system, leadership style and training and development.

As Wilson (1998) points out, team working, like most management ideas, is very simple, nevertheless this simplicity conceals a great challenge. He advocates that when selecting team members, the most important thing to look for is ones who are decent, honest, bright and capable, that good people will naturally work together better as a team. Douglas (2003:34-35), argues that introducing team working is not a straight forward grafting job, the simple matter of adding a new idea to those already in place, is about making a fundamental change in the way people work. He concludes that every team working application is different, because groups and individuals are faced with unique problems in different situations.

Team building interventions are centered on groups who work together in real life rather than a collection of individuals gathered for a training session. Unlike many training interventions, team building deals with real issues and has clear relevance to organizational objectives. The manager will seek to build a smooth functioning team to achieve high performance and high
morale. Barry and Rhonda (1990:321-344) emphasize that team building is positively associated with high performance and profitability, team-building ensures not only that a job gets done, but also that it gets done efficiently and harmoniously. Team building has positive influence on the physical and psychological well being of supervisory management personnel.

Blake and Mouton (1998:17) present additional insights regarding teamwork. They note that two variables influence team-building effort, content and process. **Content** is the subject matter to which the team applies its efforts. It is the aggregate of knowledge, skill, information, and insight the team utilizes in achieving its result. **Process** is the way teams go about using contents the dynamics that develop in setting standards of performance, in sharing responsibilities, in setting goals, in dividing up efforts, in treating, and in reviewing the consequences of the team’s action. Robert and Angelo (2002:348) opine that team building is a catchall term for a whole host of techniques aimed at improving the internal functioning of work groups, whether conducted by company trainers or outside consultant, team building workers should strive for greater co-operation, better communication and less dysfunctional conflict. With cross-cultural teams becoming common place in today’s global economy, team building is more, important than ever.

Team building involves assessing of groups functioning, feedback of this assessment to the group and its head, and problem solving by the group on the issues raised (Chadron, 2012). Team building includes interaction among members of work teams to learn how each member thinks or works. Moving from the traditional management structure to teams can create stress and confusion for team members. The success of the teams is directly linked to the team building skills of the team members and the direction they get from the leadership. This is because team building is an organizational development strategy that is often used in
organization to make work groups more cohesive, committed, satisfied, and productive (Kolfschoten et al, 2012:129-162).

Weighrich and Koontz (2005:435) maintain that, there are no definite rules for building effective teams. The following approaches however were found to be useful. Team members must be convinced that team’s purpose is worthwhile, meaningful, and urgent. They went further to add that team members should be selected according to the skills needed to achieve the purpose, be guided by rules for the group behavior, identified goals and members should encourage one another through recognition, positive feedback and rewards. To Nelson and Quick (2005:189), they are of the opinion that the things that make work team to be effective are primarily, goals and objectives, operating guidelines, performance measures, and the specification of roles. Work team structure requires a clearly specified set of roles for the executives, team leaders and team members.

Most people believe that sound leadership is the key to an effective teamwork. There is no doubt that the abilities of the team leader can affect the team as a whole (Parker, 1990:146-147). He advocate the following for the development of a team – player culture; statements by leaders for the importance of team players, promoting people who are competent team players, giving important assignment to effective team players, incorporating team-players behaviors in the performances appraisal system, offering training and workshops on the skills of effective team players, giving higher salary to positive team players and developing incentive to reward team effort.

2.2.1.7 Comparism between Teamwork and Individual Performance in Management of Organization

It is however difficult to draw any form of conclusion between individual and team performance. An example of this can be seen from a consideration of decision making.
Certain groups such as committees may be concerned more specifically with decision making, but all team must make some decisions. Team decision making can be costly and time-consuming (Mullins, 2010:353).

One particular feature of group versus individual performance is social loafing and the “Ringelmann effect”, which is the tendency for individual to expend less effort when working as a member of a group than as an individual. A German psychologist, Ringelmann, compared the results of individuals and group performing on a rope-pulling task. Workers were asked to pull as hard as they could on a rope, performing the task first individually and then with others in groups of varying size (Kraritz and Martin, 1986:936-941). A meter measured the strength of each pull. Although the total amount of force did increase with size of the work group, effort was less than the expected sum of the individual contributions. In his own view, Gullet and Hick (1981:156) have it that individual performance is tailored only to the proficiency of the individual which in the most cases fall short of the collective contribution of the employees put together. Nature has not deposited all knowledge in one person.

Nzewi (2005:14) highlights that collective style of individuals that form the team, makes the human beings have ambitions, strengths, weakness and ego. Success or failure of team is felt by all members, not just the individuals. Failures are not blamed on individual members, which give them the courage to take chances. Success is felt by every team member. Teams have superior output against all odds. This is due to synergistic effect of a team; a team can normally outperform an individual. This is because no one knows the job, task, and goals better than the individual team members.

Hall (2001:45) opines that there is a danger of elevating teams into a “Silver bullet”; a major solution to all business problems. In his words, “It is not that I don’t think teams work. They
clearly do and it would be difficult to run an organization of any size if you couldn’t create and manage a team. The truth is that teams are not always the right answer to a problem. Often a well-briefed and well managed group of individuals will do a task fine”. A further point is that some very skilled individuals are not good team players. However, the general feeling appears to be that the collective power of a group outshines individual performance (Blanchard and Bowles, 2001). “Even though individuals working on their own are capable of phenomenal ingenuity, working together in a team can produce astounding results and a better decision” (Stanley, 2002:10-12).

Guirdham (2002:498), believes that compared with individuals, groups can make objectively better decisions to which people feel more commitment, while teams can perform functions and carry out projects better and more efficiently. This can only happen, however, if the people have the special skills and abilities needed. One might expect, therefore, a higher standard of decision-making to result from group discussion. However, on the one hand there is the danger of compromise and decision being made in line with the “highest common view” and, on the other hand, there is the phenomenon of the so-called risky-shift.

2.2.2 Concept of Change in Management of Organizations

Conceptually, the change process starts with an awareness of the need for change. An analysis of this situation and the factors that have created it leads to a diagnosis of the distinctive characteristics and an indication of the direction in which action needs to be taken (Armstrong 2006:343). Possible sources of action can then be identified and evaluated and a choice made of the preferred action. According to Ewurum (2007:205) to change something implies altering it, varying or modifying it in some way. Some organizations change mainly in response to external circumstances (reactive change), others change principally because
they have decided to change (Proactive change). Some organizations are conservative in outlook, seeking little in the way of change, and others are entrepreneurial in outlook, ever seeking new opportunities and new challenges.

The term organizational change is central to all kinds of organizations. It is the way in which organizations thrive, grow and stabilize rather than wither or decline. Yet achieving change presents one of the most intransient problems for both organizations and individuals. Akarele and Akarele (2000:795), maintain that organizational change could be of different dimensions, for example, mergers, acquisitions, rapid growth and size adjustments affect the structures of organizations. Technological change, (such as computerization) results in changes in the ways people work. Mean while employees of diverse background in age, sex, educational level and ethnicity also change. While trying to predict and adapt successfully to happenings in the external front, organizations are also imitating and executing several change programmes to keep ahead of competition, deliver better value and remain the customers’ first choice (Muo, 2004:1198). This may be in the form of reengineering; rightsizing, de-layering, restructuring, rationalization, computerization, renewal or reinvention or cultural rebirth. Whichever strategy is adopted by the organization usually meets with the legendary human resistance to change, which makes it even more nightmarish. The key responsibility of managers is to effectively communicate and manage the change programmes so as to achieve the intended results. To Agbaeze (2008:123) all organized activities are under pressure for change. He goes further to enumerate various reason why change is inevitable in organizations and these are; scientific and technological developments, people, competition and communication. When planning for change, there is a tendency for people to think that it will be an entirely logical and linear process of going from A to B, it is not like that at all rather the implementation of change is an “iterative,

To manage change, it is first necessary to understand the types of change and why people resist change. It is important to bear in mind that while those wanting change need to be constant about ends, they have to be flexible about means. This requires them to come to an understanding of the various models of change that have been developed. McKee (2005) suggests that one of the most significant essentials for success during transition is team-building and leaders that can challenge, motivate and empower their teams through change are successful. He concludes that leader who can keep their work teams focused during changes will have their organizations and business thrive.

2.2.2.1 Forces of Change in Organization

Forces of change, also known as change drivers or change initiators, can either be external or internal. The external change derivers are those forces that are outside the control of management but have made change imperative (McAfee and Champagne, 1983). But internal change forces are pressures for change, which come from within the organizations for which we have reasonable measure of control. Both internal and external forces for changes are not found in isolation. They are interrelated. More often than not, external change drivers create internal drivers, which lead to organization change. Irrespective of any force that influences change in any organization, the change must be planned.

More and more organizations today face a dynamic and changing environment. This in turn, is requiring these organizations to adapt. “Change or die” is the rallying cry among today’s managers worldwide (Robbins and Judge, 2007:644). They summarize six specific forces that are acting as stimulants for change in the diagram below.
### Table 2.1: Forces for change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Force</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of the Workforce</td>
<td>More cultural diversity, Aging population, Many new entrants with inadequate skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Faster, Cheaper, and more mobile computers, On-line music sharing, Deciphering of the human genetic code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Shocks</td>
<td>Rise and Fall of dot.com stocks, 2000-02 stock market collapse, recorded low interest rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>Global Competitors, Mergers and Consolidations, growth of e-commerce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Trends</td>
<td>Internet Chart rooms, retirement of Baby Boomers. Rise in discount and “big box” Retailers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Robbins, S.P. and Judge, T.A. (2007) Organizational Behavior Prentice-Hall of India.**

Furthermore, Moorhead and Griffin (1995:468) identified four areas in which the pressures for change appear most powerful to include people, technology, information processing and communication, and competition. Nevertheless, Mullins (2010:752) is of different opinion with the other authors views, and he listed the following as factors which create an increasingly volatile environment for organizations, they are:

- Uncertain economic conditions
- Globalization and fierce world competition
- The level of government intervention
- European union social legislation
- Political interest
- Scarcity of natural resources
- Rapid developments in new technologies and the information age
- Increased demands for quality and high levels of customer service and satisfaction.
- Greater flexibility in the structure of work organizations and patterns of management
  - The changing nature and composition of the workforce and
  - Conflict from within the organizations.
2.2.2.2 Types of change

Armstrong (2006:344) submits that there are two main types of change, and they are; Strategic and Operational Changes.

(1) **Strategic Change** is concerned with organizational transformation. It deals with broad long-term and organization-wide issues. It is about moving to a future state, which has been defined generally in terms of strategic vision and scope. It will cover the purpose and mission of the organization, its corporate philosophy on such matters as growth, quality, innovation and values concerning people, the customer needs served and the technologies employed.

(2) **Operational Change** Operational change relates to new systems, procedures, structures or technology which will have an immediate effect on working arrangements within a part of the organization. But their impact on people can be more significant than broader strategic change and they have to be handled just as carefully.

In his own view, Image (2001:35) isolated four levels of change in people, and they are;

- Knowledge changes,
- Attitudinal changes,
- Behavior changes and
- Group or Organizational performance changes.

Changes in knowledge are the easiest to make followed by changes in attitudes. Attitude structure differs from knowledge structure in that they are emotionally charged in a positive or negative way. Changes in behavior are significantly more difficult and time consuming than either of the two previous levels. But the implementation of group or organizational performance change is perhaps the most difficult and time consuming.
2.2.2.3 Identifying the Need for Change in Organizations

Events occurring both inside and outside the organization can create the need for change. Change will not occur unless the need for change is critical. Because individuals and organizations usually resist change; they typically do not embrace change unless they must (Conner, 1990). To him, pain drives change. Change will not occur just because “it’s a good idea” it will only occur when the pain of an individual or an organization is sufficiently high to justify the difficulties of assimilating change.

In their view, Susman, Jansen and Michael (2006:26-30), has it that it is both internal and external events in an organization that create the need for change. First legal, technological, and competitive changes in the external environment often necessitate some adaptation on the part of the firm to maintain fit with the environment. Also lack of alignment with the
environment in which your firm operates may necessitate change in order to re-establish alignment. Openness to new ideas and opportunities presented by partners, suppliers, or customers may necessitate the need for change. Important inputs from the environment may generate initiative requiring change (that is new products or services). Change can also be a by-product of a change in leadership. Beckhard and Dyer (1983:59-65) point out that the entry or exit of a key family member is a trigger for change unique to family owned organizations.

Furthermore, Akarele and Akarele (2000:795) are of the opinion that changes are meant to cope with emerging situation in the organization. That in highly competitive industries, imitative changes may be inevitable because of the fear that current practices and culture in seemingly more successful competitors could result in the latter maintaining and even improving on the market advantages they are perceived to have gained. To Waddock and Boyle (1995:125-130), many organizations that have gone global, found it convenient to restructure into a series of alliances or networking in order to expand the number and scope of communities with which they interact and to whom they become responsible for their actions.

Globalization has resulted in “weight shedding” in organizations. Coping with different governmental regulations concerning employee benefits, health care and pensions also resulted in changes in organizations. In all cases of change, organizations need careful planning to avoid situations of over-restructuring and “underweight” in terms of employee (Morgan, 1997:8). Changes resulting from climatic problem and stumbling productivity due to increasing rate of absenteeism and turnover, should be handled carefully. Raymond (2011) is of the opinion that those organizations most often interested in changing their culture are usually those performing poorly, facing a crisis, newly reorganized under a large entity and those with new missions or new managers. In conclusion, while making changes for the sake
of change or in imitation of similar changes in other manufacturing organization may be harmful; the failure to recognize the need for change at the appropriate time could be disastrous (Akarele and Akarele, 2000:795).

2.2.2.4 Resistant to Change

Despite the potential positive outcomes, change is often resisted at both the individual and the organizational level (Mullins, 2010:756). Just as change is inevitable, so is resistance to change, paradoxically, organizations both promote and resist change (Moorhead and Griffin, 1995:483). The reality is that every human grouping has some forces within it which keep it together and provide it with stability, and others which provide it with reason to change or adapt (Lewin, 1951) in (Ewurum, 2007:208) illustrated the dilemma neatly with his classic notion of “force-field Theory”.
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**Figure 2.4: Why People Resist Change**

In explanation to the diagram on why people resist change in manufacturing organizations; change could be in the form of new directives, new policy and improved training and developments, as may be dictated by modernization. The reasons for resistance to change by people are many. The major reasons are; unknown effect, not knowing the reason for the change, fear and loss of benefit and power.

This methodology for analyzing change involves according to Armstrong (2006:347),

- Analyzing the restraining or driving forces that will affect the transition to the future state; these restraining forces will include reactions of those who see change as unnecessary or as constituting a threat.
- Assessing which of the driving or restraining forces are critical,
- Taking steps both to increase the critical driving forces and to decrease the critical restraining forces.

By selectively removing forces that resist change, the driving forces will be strong enough to enable implementation. As resistant forces are reduced or removed, behavior will shift to incorporate the desired changes. One of the well-documented findings from studies of individual and organizational behavior is that organizations and their members resist change. In a sense this is positive. It provides a degree of stability and predictability to behavior (Robbins and Judge, 2007:647). If there weren’t some resistance, organizational behavior would take on the characteristics of chaotic randomness, but to them there is also a definite downside to resistance to change. They opine that it hinders adaptation and progress. They isolated four types of resistance to change, they are

- **Overt Resistance** This resistance is the easiest to manage and deal with.
- **Immediate Resistance** This resistance is also very easy to manage. For example a change is proposed and employees quickly respond by voicing complaints, engaging in a work slowdown, threatening to go on strike, or the like.
• **Implicit Resistance** implicit resistance efforts are more subtle-loss of loyalty to the organization, loss of motivation to work, increased errors or mistakes, increased absenteeism due to “sickness” – and hence more difficult to recognize and manage.

• **Deferred Resistance** This is the most difficult to manage because deferred actions cloud the link between the source of the resistance and the reaction to it. A change may produce what appears to be only a minimal reaction at the time it is initiated, but then resistance surfaces weeks, months, or even years later. Reactions to change can build up and then explode in some response that seems totally out of proportion to the change action it follows (Robbins and Judge, 2007:647-648).

### 2.2.2.5 Change Agents

These are the individuals in an organization that are responsible for managing change activities (Judge, 2000:216-226). Change agents can be managers or non-managers, current employees of the organization, newly hired employees, or outside consultants. According to Robbins and Judge (2007:647), change agents are persons who act as catalysts and assume the responsibility for managing change activities. They can be internal or external to the organization. Internal change agents are usually employees of the organization, while external change agents are usually advisers or consultants. On any change programmes internal and external change agents can work together.

Research shows that organizations are more likely to embark on transformational change when headed by leaders from outside the traditional network (Kraatz and Moore, 2002:28-45). In some instances, internal management will hire the services of outside consultants to provide advice and assistance with major change efforts. Because they are from the outside, these individuals can offer an objective perspective often unavailable to insiders.
Outside consultants, however, are disadvantaged because they usually have an inadequate understanding of the organization’s history, culture, operating procedures, and personnel. Outside consultants also may be prone to initiating more drastic changes – which can be a benefit or a disadvantage – because they don’t have to live with the repercussions after the change is implemented. In contrast, internal staff specialists or managers, when acting as change agents, may be more thoughtful (and possibly more cautious) because they have to live with the consequences of their actions (Robbins and Judge, 2007:647).

2.2.2.6 Forms of Resistance to Change

Resistance to change can take many forms and it is often difficult to pinpoint the exact reasons. Resistance may come from the organization, the individual, or both.

Against this backdrop, Mullins (2010:756-757), Moorhead and Griffin (1995:484-487), Robbins and Judge (2007:648) and Armstrong (2006:345-346) identify the following as the reasons why individuals and organizations resist change;

(A) **Individual Resistance:** Individual sources of resistance to change are rooted in basic human characteristics such as needs and perceptions, they include the following:

- **Habit:** Doing a job the same way every day is easy. If the steps in the job are repeated over and over, the job becomes increasingly easier. But learning an entirely new set of steps increases the jobs difficulty. For the same amount of return (pay), most people prefer to do easy rather than hard work.

- **Security:** Some employees like the comfort and security of doing things the same old way. They gain a feeling of constancy and safely in knowing that some things stay the same despite all the change going on around them. Thus, people who believe that their security is threatened by a change are likely to resist the change.

- **Economic Factors:** Change may also threaten employees steady pay checks. Workers may fear that change will make their jobs obsolete.
• **Fear of the unknown:** Some people fear anything unfamiliar. Employees become familiar with their boss, their job, and relationships with others within the organization. Such as contact people for certain situations. These relationships and contacts help to facilitate their work. Any disruption of familiar patterns may create fear because it can cause delays and the belief that nothing is getting accomplished.

• **Lack of Awareness:** Because of perceptual limitation, such as lack of attention or selective attention, a person may not recognize a change in rule or procedure and thus may not alter behavior. People may pay attention only to those things that support their point of view; they therefore may continue the current practice as long as possible.

• **Social Factor:** People may resist change for fear of what others will think. Employees may believe that change will hurt their image, result in ostracism from the group, or simply make them “different”. For example, an employee who agrees to conform to work rules established by management may be ridiculed by others who openly disobey the rules.

• **Inconvenience or loss of freedom:** If the change is seen as likely to prove inconvenient, make life more difficult. Reduce freedom of action or result in increased control, there will be resistance.

• **Competence fear:** Concern about the ability to cope with new demands or to acquire new skill can make people resist change.

• **Threat to status or skill:** If the change is perceived as reducing the status of individual or as de-skilling them, it is bound to be resisted by employees involved. It could mean the possibility of relinquishing or diminishing of one’s span of control and authority.
• **Wrong timing:** This concerns when change efforts are introduced. If it is at a time when workers are busy or have a bad relationship with management, they are going to resist the change efforts.

• **Surprises:** Because people’s reflex is to resist when they must deal with a sudden, radical change or peer pressure. If people are taken unawares, they are bound to resist the change initiative because they are not properly communicated about the change.

**B) Organizations Resistance:** although organizations have to adapt to their environment, they tend to feel comfortable operating within the structure, policies and procedures which have been formulated to deal with a range of present situations. To ensure operational effectiveness, organizations often set up defense against change and prefer to concentrate on the routine things they perform well. Some of the main reasons for organizational resistance against change are as follows:

• **Narrow Focus of Change:** Any effort to force change in the tasks of individuals or groups must take into account the interdependencies among organizational elements such as people, structure, tasks, and the information system. For example, some attempts at redesigning jobs are unsuccessful because the organizational structure within which jobs must function is inappropriate for the redesigned jobs.

• **Group Inertia:** When an employee attempts to change his or her work behavior, the group may resist by refusing to change other behaviors that are necessary complements to the individual’s changed behavior. In other words, group norms may act as a brake on individual attempts at behavior change.

• **Over-determination or Structural Inertia:** Organizations have several systems designed to maintain stability. For example, consider how organizations control employee’s performance. In other words the structure of the organization provides resistance to change because it was designed to maintain stability.
• **Threatened Expertise**: A change in the organization may threaten the specialized expertise individual or groups have developed over the years. A job redesign or a structural change may transfer the responsibility for a specialized task from the current expert to someone else, thus threatening the specialist’s expertise and building his or her resistance to the change.

• **Threatened Power**: Any redistribution of decision-making authority may threaten an individual’s power relationships with others. If an organization is decentralizing its decision-making powers in return for special favours from others, they may resist the change because they do not want to lose their power base.

• **Resource Allocation**: Groups that are satisfied with current resource allocation methods may resist any change that they believe will threaten their future allocations. Resources in this context can mean anything from monetary rewards and equipment, to additional seasonal help, to more computer time.

• **Organization culture**: The culture of an organization develops over time and may not be easy to change. The pervasive nature of culture in terms of “how things are done around here” also has a significant effect on organizational processes and the behavior of staff. An ineffective culture may result in a lack of flexibility for or acceptance of change.

• **Low Risk Environment**: In an organization that does not promote change and tends to punish mistakes, individuals develop a resistance to change, preferring instead to continue in safe, low risk behaviors than embracing strange new changes.

### 2.2.2.7 Overcoming Barriers to Resistance to Change

Every type of change initiative faces severe obstacles from the people, the process, and the technology. These obstacles, which include the legendary human resistance, make changes nightmarish for managers (Mu, 2004:1202). Creating a sense of ownership by involving all
members to be directly or indirectly affected by the change, in the planning and eventual implementation of the change could drastically reduce the resistance to change (Akarere and Akarele, 2000:800). Since economic, psychological and social losses are strong sources of resistance to change, guarantees against such losses will also be beneficial.

To Armstrong (2007:346-347) resistance to change can be difficult to overcome even when it is not detrimental to those concerned. But the attempt must be made. People should be involved in the process of change this will give them the chance to raise and resolve their concerns and make suggestions about the form of the change and how it should be introduced. In other words Kotter and Schlesinger (1979:106-114) in Robbins and Judge (2007:648-650), suggested seven tactics for use by change agents in dealing with resistance to change, they include;

- **Education and Communication:** Communication can reduce resistance on two levels. First, it fights the effect of misinformation and poor communication; second, communication can be helpful in “selling the need for change”. Indeed, research shows that the way the need for change is sold matters – change is more likely when the necessity of changing is packaged properly. (Dutton, Ashford, O’Neill and Lawrence (2001:716-736).

- **Participation:** It’s difficult for individuals to resist a change decision in which they participated. Prior to making a change, those opposed can be brought into the decision process.

- **Building Support and Commitment:** Change agents can offer a range of supportive efforts to reduce resistance. When employee’s fear and anxiety are high, employee counseling and therapy, new-skills training, or a short paid leave of absence may facilitate adjustment.
• **Negotiation:** Another way for the change agent to deal with potential resistance to change is to exchange something of value for a lessening of the resistance. Negotiation as a tactic may be necessary when resistance comes from a powerful source. It might be costly and risky due to blackmail possibilities.

• **Manipulation and Cooptation:** Manipulation refers to covert influence attempts. Twisting and distorting facts to make them appear more attractive, withholding undesirable information, and creating false rumors to get employees to accept a change. While cooptation is a form of both manipulation and participation. It seeks to “buy off” the leaders of a resistant group by giving them a key role in the change decision. Both are relatively inexpensive and easy ways to gain the support of adversaries.

• **Selecting People who Accept Change:** Research suggests that the ability to easily accept and adapt to change is related to personality. One study of managers in the United States, Europe, and Asia found that those with a positive self-concept and high risk to tolerance coped better with organizational change. Another study found that selecting people based on resistance-to-change scale worked well in winnowing out those who tended to react emotionally to change or to be rigid (Oreg, 2003:680-693).

• **Coercion:** Is the application of direct threats or force on the resisters. For example, threats of transfer, loss of promotions, negative performance evaluations, and a poor letter of recommendation. The advantages and drawbacks of coercion are just the same as those in manipulation and cooptation.
2.2.2.8 Approaches to Managing Organizational Change

There are several approaches to management of organizational change, but we will highlight some of them, example; Action Research, 10 Principles of change management, Prosci’s change management methodology and Organizational Development.

(A) Action Research

Action Research refers to a change process based on the systematic collection of data and then selection of a change action based on what the analyzed data indicated (Eden and Huxham, 1996). Its importance lies in providing a scientific methodology for managing planned change. The process of action research consists of five steps: Diagnosis, analysis, feedback, action and evaluation. These steps are closely parallel to the scientific method (Robbins and Judge, 2007:653). It has two benefits to the organization. First it is problem focused and reduces resistance to change, because employees are heavily involved in the change process.

![Diagram of Action Research Process of Change](Figure 2.5: The Action Research Process of Change)

(a) **Diagnosis**  The change agent, often an outside consultant begins by gathering information about problems, concerns, and needed changes from members of the organization. The change agent asks questions, interviews employees, reviews records, and listen to the concerns of employees.

(b) **Analysis** This process follows, diagnosis, what problems do people key in on? What patterns do these problems seem to take? The change agent synthesizes the information into primary concerns, problem areas, and possible actions.

(c) **Feedback** The third step feedback requires sharing with employees what has been found from steps one and two. The employees, with the help of the change agent, develop action plans for bringing about any needed change.

(d) **Action**  The employees and the change agent carry out the specific actions to correct the problems that have been identified.

(e) **Evaluation** The final step, consistent with the scientific underpinnings of action research is evaluation of the action plan’s effectiveness. Using the initial data gathered as a benchmark, any subsequent changes can be compared and evaluated.

(B) **10 Principles of Change Management**

Jones, Aguirre and Caldrone (2004) provide this set of practices, tools, and techniques that can be adapted to a variety of solutions by most organizations that plan to under some changes. These guiding principles for change management they provided are systematic, comprehensive framework, that executives can understand in order to know what to expect, how to manage their own personal change, and how to engage the entire organization in the change process, and they include;

(A)**Address the “Human Side Systematically”** This demands as much data collection and analysis, planning and implementation discipline as does a redesign of strategy, systems, or
processes. The change-management approach should be based on a realistic assessment of
organization’s history, readiness, and capacity to change.

(B) Start at the Top The leaders themselves must embrace the new approaches first, both to challenge and to motivate the rest of the organization. They must speak with one voice and model the desired behaviors.

(C) Involve Every Layer Change efforts must include plans for identifying leaders at different levels of the organization and pushing responsibility for design and implementation down, so that change “cascades” through the organization. At each layer of the organization, the leaders who are identified and trained must be aligned to the company’s vision, equipped to execute their specific mission, and motivated to make change happen.

(D) Make the Formal Case The articulation of a formal case for change and the creation of a written vision statement are invaluable opportunities to create or compel leadership-team alignment. This stage involves three steps: First, confront reality and articulate a convincing need for change. Second, demonstrate faith that the organization has a viable future and the leadership to get there. Finally, provide road map to guide behavior and decision making.

(E) Create Ownership This demand ownership by leaders willing to accept responsibility for making change happen in all the areas they influence or control. Ownership is often best created by involving people in identifying problems and crafting solutions. It is reinforced by incentives and rewards.

(F) Communicate the Message Too often, change leaders make the mistake of believing that others understand the issues, feel the need for change, and see the new direction as clearly as they do. Communications flow in from the bottom and out from the top, and are targeted to provide employees the right information at the right time and to solicit their input and feedback. Often this will require over communication through multiple, redundant channels.
(G) **Assess the Cultural Landscape** Organizations often make the mistake of assessing culture either too late or not at all. Thorough cultural diagnostics can assess organizational readiness to change, bring major problems to the surface, identify conflicts, and define factors that can recognize and influence sources of leadership and resistance. These diagnostics identify the core values, beliefs, behaviors, and perceptions that must be taken into account for successful implementation of change.

(H) **Address Culture Explicitly** Once the culture is understood, it should be addressed as thoroughly as any other area in a change program. This requires developing a baseline, defining an explicit end state or desired culture, and devising detailed plans to make the transition. Company culture is an amalgam of shared history, explicit values and beliefs and common attitudes and behaviors. Change programs can involve creating a culture, combing cultures, or reinforcing cultures. Understanding that all companies have a cultural center – the locus of thought, activity, influence, or personal identification, is often an effective way to jump-start culture change.

(I) **Prepare for the Unexpected** No change program goes completely according to plan. People react in unexpected ways, areas of anticipated resistance fall away and the external environment shifts. Effectively managing change requires continual reassessment of its impact and the organization’s willingness and ability to adopt the next wave of transformation.

(J) **Speak to the Individual** Change leaders should be as honest and explicit as possible. Employees need to know how their work will change, what is expected of them during and after the change program, how they will be measured and what success or failure will mean for them and those around them.
(C) Prosci’s ADKAR Model of Change Management

This model has the five key building blocks an individual needs to make a change successfully, whether at home or in the workplace. The model states simply that for someone to effectively engage in their role in change management, they need, Awareness of the need for change, Desire to participate and support the application of change, knowledge on how to change, Ability to implement the required skills and behaviors for their role in change, and Reinforcement to sustain change, (Prosci, 2010). The name ADKAR stands for;

A - Awareness
D - Desire
K - Knowledge
A - Ability
R - Reinforcement

ADKAR describes successful change at the individual level, because to Prosci organizations don’t change, it is individuals that change. He is of the opinion that when an organization undertakes an initiative to change, that change only happens when the employees who have to do their jobs differently can say with confidence, “I have the Awareness, Desire, Knowledge, Ability and Reinforcement to make this change happen.

(D) Organizational Development

Organizational development activities are aimed at bringing about planned change, to increase an organization’s effectiveness. (Ewurum and Okorie, 2008:78). To corroborate the above point, Mullins (2010:737) sees organization development as a generic term embracing a wide range of loosely defined intervention strategies into the social processes of an organization,. These strategies are aimed at the development of individuals, groups and the organization as a total system.
In a general sense, Organization Development is concerned with attempts to improve the overall performance and effectiveness of an organization. It is an applied behavioral science approach to planned change and development. Its goal is to change people and the quality of their interpersonal relationships. The aims of organizational development are to encourage cooperation, eliminate conflict, increase motivation, and improve problem-solving, open lines of communication and to develop mutual trust among employees.

Robbins and Judge (2007:654-658), Mullins (2010:737-738), Armstrong (2006:341-342) and Akarele and Akarele (2000:796-797) maintain that, there are some of the organizational development techniques or interventions for bringing about change, in organizations, and they are;

(a) **Survey feedback** This is where employees’ views are obtained blind through survey questionnaires to establish the areas where employees require change. It is a technique for assessing attitudes, identifying discrepancies in them, and resolving the differences by using information in feedback groups.

(b) **T-groups (or Sensitivity Training)** this is a method of changing behaviors through unstructured group interactions. It involves small, unstructured, face-to-face groupings who meet without a planned agenda or set activities. Training is intended to concentrate on process rather than content: that is on the feeling level of communication rather than the information value of communication.

(c) **Process Consultation** This involves help given by an outside consultant to a manager in perceiving understanding, and acting upon interpersonal processes. The information will relate to organizational processes such as inter-personal relations, inter-group relations and communications. The job of the process consultant is to help the organization to solve its own problems by making it aware of organizational
processes, of the consequences of these processes and of the mechanisms by which they can be changed.

(d) **Inter-group Development** A major area of concern in organizational development is the dysfunctional conflict that exists between groups. Inter group development seeks to change the attitudes, stereotypes, and perceptions that groups have of each other. The groups involved meet each other to share what they have learnt, to agree on the issues to be resolved and the actions required.

(e) **Appreciative Inquiry:** Most organizational development approaches are problem-centered. They identify a problem or set of problems, then look for a solution. Appreciative inquiry accentuates the positive. Rather than looking for problems to fix, this approach seeks to identify the unique qualities and special strengths of an organization, which can then be built on to improve performance (Barge and Oliver, 2003:124-142). That is, it focuses on an organization’s successes rather than on its problems.

(f) **Team-building:** This involves interactions among members of work teams to learn how each member thinks and works. Team building builds the cooperation and trusting attitudes of members to accept mutual dependence and co-responsibility. The basic objective is to improve the overall performance of the organization through improvements in the effectiveness of teams. Attention is focused on work procedures and interpersonal relationships, and especially the role of the leader in relation to other members of the group.

(g) **Grid training:** This is developed by Blake and Mouton (1991:420-435), that is managerial Grid approach; it combines concern for both people and output to ensure effective implementation of change and its permanence in the organization.
2.2.3 Concept of Group in Organization

Groups at work are formed as a direct consequence of an organization’s need to differentiate itself. Differentiation, or specialization, involves not only the breaking dawn of the organization into functions, but also the formation of group to support those assigned to those functions. Telsang (2007:203) opines that, a group is any number of persons who interact with each other in such a manner that the behavior of one is influenced by the behavior of other persons. Thus, group involves interaction between two or more persons. To him organizations achieve their goals by allocating task to groups of people who are held responsible for accomplishing them. Groups provide synergy to the organization. A group is basically a collection of individuals contributing to some common aim under the direction of a leader, and who share sense of common identity. Thus a group is more than an aimless crowd of people waiting in an airport lodge or at a bus stop. To Ezigbo (2011:464) a group is two or more individuals who come into personal and meaningful contact on a continuing basis. A group has some central purpose, temporary or permanent, and a degree of self-awareness as a group. A group is two or more people having interest, objectives and continuing interaction (Nelson and Quick, 2005:178).

Work is a group-based activity, and if the organization is to function effectively, it requires collaboration and co-operatively among its members. Groups are an essential feature of any organization. Individuals seldom work in isolation from others. According to Schein (1988:145) a group is any number of people who interact with one another, are psychologically aware of one another and perceive themselves to be a group. Groups are characteristic of all social situations and almost everyone in an organization will be a member of one or more groups. Another useful way of defining a work group is a collection of people who share most, if not all, of the following characteristics: a definable membership, group consciousness, a sense of shared purpose, interdependence, interaction and ability to act in a
unitary manner (Adair, 1986). The working of groups and the influence they exert over their membership is an essential feature of human behaviour and of organizational performance. Member of a group must co-operate in order for work to be carried out, and managers themselves will work within these groups. Mullins (2010:307) is of the opinion that people in groups should influence each other in many ways and that groups may develop their own hierarchies and leaders. Also group pressures can have a major influence over the behaviour of individual members and the work performance.

In other words, a work group can be described as a collection of individuals working towards a common goal and who are interdependent to a significant degree as they relate to and interact with each other, while performing their tasks (Telsang, 2007:203). A group is seen as two or more people who interact with each other depend on each other, and work towards some common goal or purpose (Bateman and Zeithaml, 1990). But Robert and David (2001) see a group as two or more individuals who interact with another and where there is a psychological relationship between them. On the same note Dessler (1990) sees a group, as consisting of two or more people interacting. In other words group member share some common perception, ideology, values, beliefs, and norms, and these common interests contribute to this predictability.

However, whatever definition any person may ascribe to the term “group”, one important thing to note is that groups are formed to meet objectives that can best be met collectively thus; groups help organizations to overcome the limitations of individuals. Issues that may best be dealt with collectively are left for groups to decide so that each individual will contribute expertisely toward solving the problem. Managers therefore constitute work groups to accomplish those assignments that may be better accomplished collectively.
2.2.3.1 Types of Groups

There are many ways of classifying groups. The important classifications according to Telsang (2007:356) and Mullins (2010:311) are formal and informal groups. But for Hellriegel, Jackson and Slocum (1999) in Ezigbo (2011:464), group is classified as informal group and work teams. Both formal and informal groups exist in the organization. Formal groups are created to achieve specific organizational objectives and are concerned with the co-ordination of work activities (Mullins, 2010:311).

(A) **Formal groups** are seen as a collection of employees who are made to work together in the organization to get the job done smoothly and efficiently (Telsang, 2007:356). A formal work groups can create both permanent and temporary formal groups. It is further divided into the following.

- **Task or work Group:** Task or work groups are formed with the purpose of pooling together and coordinating the resources, activities and efforts of a number of people for the performance of a common task. Such groups are formed when the nature of task requires a variety of skills and close co-ordination of activities of more than one worker (Telsang, 2007:356).

- **Problem Solving Groups:** Problem solving groups are created with the purpose of arriving at solutions to specific problem. A committee as a group of persons to whom as a group, some matter is committed, (Weihrich and Koontz, 2005:424).

- **Command Groups:** Command groups are created through the establishment of authority-responsibility relationships. These groups comprise people performing similar or closely related activities.
(B) Informal Groups

An informal group consists of small number of individuals usually three to twelve, who frequently participate together in activities and share feelings for the purpose of meeting their mutual need (Ezigbo, 2011:465). Memberships of informal groups are voluntary, although access into one of these groups can be difficult since such groups can quickly develop their own ways of doing things which provide barriers to entry and acceptability. They emerge naturally in response to the common interests of organizational members. They are formed spontaneously without any formal designations and with common interests such as self-defense, work assistance and social interactions. They exist outside the formal authority structure and without any set of rigid rules (Telsang, 2007:359).

Informal groups serve to satisfy psychological and social needs not related necessarily to the tasks to be undertaken (Mullins, 2010:312). They may comprise individuals from different parts of the organization and/or from different levels of the organization, vertically and diagonally as well as from the same horizontal level. An informal group could also be the same as the formal groups or it might comprise a part only of the formal group. That is why Law (2005:26-28) states that “we humans are a gregarious lot, we like to gather together and establish our own social networks, which are often the real key to creativity and innovations in organization” But many managers are unaware that seemingly pointless social networking does in fact play a crucial part in the way people interact with each other and get work done.

However, the coherence and psychological solidarity that characterize informal groups can also be a great asset to the organization when management goals and those of the groups are in line. The management processes, therefore, must take into account both types of groups when dealing with almost any aspect of organization.
2.2.3.2 Stages of Group Maturity

The degree of cohesiveness is affected by the manner in which groups’ progresses through the various stages of development and maturity before getting down to the real tasks in hand. This process can take time and is often traumatic for the members. Bass and Ryterband, (1979) identify four distinct stages in group development;

- Mutual acceptance and membership
- Communication and decision-making
- Motivation and productivity; and
- Control and organization.

An alternative and more popular model by Tuckman and Jensen (1977:419-427) are five main successive stages of group development and relationships: Forming, Storming, Norming, Performing and Adjourning.

1. **Forming**: The Initial formation of the group and the bringing together of a number of individuals who identify, tentatively, the purpose of the group, its composition and terms of reference. This stage includes, finding out about the task, rules and methods, acquiring information and resources, and relying on the leader.

2. **Storming**: As members of the group get to know each other better, they will put forward their views more openly and forcefully. Disagreements will be expressed and challenges offered on the nature of the task, and arrangements made in the earlier stage of development. This may lead to conflict and hostility. At This stage, internal conflict develops and members may resist the task at the emotional level. This stage is important because, if successful, there will be reformation for the working and operation of the group.

3. **Norming**: As conflict and hostility start to be controlled, members of the group will establish guidelines and standards and develop their own norms of acceptable
behaviour. This stage is important in establishing the need for members to cooperate in order to plan, agree to standards of performance and fulfill the purpose of the group.

4. **Performing:** When the group has progressed successfully through the three earlier stages of development, it will have created structure and cohesiveness to work effectively as a team. At this stage, the group can concentrate on the attainment of its purpose and performance of the common task is likely to be at its most effective.

5. **Adjourning:** This refers to the adjourning or disbanding of the group because of, for example, completion of the task, members leaving the organization or moving on to other tasks. Some members may feel a compelling sense of loss at the end of a major or lengthy group project and their return to independence is characterized by sadness and anxiety.

Another writer Green, (1993:12) suggests that new groups go through the following stages.

- The polite stage
- The why are we here, what are we doing stage
- The power stage, which dominant will emerge
- The constructive stage when sharing begins; and
- The unity stage – This often takes weeks, eating together, talking together.

### 2.2.3.3 Components and Characteristics of Groups

The classical approach to organization and management tended to ignore the importance of groups and the social factors at work, but the human relations approach, however gave, recognition to the work organization as a social organization and to the importance of the group, and group values and norms, in influencing behavior at work (Mullins, 2010:309).
According to Riches (2009), one way to improve group performance is to establish agreed norms or rules for how the team is to operate and rigorously stick to them.

In other words, in order to understand and to influence the functioning and operating of a group, it is necessary to study patterns of interaction and the parts played by individual members. To Stanley (2002:10-12) there are two main methods of analyzing the behavior of individuals in group situation, they include sociometry and interaction analysis.

(A) **Sociometry** originally developed by Moreno in 1960, Sociometry is a method of indicating the feelings of acceptance or rejection among members of a group. A sociogram is a diagrammatical illustration of the pattern of interpersonal relationships derived from sociometry Moreno (1953), in Mullins (2010:347-349). The sociogram depicts the choices preference, likes or dislikes and interactions between individual members. It can also be used to display the structure of the group and to record the observed frequency and/or duration of contacts among members. Although, sociogram has limitations on how to draw and interpret roles of individual group members, but sociogram is best seen as a useful vehicle that, if handled sensitively, can serve to encourage meaningful discussions on patterns of social/interactions, group behavior and the perception of individual members, toward each other.

(B) **Interaction Analysis** The basic assumption behind interaction analysis is that behavior in groups may be analyzed from the viewpoint of its function. This approach has developed largely from the work of Bales on methods for the study of small groups. This aims to provide ways of describing group process and indications of factors influencing the process Bales (1950:257-263), in Mullins (2010:349-350). In Bales “interaction process analysis” every act of behavior is categorized, as it occurs. The display of behavior in this way is termed self-oriented behavior. This gives a classification of three main types of functional
behavior that can be exhibited by individual members of a group; Task-oriented, maintenance-oriented and self-oriented.

To Nelson and Quick (2005:178), group behavior has been a subject of interest in social psychology for a long time, and many different aspect of group behavior have been studied over the years. They identified four relevant functions of groups in an organization, they are;

(C) Norms of behavior: The standards that a work group uses to evaluate the behavior of its members are its norms of behavior. These norms may be written or unwritten, verbalized or not verbalized, implicit or explicit. As long as individual members of the group understand the norms, the norms can be effective in influencing behavior (Nelson and Quick, 2005:199). Groups develop norms which refer to the expected behavior of the group members, if individuals deviate from the norms; pressure is exerted to make them comply (Weihrick and Koontz, 2005:432). Group Norms are influenced by organizational factors such as policies, management style of superiors, and rules and procedures. They are also influenced by individual employees, whose standards may or may not be in line with those of the official organization. Norms that create awareness of emotions and helps regulate emotions are critical to groups’ effectiveness (Druskat and Wolff, 2001:80-90).

(D) Group Cohesion: The interpersonal glue that makes the members of a group stick together is group cohesion (Nelson and Quick 2005:179). Group cohesion can enhance job satisfaction for members and improve organizational productivity (Summers, Coffelt and Horton, 1988:627-636). Group cohesiveness refers to the ability of the group members to stick together, it also applies to the ability of a group to attract new members (Ewurum, 2009:63) Highly cohesive group at work may not have many interpersonal exchanges away from the work place. Nevertheless, they are able to control and manage their membership better than work groups low in cohesion. This is due to the strong motivation in highly cohesive groups to maintain good, close relationships among the members.
Group cohesion is influenced by a number of factors, most notably time, the size, the prestige of the team, external pressure, and internal competition (Nelson and Quick, 2005:184-185). The impact of group cohesion can, however result in negative as well as positive results (Armstrong, 2009:372). For example, goal conflict in a group, unpleasant experiences, and domination of a subgroup are among the threats to group’s cohesion. Also groups with low level of cohesion have greater difficulty exercising control over their Standards of behavior.

Group cohesion evolves gradually over time through a group’s normal development. Similarly, smaller groups- those of five or seven members, are more cohesive than those of more than twenty-five. Also prestige or social status influences a groups cohesion, with more prestigious groups being highly cohesive than the groups of very low prestige. Furthermore, external pressures tend to enhance cohesion, while internal competitions usually decrease cohesion within a group. However, one study found that company imposed work pressure disrupted group cohesion by increasing internal competition and reducing cooperative interpersonal activity (Klein, 1996:68-75)

Mullins (2010:314-315) posits that, the main aim of managers of organization is to make members of a work group co-operate in order to achieve the results expected of them. Co-operation among members is likely to be greater in united and cohesive groups. Strong and cohesive groups can therefore, have beneficial effects for the organization. He identified many factors which affect group cohesiveness and performance that can be summarized less than four broad heading as shown in this figure:
Moreover, for teams to be cohesive, the work must require group efforts rather than individual efforts (Nelarine, 2001:172). This involves employees in the group seeing themselves as part of a team and having a task that involves interacting frequently as a team.

**Social Loafing** Social loafing occurs when one or more group members rely on the efforts of other group members and fail to contribute their own time, effort, thoughts, or other resources to a group (Price, 1993:329-344). Social Loafing is defined by Mullins (2010:354-355) as the tendency for individuals to expend less effort when working as a member of a group than as an individual. This may create a real drag on the group’s efforts and achievements. Some scholars argue that, from the individual’s standpoint, social loafing, or free riding, is rational behavior in response to an experience of inequity or when individual efforts are hard to
observe. However, it shortchanges the group which losses potentially valuable resources possessed by individual members (Albanese and Van Fleet, 1985:244-255).

To Derek, Hall and Taylor (2008:306), social loafing occur in a situation where one or more team members rely on the others to put in extra effort to achieve objectives to cover for their own lack of effort. A number of methods for countering social loafing exist, such as having identifiable individual contributions to the group product and member self-evaluation system. For example, if each group member is responsible for a specific input to the group, a member’s failure to contribute will be noticed by everyone. If members must formally evaluate their contributions to the group, they are less likely to loaf (Nelson and Quick, 2005:179).

**Loss of Individuality** social loafing may be detrimental to group achievement, but it does not have the potentially explosive effects of loss of individuality. Loss of individuality or deindividuation is a social process in which individual group members, loss self – awareness and its accompanying sense of accountability inhibition, and responsibility for individual behavior (Diener, 1979:1160-1171). When individuality is lost, people may engage in morally reprehensible acts and even violent behavior as committed members of their group or organization. For example, loss of individuality was one of several contributing factors in the violent and aggressive acts that led to the riot that destroyed sections of Los Angeles following the Rodney King verdict in the early 1990s. Loss of individuality is not always negative or destructive, however. The loosening of normal ego control mechanisms in the individual may lead to pro-social behavior and heroic acts in dangerous situations (Prentice-Dunn and Rogers, 1989:87-109). A group that successfully develops into a mature group may not encounter problems with loss of individuality (Nelson and Quick, 2005:180).

**Group Dynamics** The term group dynamics according to (Armstrong, 2009: 372) can be used to describe the ways in which groups are formed and group members interact. But
originally as defined by Kurt Lewen (1947), it refers to the improvement of group processes through various forms of training example; team-building, interactive skills, training and T-groups. Interest in the study of group process and behavior has led to the development of group dynamics and a range of group training methods aimed at increasing group effectiveness through improving social interaction skills (Mullins, 2010:358). Group dynamics are concerned with the interactions and forces among group members in a social situation, when the concept is applied to the study of organizational behavior, the focus is on the dynamics of members of formal or informal groups in the organization (Luthans, 2000:357). Just as there is no one definition of the word group, there is no universal agreement on what is meant by group dynamics, although Kurt Lewin popularized the term in the 1930s. Through the years, different connotations have been attached to it.

One normative view is that group dynamics describe how a group should be organized and conducted. Democratic leadership, member participation, and overall cooperation are stressed. Another view of group dynamics is that it consists of a set of techniques. Here, role-playing, brainstorming, buzz groups, leaderless groups, group therapy sensitivity training, team building, transactional analysis, and the Johari window are equated with group dynamics. A third view is the closest to Lewins original conception. Group dynamics are viewed from the perspective of the internal nature of groups, how they form their structure and processes, and how they function and affect individual members, others and the organization (Luthans, 2000:357).

Furthermore, to Mullins (2010:358-359), a central feature of group dynamics is sensitivity training, in which members of a group direct attention to the understanding of their own behavior and to perceiving themselves as others see them. He identified the use of T-groups as a usual method of sensitivity training. A T-group has been defined by Cooper and Mangham (1971), in Mullins (2010:359) as an approach to human relations training which
broadly speaking, provide participants with an opportunity to learn more about themselves and their impact on others, and in particular to learn how to function more effectively in face-to-face situations. In other words, a simple framework for looking at self-insight which is used frequently to help individuals in the T-group process is the Johari Window. The Johari Window classifies behavior in matrix form between what is known-unknown to self and what is known-unknown to others Luft (1970), in Mullins (2010:358-359).

**Hidden Behavior** Is that which the individual wishes to conceal from or not to communicate to other group members. It is part of the private self. An important role of the group is to establish whether members conceal too much or too little, about themselves from other members.


**The blind area:** (That is behavior known to others but unknown to self) includes mannerisms, gestures and tone of voice and represents behavior of the impact of which the other individual is unaware.

Members must establish an atmosphere of openness and trust in order that hidden and blind behaviors are reduced and the public behavior enhanced.
Brainstorming: A brainstorming approach (sometimes now referred to as “thought showers” or “Cloud Bursting”) involves the group adopting a “freewheeling” attitude and generating as many ideas as possible, the more wild or apparently far-fetched the better (Osbon, 1963) in (Mullins, 2010:356). Brainstorming is based on encouraging members to suspend judgment, the assumption that creative thinking is achieved best by encouraging the natural inclinations of group members, and the rapid production and free association of ideas. The quantity of ideas will lead to quality of ideas (Mullin, 2010:356).

Availability of time is one factor that makes for an effective brainstorming of a group to produce more creative problem-solving ideas than if the same members worked alone as individuals. Brearly (1994) is of the opinion that despite the rather negative view of nominal group brainstorming, people should recognize the importance of innovation for successful organizational performance. For an effective brainstorming to take place any procedure which aids the process of creativity should be welcomed and there are a number of potential positive achievements in terms of related structural techniques for stimulating innovation. These include the Delphi techniques and Quality circles.

(A) Delphi Technique: The Delphi techniques was originally developed by a research group at the Rand Corporation. It makes use of a group of experts, all of whom are physically separated from each other to arrive at a consensus (Anderson, Sweeney and Williams, 1994:717-718) in (Ugbam, 2011:138). Both nominal group techniques and the Delphi techniques make use of brainstorming sessions to generate a decision that would be better than an individual expert could have generated (Ivancerich, 1998:150). The Delphi technique according to Mullins (2010:357) is based on multiple, anonymous inputs from individual members of the group. Ideas and suggestions are recorded by a central manager and then re-circulated to other members for their feedback. The central manager collates the responses and continues the circulation process again until consensus is reached. Although a time
consuming process, the Delphi techniques helps to overcome the limitations of face-to-face brainstorming and symptoms of groupthink.

(B) Quality circles: A quality circle is a group of people within an organization who meet on a regular basis to identify, analyze and solve problem relating to quality, productivity or other aspect of day-to-day working arrangements using problem-solving techniques (Mullins, 2010:357). Although quality circles actually originated in America, they were exported to Japan and are more usually associated with their wide applications in Japanese manufacturing industries as well as in some white collar operations. In America, quality circles appear to have been first implemented in 1974 (Meyer and Scott, 1985: 35-50) in (Mullins, 2010:357). The application of quality circles does appear simple and straightforward, but early experience must be viewed in the context of Japanese culture and management systems. In as much as there are a number of potential benefits of problem-solving in work related decisions attributed to quality circles, there are some doubts, however as to the extent to which the hopes for, or potential benefits of quality circles are realized fully in organizations (Hill, 1991:541-568).

2.2.3.4 Differences between Groups and Teams

Groups and teams are key subjects both in modern management literature and in management practice. The words group and teams are often used as substitutes. According to Robbins and Judge (2000:339) groups and teams are not the same thing. A work group is a group that interacts primarily to share information and to make decision to help each member within his or her area of responsibility. Work groups have no need or opportunity to engage in collective work that requires joint effort. Hertog and Tolmen (1988:96), state that such groups can be found almost anywhere; in families, schools, sports clubs, and work organizations. There is no positive synergy that would create an overall level of performance that is greater than the sum of the inputs.
In other words, a work team generates positive synergy through coordinated effort. There individual efforts result in a level of performance that is greater than the sum of those individual inputs. A set of team has to be tied together for a certain purpose. This is reflected in well-accepted definition of a team as a set of interpersonal relationships structured to achieve established goals (Hertog and Tolmen, 1988:96). The organizations are sometimes unsure whether they have teams or simply groups of people working together (Cane 1996:116). Whereas all team are, by definition groups, it does not necessary follow that all groups are teams, (Mullin, 2010:308). The group and the team are regarded as poles to a continuum.

Furthermore, any team is to be regarded as a group. The group turns into a team once it gets organized well enough to fulfill a purpose. This implies a process of organization design by which effective pattern of task allocation, decision-making and communication emerge. The transition of groups into teams is in this respect the result of a learning process or in other words, the result of organizational development. The group becomes an effective team using its experience in following and improving organizational patterns. This represents the double perspective (Hertog and Tolmen, 1988:96).

Belbin (2000) maintains that teamwork is becoming a fashionable term and has begun to replace the more usual reference to groups and every activity is now being described as “team work”. He suggests that there are several factors that characterize the difference between groups and team. The best differentiation is size; groups can comprise any number of people but teams are smaller with a membership between (ideally) four and six. To Robbins and Judge (2007:340), merely calling a group a team doesn’t automatically increase its performance. The extensive use of teams creates the potential for an organization to generate greater outputs with no increase in inputs while acknowledging the work of Belbin (2000), it
appears that the term “group” is often used in a more general sense and “team” in a more specific context.

Table 2.2: Differences between a team and a group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Selection</td>
<td>Crucial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Sharing or rotating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>Mutual knowledge understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Role spread coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Spirit</td>
<td>Dynamic interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Collective performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Synergy</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Individual and mutual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Complementary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2.3 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

There are so many theories about teams, groups and change, but this work is based on the theories of these authors;

(a) Adair (1986) Theory of Desirable Personal Attribute: This theory suggests that the test of a good (i.e. effective) team is whether its members can work as a team while they are apart,
contributing to a sequence of activities rather than to a common task, which requires their presence in one place and at one time. Adair emphasizes the important of careful selection of team members. The key factors here for individuals are not only technical or professional competence, but also the ability to work as a team member, and the possession of desirable personal attributes, such as willingness to listen, flexibility of outlook and the capacity to give and accept trust.

(b) Belbin’s Team-Roles: one of the most popular and widely used analyses of individual roles within a work team is that developed by (Belbin, 1981). Following years of research and empirical study, Belbin concludes that teams composed entirely of clever people, or of people with similar personalities, that display a number of negative results and lack creativity. That the ideal, (an effective) team is one that is likely to have a range of roles present in its make-up. A team role is described as a pattern of behavior, characteristic of the way in which one team member interacts with another whose performance serves to facilitate the progress of the team as a whole. In a follow up publication, Belbin (1993:23) discusses the continual evolution of team roles, which differ in a few respects from those originally identified, and adds a ninth role. The nine team role evolved by Belbin includes, Plant, Resource investigator, Coordinator, Shaper, Monitor-Evaluator, Team worker, Implementer, Completer and Specialist.

(c) McGregor Characteristics of effective Team: McGregor and his colleagues developed lists of characteristics for effective and ineffective teams. McGregor (1960) his list focuses on management of teams. Other scholars that conducted research similar to his includes, Argyris (1965) who focuses on organizational effectiveness that impact inter- personal competence of team members. He also looks at how the organization supports positive norms, such as openness, experimentation, individuality, thoughtfulness, concern, internal commitment,
candidness, encouraging candidness, assisting with experimentation, and encouraging openness.

(d) Blake and Mouton Theory of Managerial Grid: Blake and Mouton, (1964), they linked management style with effectiveness in their managerial grid. The grid has a vertical and horizontal axis; the vertical access measures a managers’ concern for people and the horizontal access measures, a manager’s concern for productivity. This grid is used to improve overall team effectiveness as well as individual effectiveness of each team members.

(e) Hackman and Oldham team effectiveness: To Hackman and Oldham (1980) team effectiveness comprises all of the following; the teams’ ability to produce an output that meets or exceeds an organization’s performance standards or expectations, the team experience serving more to satisfy than frustrate the personal needs of team members, and the team’s ability to work together on future assignments as a result of the social process engaged in to carry out current tasks.

(f) Lewins Process: Planned organization change requires a systematic process of moving from one condition to another Lewin (1951) suggests that efforts to bring about planned change in organizations should approach change as a multi stage process.

Unfreezing The important factor in this stage is making employees knowledgeable about the importance of a change and how their jobs will be affected by it. It involves the altering of the present stable equilibrium which supports existing behaviors and attitudes. This process must take account of the inherent threats that change presents to people and the need to motivate those affected to attain the natural state of equilibrium by accepting change.

Changing Is the movement from an old stage to a new one. Change may mean installing new equipment, restructuring the organization, or implementing a new performance appraisal
system - anything that alters existing relationships or activities. Developing new responses based on new information.

**Refreezing** This makes new behaviors relatively permanent and resistant to further change. It stabilizes the change by introducing the new responses into the personalities of those concerned. Refreezing is necessary because without it, the old way of doing things might soon reassert themselves while the new ways were forgotten. Learning theory and reinforcement theory can play important roles in the refreezing phase.

(g) The Continuous Change Process by Ackerman

This approach looks at planned change from the perspective of top Management and indicates that change is continuous. According to the diagram below, this approach explains how top management perceives that certain forces or trends call for change, and the issue is subjected to the organization’s usual problem-solving and decision-making process. Usually top management defines its goals in terms of what the organization or certain processes or outputs will be like after the change. Alternatives for change are generated and evaluated, and an acceptable one is selected. To Ackerman (1982:37-45), transition management is the process of systematically planning, organizing and implementing change, from the disassembly of the current state to the realization of a fully functional future state within an organization.
(h) Beer, Eisentat and Specter (1990:158-166): Michael Beer and his colleagues advocate a model that recognizes that change is more complex and therefore, requires a more complex, albeit still uniform set of responses to ensure its effectiveness. They prescribe a six-step process to achieve effective change. They concentrate on task alignment, where employees roles, responsibilities and relationships are seen as key to bring about situations that enforce changed ways of thinking and behaving. From Armstrong (2006:351) the steps are:

- Mobilize commitment to change through the joint analysis of problems.
- Develop a shared vision of how to organize and manage to achieve goals such as competitiveness
- Foster consensus for the new vision, competence to enact it, and cohesion to move it along.
- Spread revitalization to all departments without pushing it from the top – don’t force the issue, let each department find its own way to the new organization.
- Institutionalize revitalization through formal policies, systems and structures.
- Monitor and adjust strategies in response to problems in the revitalization process.
Kotter’s Eight-Step Plan for Implementing Change: John Kotter of the Harvard Business School built on Lewin’s three-step model to create a more detailed approach for implementing change. Kotter (1996) began by listing common failures that managers make when trying to initiate change. He then established eight sequential steps to overcome these problems; they are, as written by Robbins and Judge (2007:653):

- Establish a sense of urgency by creating a compelling reason for why change is needed.
- Form a coalition with enough power to lead the change.
- Create new vision to direct the change and strategies for achieving the vision.
- Communicate the vision throughout the organization.
- Empower others to act on the vision by removing barriers to change and encouraging risk taking and creative problem-solving.
- Plan for, create, and reward short-term “wins” that move the organization toward the new vision.
- Consolidate improvements, reassess changes, and make necessary adjustments in the new programs.
- Reinforce the changes by demonstrating the relationship between new behaviors and organizational success.

Creative Leadership and group development Theory: By Richards and Moger (2009:283-273) in an examination of creative leadership and team effectiveness, Richards and Moger propose a modification to the Tuckman model and suggest a two-barrier model of group development. Creative leadership is suggested as producing new routines or protocols designed as “benign structure” which helps teams progress through the first barrier at Tuckman’s storm stage (a, behavioral barrier), and beyond a second barrier at the norm stage (a norm-breaking barrier). From empirical studies of small groups and project teams
Richards and Moger put forward the two barrier model that provide point for exploring on the performance of teams. They suggested several factors through which a leader might influence effective team development;

- Building a platform of understanding
- Creating a shared vision
- A creative climate
- A commitment to idea ownership
- Resilience to setbacks
- Developing networking skills
- Learning from experience

(k) Social Identity Theory by Tajfel and Turner (1986:7-24): This theory is about a feature of the importance and significance of group membership. Tajfel and Turner originally developed the idea of social identity theory as a means of understanding the psychological basis of inter-group discrimination. Individual are perceived as having contexts and membership of groups. In collaboration to social identity theory Guirdham, (2002:118) asserts that “self – categorization is the process that transforms a number of individuals into a group”. Haslam (2004:17) refers to the relationship between individuals and groups in an understanding of organizational behavior, and argues that, “in order to understand perception and interaction in organizational context we must do more than just studying the psychology of individuals as individuals, instead, we need to understand how social interaction is bound up with individual’s social identities, their definition of themselves in terms of group membership.

According to Flynn, Chatman, and Spatato (2001:414-442) over time, the sense of shared identity with the in-group increases a feeling of what is right and proper and highlights differences from the out-groups. As a result, this reinforces both social identity with our own
category and the projection of negative perception and stereotypes towards out-groups. Tajfel and Turner (1986:7-24) suggests that the mere act of individuals categorizing themselves as group members leads – them to exhibit in-group favoritism. In conclusion Hewstone, Riubin and Willis (2002:575-604), suggest that even without realizing it, we tend usually to favour the groupings we belong to more than denigrate out-groups. Successful inter-group bias enhances self-esteem.

(1) Balanced Theory by Luthans (2000:357): It states that persons are attracted to one another on the basis of similar attitudes toward commonly relevant objects and goals. This is because the major element is attraction. Persons in a group interact with one another, not just in the physical closeness sense, but also in social interactions to solve problems, attain goals, facilitate coordination, reduce tension, and achieve a balance.

2.4  EMPIRICAL REVIEW

The study reviews the work of other authors in line with the objectives.

2.4.1 Strategies for Change and Teamwork Approach

In their study “The Hard Side of Change management” conducted by Sirkin, Keenan and Jackson (2005:2-14). They created awareness of how a change program is progressing and how participants are responding to the change events. They suggest that four key elements should be measured to identify potential problem areas and to make necessary modifications. The four elements are abbreviated to “DICE” which are:

- Duration –The implementation time (if a small initiative) or the time between milestone review for longer efforts (the shorter the better).
- Integrity of Performance – The change team’s skills.
- Commitment – Senior leaders (C1) and employee dedication (C2) to the change.
- Effort – The extra work employees must perform to adopt new processes (the less, the better).
In another study conducted in the USA on leadership and Innovation, by Bouncken, Imcharoen and Klaasen-Van-Husen (2007), they examined the influence of Collectivism on Leadership and its impact on teamwork performance. The sample size of 187 leaders and 97 non-leaders who work in multicultural teams of professional service firms was used. The findings show that collectivism affects the preferred leaders. It has indirect effect on team’s effectiveness through leadership styles and teamwork quality.

Also in a study conducted by Bacon and Blyton (2005:238-255) in UK company in steel industry “worker response to team working”: Exploring employees’ attributions of managerial motives. Their study after two years of investigation revealed that managers benefited disproportionately from team working in comparison with other employees. Employees perceived the introduction of teamwork merely as a means for furthering the career of the managers who were successful in its implementation.

On the other hand, data from the quality of work life survey in Finland in 2007 showed the opposite trend whereby the employees themselves belief that productivity improves when work is completed in groups. This belief is stronger in the private sector and in the public sector at local government level than in the public sector at central government level.

Zhang (2000:129-137): Zhang in his study found that top management commitment had the greatest effect in smooth execution of change process. His study was conducted by taking structured interviews of managers of manufacturing companies.

In their own study, Van der Wiele and Brown (2002:508-523) found that the longer sustainability of incremental changes gets affected by management-related factors like;

- The Chief Executive Officer tenure,
- Strength of executive board,
- Prevailing management system,
• Extent to which quality system is integrated into the organization system and  
• Impact of the continuity of true implementation of quality management.

2.4.2. Teamwork Approach, Sustenance and Viability

In a study conducted in Germany at German Sociological Research Institute, at the University of Gottingen, by Kuhlmann, Sperling and Balzert (2004). The study emphasized the importance of correct and comprehensive implementation of teamwork, and proposes a “Coherence Thesis”, founded on making close links between an organization’s various dimensions. “The key issues are the integration of work organization and teamwork with the overall company organization and payment system.

Also in another study conducted in Portuguese by Curral and Chambel (1999:163-192), investigating the efficiency of teams in Service Sector Companies. This study emphasized the need for what is known as participation security so that the teams function well and proposes innovation ideas. The study examined 26 teams accounting for 70 individuals in total, who work for seven publicity agencies in the Lisbon region.

Oeij and Wiezer (2002) in their study, examined teamwork from the perspective of participation, work intensity, learning new things and multi-skilling and autonomy. The empirical result showed that working in a team is closely associated with an environment typical of the possibility to learn new things and job enlargement attributes. Successful organizations today know that teams make a big difference in achievement of strategic goals. That is why the CMOE (2010) advocate for team that are strong, flexible, and productive to be the competitive edge needed to produce better results, achieve higher quality, lower cost both for the organizations and the customers. Hence, building an effective team requires applying practical skills to maximize team performance and development.
More also, in their study “Team Conflict Management and Team effectiveness: The Effects of task interdependence and team identification”. Somech, Desvilya and Lidogoster (2009:359-378), explored the dynamics of conflict management as a team phenomenon. The study examined how the input variable of task structure (task interdependence) is related to team conflict management style (cooperative versus competitive) and to team performance, and how team identity moderate these relationships. Results revealed that a high level of team identity, task, and interdependence was positively associated with the cooperative style of conflict management, which in turn fostered team performance.

2.4.3 Relationship between Teamwork and organizational Performance in Management

In a study conducted in Netherlands by the Netherlands Organizations for Applied Scientific Research in 2005, managers appraised the performance of the work considering the difference in productivity between workplace where employees are organized in teams and workplace where employees do not work in teams. It was found that overall productivity based on an aggregate productivity scale did not depend on whether the manager organized the work according to teams. Nevertheless, an assessment of selected performance characteristics does demonstrate certain aspect of teamwork.

In another study “Teamwork and Organizational Performance”, conducted by Efi (2010:65-71) at Champion Breweries Plc Uyo in Nigeria. The work examined the effect of teamwork on organizational performance by assessing their relationship. The study adopted teamwork dimensions questionnaire (SWDQ) as its instrument for generating primary data from 120 respondents. One hypothesis was formulated and tested using Chi-square statistics. The result revealed that there is a positive relationship between teamwork and improved organizational performance.
Furthermore, in another study carried out in Germany by Hoegl and Gemuenden (2001:435-449), the research was aimed at contributing to a better understanding of the relationship between teamwork quality and team performance in software developing projects with varying degrees of innovativeness. The study was on Teamwork Quality and Success of Innovation Projects. Two hypotheses were tested using the data from 575 team members, team leaders, and managers of 145 German software teams. The data from the correspondents were analyzed using Partial Correlation, Factor analysis, Regression, and One-Way ANOVA. They discovered that teamwork quality was significantly associated with team performance as rated by team members, team leaders, and team managers. Subsequently, teams from manufacturing or customer service, the quality of its collaborativeness may only be positively associated with team performance.

In their study, “Productivity Outcomes of Teamwork as an Effect of Team Structure”, Delarue, Gryp, and Van Hootegem (2003) conducted an empirical work on Flemish firms in Belgium. Their study was to analyze the impact of teamwork on performance, and more specifically on productivity. The data were sourced from 10 employees from 336 organizations. The statistical tools used in the analysis of the data are One-Way ANOVA and t-test. The results revealed that there is no statistically significance difference between team organizations and non-team organizations in terms of the labour productivity.

2.4.4 Employees Reaction to Organizational Change

In a study carried out in USA Physicians in 37 specialty department in a large health care organization by Caldwell, Chatman, O’Reilly III, Ormiston, and Lapiz (2008:124-133), were surveyed regarding their support for a new customer service initiative. The study explored how three variables – agreement with new strategy, leaders action, and groups general orientation toward change can influence member of physician teams to take actions
supporting a strategic shift aimed at improving patient satisfaction. Normative support for the specific strategic change was directly related to increased patient satisfaction 1 year later. The interaction between norms supporting change readiness and the quality of leadership was positively related to change in patient satisfaction.

In other words, a study conducted in Nigeria by Adeyeye (2009:15-21) at Unilever Nigeria Plc, examined the level of acceptance of organizational change among workers in the organization. Utilizing data collected from a randomly selected sample of 720 senior management staff and junior non-management staff, regression analysis was performed to identify the determinants of acceptance of change among the employees. The results show some level of employee acceptance of innovations and reveal that out of 2 categories of employees analyzed, non-management staffs were more amenable to change than the management staff.

In another study, “The Adoption and Non-adoption of Modern Cost Accounting Practices”, conducted among 20 UK manufacturers by Walley, Blenkinsop and Duberley (1994), reported that many owners and managers (9 out of 20) companies exerted a negative influence on change to existing cost systems. The researchers found that satisfaction with the existing system, shortage of resources, and inadequate information was among the reason given for resistance.

Furthermore, in a study conducted in India by Dubey and Sanjeev Bansal (2012:48-49), to empirically examine the relationship between key sets of variables known to influence the successful implementation of change management in manufacturing organizations; Data for the study were collected through questionnaire which were mailed to 639 respondents. Exploratory principal component factor analysis and Factor analysis with Varimax rotation was used in analysis of the data. From the analysis of the data, six underlying obstacles were found to be associated with ineffective change management and they are;
• Organizational barrier
• Managerial barrier
• Process barrier
• Lack of leadership for quality
• Employees’ resistance
• Lack of customer focus

2.4.5 Challenges of Teamwork Approach to Change Management

Although there are good reasons and many benefits derived from using teamwork, there are also some challenges facing work teams and their institution in any organization. Weihrich and Koontz (2005:429) maintain that, teamwork is costly to implement, may result in compromises, may lead to indecision, can split responsibilities and they may lead to a situation in which a few persons impose their will on the majority, not allowing participation of other members. To Ezigbo (2006:216) teams inevitably face obstacles which if not overcome, can waste the organization’s resources, hamper morale and ultimately lead to the organization’s demise. Marks, Mathieu and Zaccaro (2001:356-376) assert that not all teams are successful because arrangements of the individuals’ cooperation in the work may not be satisfactory, that the success of teams in accomplishing their goals is related not only to the members’ talents and their effective resources, but is also associated with their interaction, as team members.

However, Robbins and Judge (2007: 353) assert that conflict on a team isn’t necessarily bad, they maintain that teams that are completely void of conflict are likely to become apathetic and stagnant. So conflict can actually improve team effectiveness (Peterson and Behfar, 2003:102-112). But not all types of conflicts, relationship conflicts are always dysfunctional, while task conflict is not detrimental to teamwork, because it lessens the likelihood of
groupthink. The effectiveness of team behavior and performance can be adversely affected by the idea of “Groupthink” ([Janis 1972, Somech et al, 2009, Khan 2007 and Ezigbo; 2011: 469]). Groupthink is defined as a deterioration of mental efficiency, reahty testing, and moral judgment that results from in-group pressures (Janis, 1982). Groupthink tends to occur when group members have very similar experiences and frame of references particularly when they have relatively long tenures in the group (Hambrick, 2001:289). Furthermore, Ezigbo (2011:469) believes groupthink is the belief that every member already knows what the other will propose as solutions, and when this happens, teams can become paralyzed by inaction.

Other problems faced by teamwork are due to interpersonal clashes and ignorant of conflict resolution skills, unwillingness to speak up when-things are going wrong, a poor mix of team members that result in insufficient skills, conflicting priorities and personalities. Insufficient clarity as to who does what can adversely affect the performance of team members, also insufficient and unclear communication between team members can adversely affect team progress. A disconnection between what is expected of the team and what the team wants to/can accomplish (Somec et al, 2009).

Furthermore, another major problem obtained in teamwork is the concept of social loafing. The tendency for individuals in teams to hide inside team and coast in the team’s effort because their individuals’ contributions can not be identified (Robbins and Judge, 2007:353). Social loafing can occur in all kinds of team and in all kinds of organization. It can result in lower team performance and may even prevent team from attaining its goals. Successful teams make members individually and jointly accountable for the team’s purpose, goals, and approach. Hall (2001:45) maintains that, there is a danger of elevating teams into a “silver bullet” a magic solution to all business problems. He went further by saying that, “The truth is that teams are not always the right answer to a problem. Often, a well-briefed and well-
managed group of individuals will do a task fine; he concludes that some very skilled individuals are not good team players.

Another major problem of teamwork is the Risky-Shift phenomenon, this suggests that instead of the team taking fewer risks and making safer or more conservative decisions, the reverse is often the case. Studies suggest that people working in groups generally advocate more risking alternative than if they were making an individual decision on the same problem (Kogan and Wallach, 1967) in Mullins (2010:354). Presumably, this is because members do not feel the same sense of responsibility for team decision or their outcomes because a decision which is everyone’s is the responsibility of no one.

In other words, it must be appreciated that teamwork may not always produce satisfactory result due to both internal factors (the how and who of the team) and external factors (unforeseen and intervening). That is why Woodcock and Francis (1993:17) suggest that teamwork takes more time and often more resources than individual work. So the benefits of using teamwork have to exceed the costs of implementing teamwork. Nevertheless Hopper and Potter (2000:23) observe that team members often take much longer time than individuals in taking decisions. Therefore Chukwu (2007:167) maintains that under emergency situations, team decision making is not required. Also while many managers and executives view teams as the most effective design for involving all employees in the success of a company, Efi (2010: 67) asserts that team members may not altogether be skilled in the group dynamics needed to perform work in a team effectively. While at best, work teams operate to increase performance, but these challenges mentioned above can lead frustrated human resource managers to abandon team work effort entirely. It has been observed that, in the excitement to enjoy the benefits of team, some managers have introduced teamwork into situations in which the work is better done by individuals (Naqium and Tynan, 2003:332-
So before you rush to implement teams, you should carefully assess whether the work requires or will benefit from a collective effort. It has been suggested that three tests be applied to see if a team fits the situation, Drextter and Forrester (1998:55-58) identify three tests to be applied as:

1. First, can the work be done better by more than one person? Simple tasks are better left for individuals while complex and work requiring different perspectives should require teams to achieve it.

2. Second, does the work create a common purpose or set of goals for the people in the team that is more than the aggregate of individual goals?

3. The final test to assess whether teams fit the situation is. Are the members of the group interdependent? Teams make sense when there is interdependence between tasks; when the success of the whole depends on the success of each one, and the success of each one depends on the success of the others e.g. soccer.

2.4.5.1 Prospects of Team-Approach to Change Management

Teams perform well because they bring together people with complementary skills and experiences that exceed the capacity of any of the members or of the members collectively but working independently. According to Ezigbo (2006:216) the broad base of teams enables them to respond well to a wide variety of challenges from customers, change and technological innovation. Teams also facilitate the breaking down of barriers between genders, age groups, races, ethnic groups, and geographic biases. With such barriers reduced, an environment of greater trust and mutual confidence develops, as well as a stronger commitment to organizational goals. In other words, teams provide an arena for interpersonal and cross-cultural learning (Parker, 1997), this is because they have opportunity of working with a variety of different people, thereby developing their own personal skills and a level of
comfort. Quick (1986), has it that, participating on a team, also provides job enrichment, this can also come as a reward for the team. However, according to Sheng and Chen (2010:1298), team work can lead to better performance for organizations, such as the enhancement of productivity in the workplace, improvement of service quality, greater satisfaction of employees with jobs, less absence, and reduced turnover rate.

However, Nelson and Quick, (2005:191), identified two social benefits that are available to team members. One of the social benefits accrues from achieving **Psychological Intimacy** which means emotional and psychological closeness to other team members and the second one is **Integrated Involvement** this means closeness achieved through tasks and activities. In addition, the Centre for Management and Organization Effectiveness (CMOE) identified a numbers of benefits that is derived from teamwork. They stress that a productive team environment contains an atmosphere of trust and its members are completely accountable for the group’s bottom line results. The high performing teams are the mechanism by which organizations unlock world class results. Ezigbo (2011:476) and the CMOE (2010) highlighted the following benefits as accruing from teamwork development:

- Teamwork helps organization to quickly respond to change and to respond with ability and flexibility.
- Teamwork increases the need to produce products/services at highest quality, lowest cost, and using the most, efficient method possible.
- Teamwork increases demands for continuous improvement for leadership.
- It increases peoples need for sense of belonging.
- Teamwork helps in sound decision-making and problem solving.
- It increases the need for skill acquisition through constant, improvement and career growth in order to stay competitive and serve the organization.
- Teamwork allows resources to be used move effectively.
• It increase employee ownership, commitment, and motivation.
• Teamwork reinforces or expands informal networks in the organization.
• It improves customer relations and on-time delivery results.
• Teamwork enables organizations to adapt easily to changing competitive, economic, social and technological environment.

Mullins (2010:331) maintains that effective teamwork is an essential element of modern management practices such as empowerment, quality circles and total quality management, and how group manage and change. Teams are also powerful in change behavior, attitudes, and values and in disciplining members. Teams can compete, wrestle, succeed or fail. A good organizational team can be an invaluable asset to the organization. A bad team can break the internal structure of the organization (Nzewi, 2006:14). The need for team approach towards solving challenging problems of manufacturing industry can also manifest in the opportunities created for members to learn from one another. Against this back drop, Weihrich and Koontz (2005:426-428) identify these as prospects of team approach to change management in manufacturing organizations, and they are;

(A) **Group Deliberation and Judgment**: There is an adage which says that “two good heads are better than one” most problems require more knowledge, experience and judgment than any individual possesses.

(B) **Coordination of Departments, Plans and Policies**: There is general agreement that teams are very useful for coordinating activities among various organizational units. They are also useful for coordinating plans and policies as well as their implementation.

(C) **Transmission and Sharing Information**: Teams are useful for transmitting and sharing information. All group members affected by a mutual problem or project can
learn about it simultaneously, and decisions and instructions can be received uniformly with opportunities for clarifications. This saves time.

(D) **Motivation Through Participation:** Teams permit wide participation in decision making. People who take part in planning a program or making a decision usually feel more enthusiastic about accepting and executing it. Even limited participation can be helpful.

(E) **Combined Opinions of Members:** The ability of teams to bring specialists from different disciplines to make decision concerning a subject is beyond debate. Teams bring together all those whose experience is necessary to a decision to contribute in making the decision.

(F) **Securing Co-operation of Staff:** Team building increases the feeling of security and creates an opportunity to participate in meetings to contribute to the acceptance of decision; thereby members obtain co-operation while implementing their plans.

(G) **Manpower Development:** The use of teams in an organization provides an opportunity for the development of manpower through exposure to the problems of a department or unit and the whole organization in general. Teams provide a means of training young executives since executives assigned to teams tend to appreciate the difficulties encountered in different departments.

(H) **Exchange of Information:** Teams are excellent means of communicating information to members of an organization. At the same time, it enables the manager get ideas back from the subordinates. Teams form a means of coordinating the different viewpoints and knowledge of individual departments, and so ensuring that no relevant knowledge is overlooked.
Furthermore Lantz (2011:92) observes that a good argument for investing in teamwork is that it promotes self-organization. Employees learn to think outside the box and proactively take initiatives that go beyond a limited interpretation of their job description and participate in processes that are important for innovation. Taking this idea further [North and Gu “Idenberg (2008); Sawyer (2007) and Zimmer (2001:42-56)] dwell on teamwork creating innovation processes which is required to improve on appropriate conditions and organization of work, so that unexpected problems can be dealt with and new opportunities responded to effectively.

2.5 SUMMARY OF REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Change is a constant thread woven into the fabric of our personal and professional lives. These are revolutionary times that require revolutionary changes. Organizations are reengineering their key processes, creating teams to manage these processes. Survival is paramount for these organizations in an environment where change is pervasive and relentless. In today’s environment of rapid change, advanced technologies, global competition, and demanding customers, slow bureaucracies do not work well. Today, entrepreneurial leaders manage change differently. They decentralize decisions through participatory management and use a variety of strategies like, organizational development, and these leaders encourage teamwork, recognize employees who innovate, and invest in employees with skills, and moral to make the most of their empowerment.

Despite the outcomes, change is often resisted at both individual and the organizational levels. Resistance to change can take many forms and it is not always easy to pinpoint the exact reasons. It is important therefore for managers to adopt a clearly defined strategy for the initiation of change, including attention to the style of leadership, human and social factors to change. The challenge of manufacturing organizations leaders is to encourage their
organizations to anticipate change, to understand the nature of change and to manage change well.

Strategies can be developed to introduce change in organizations such as team-building efforts, to improve organizations functioning. The team-approach is often being used to accomplish short-term projects, such as planning programs, conducting a needs assessment, or developing a new curriculum. Team-building is an organizational development strategy that is used to make work groups more cohesive, committed, satisfied, and productive. However, team-building efforts are most effective when perceived as an integral concept within an organization and not merely as a sporadic intervention.

The researcher did conceptual framework and theoretical framework on teams, change and groups which are the variables in the topic. Of great importance in this study is leadership in teams, which the researcher almost exhausted completely and gave insight on leadership roles for building high performing teams. Also discussed extensively in this work is the concept of group in manufacturing organization, because you cannot talk about team without first explaining the meaning of group. Components and characteristics of groups were also discussed. Also, Empirical reviews were discussed in line with the research objectives. Furthermore, even though team-approach to change management holds good prospects for sustenance and viability in manufacturing organisations, one cannot lose sight of the challenges associated with team-approach to change management. To this end, the researcher presented strategies to management of change through team approach, to be able to curb some of the challenges that manufacturing organizations might be experiencing while using teams to manage change.

Finally, some authors have conducted research on change management and team-building in public and private sectors. However, this current study is important because no study has been conducted on team-approach to management of change in manufacturing organisations
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CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter aims at examining the teamwork approach to management of change in manufacturing organizations in Nigeria. It shows the research design of the study, area of the study, population under study, sample size and sampling techniques, instruments of data collection, and method of data analysis.

3.2 Research Design

Research design seeks to answer the questions about the what, where, when, how and by what means data would be generated to provide the solutions under investigation (Eboh, 2009.) It is simply the plan or blue-print on how to go about data collection and analysis, all aimed at providing solution to the problem under investigation (Onodugo, Ugwuonah and Ebinne, 2010:65). In this study, the descriptive survey research design is used. This is so because of the absence of archival data in most Nigerian manufacturing organizations. Meanwhile it is simple and survey means “to view comprehensively, and in detail” or “the act of obtaining data for mapping (Denscombe, 1998). Also survey is used in this study because it is wide and inclusive in coverage, it generally seems to bring things up to date and relate to the present state of events. Lastly, survey is empirical and obtains what exists (Facts and Figures) and useful because of the relatively large population from which information was collected.

3.3 Area of study

The area covered by this study is 10 Manufacturing organizations in Southeastern part of Nigeria, which includes Anambra, Enugu, Ebonyi, Imo and Abia States.
3.4 Sources of Data

Information obtained for this work is through data. Data is simply defined as facts and figures (Onodugo et al, 2010:67). Data is what differentiates research from guess work, imagination, myths and other sources of knowledge. The data for this work is obtained through two major sources, they are; Primary and Secondary data.

3.4.1 Primary Data:

The primary data were collected through the use of 26 item structured questionnaire, observation and holding of personal interviews administered on the respondents. This agrees with Uzoagulu, (1998:63) and Orji, (1999:3), that primary data contains the data originally assembled by the person who actually observed the phenomenon.

3.4.2 Secondary Data

The secondary data used for this study comprises sources of data which, though needed for this current study, were collected primary for other study before this one. Data from secondary source were not original to the researcher; they were assembled by another person. Secondary sources include:

- Research and project Reports in the related field,
- Manuals containing policy statements of the organizations, encyclopedias
- The University of Nigeria, Enugu campus Library
- Management Department of UNEC. Library sections.
- ESUT Business School Library,
- Publications from the sampled manufacturing organization;
- Enugu State Library and personal Library;
- Internet facilities
- Manufacturer Association of Nigeria Enugu and Imo branch offices.
3.5 Population of the study

All the people or things that constitute the focus of this study are called population. Simply put, a study population is the entire aggregation of cases which meet a designated set of criteria (Polit and Hungler, 1978). However, Afonja (1985:317) sees population as “the set of all object (units) or observations through which conclusions are about to drawn” while Ogolo (2007:39) is of the view that population specifies the total number of members of a class. The population of the study is designed to include all the 225 companies that are members of manufacturers association of Nigeria in the South-Eastern States. However, it will not be possible to use the entire population (infinite population). Ten out of 225 manufacturing organizations in the South-Eastern part of Nigeria which are duly registered members of MAN, doing business in Nigeria, must have up to 40 individuals working in the organization and specialize in the production of household products were purposively selected. The targeted population for this study consists of the entire staff of the selected organizations. According to the information obtained from documents provided by these manufacturing organizations, their population is finite and it is 13,623, as indicated below in Table 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>ORGANIZATIONS</th>
<th>Managerial Cadre</th>
<th>Non-managerial cadre</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Innoson Technical and Industries Company Limited Enugu.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unilever Onitsha Plc. Anambra.</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>P.Z Cussons Nigeria Plc Aba, Abia.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rokana Industries Plc Owerri, Imo</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Crushed Rock Industries (Nigeria) Limited Isiagu, Ebonyi.</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hardis and Dromedas Ltd Enugu</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pokobros Food and Chemical Industries Ltd Onitsha Anambra</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Chellarams Plc Aba, Abia</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rice Mill Company Nigeria Ltd, Ebonyi</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Camela Vegetable Oil Co Ltd, Imo</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2473</strong></td>
<td><strong>11150</strong></td>
<td><strong>13623</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Manufacturing Organizations under study, 2014.
3.6 Sample size determination:

The idea of sample arises because, in most cases, it is difficult to study the entire population, on few cases, it is simply impossible. A sample size is a group of items or individuals selected from a population of study (Udenze, 2005:159). It is against this backdrop that the issue of sample becomes expedient. According to Deng and Ali (1983:61), sampling is a procedure of selecting or drawing from some population of possible cases with the aim of ensuring that the portion of the population being selected is representative of the population. Since the population is finite in calculating the sample size the researcher apply Yamane’s (1964:280) formula for selecting a finite population to this study.

The formula is stated thus

\[ n = \frac{N}{I + N(e)^2} \]

Where \( I = \) constant

\( n = \) sample size

\( N = \) the population

\( e = \) Allowable margin of error, in this case, we consider 4% (0.04) error margin adequate..

Substituting the value into this formula, we have

\[ n = \frac{13623}{1 + 13623 \times (0.04)^2} \]

\[ n = \frac{13623}{1 + 13623 \times 0.0016} \]

\[ n = \frac{13623}{1 + 22.6768} \]

\[ n = \frac{13623}{23.6768} \]

\[ n = 598 \]

Our sample size is therefore, 598.
After selecting the sample, the sample size was distributed among the ten manufacturing organizations in the Southeast under study, by the proportionality formula given below:

\[ Q = \frac{A}{N} \times \frac{n}{1} \]

Where:

\[ Q \] = the number of questionnaire to be allocated to each segment.

\[ A \] = the population of each segment.

\[ N \] = the total population of all segments.

\[ N \] = the estimated sample size used in the study.

\[ Q_1 = \text{Innoson Technical and Industries Company Limited} \]

\[
\frac{100}{13623} \times \frac{598}{1} = 4
\]

\[ Q_2 = \text{Unilever Plc} \]

\[
\frac{944}{13623} \times \frac{598}{1} = 41
\]

\[ Q_3 = \text{P.Z Cussons Nigeria Plc} \]

\[
\frac{3000}{13623} \times \frac{598}{1} = 132
\]

\[ Q_4 = \text{Rokana Industries} \]

\[
\frac{45}{13623} \times \frac{598}{1} = 2
\]

\[ Q_5 = \text{Crushed Rock Industries (Nigeria) Limited} \]

\[
\frac{620}{13623} \times \frac{598}{1} = 27
\]

\[ Q_6 = \text{Hardis and Dromedas Ltd} \]

\[
\frac{300}{13623} \times \frac{598}{1} = 13
\]

\[ Q_7 = \text{Pokobros Food and Chemical Industries Ltd} \]

\[
\frac{3000}{13623} \times \frac{598}{1} = 132
\]

\[ Q_8 = \text{Chellarams Plc} \]
Table 3.2: Breakdown of the Sample Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/NO</th>
<th>ORGANIZATIONS</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Innoson Technical and Industries Company Limited Enugu.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unilever Onitsha Plc. Anambra</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>P.Z.Cussons Nigeria Plc Aba, Abia.</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rokana Industries Plc Owerri, Imo</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Crushed Rock Industries (Nigeria) Limited Isiagu, Ebonyi.</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hardis and Dromedas Ltd Enugu</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pokobros Food and Chemical Industries Ltd Onitsha Anambra</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Chellarams Plc Aba, Abia</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rice Mill Company Nigeria Ltd, Ebonyi</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Camela Vegetable Oil Co Ltd, Imo</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13623</td>
<td>598</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7 Sampling Selection procedure:

The sampling technique used in this study is stratified sampling. This is in appreciation of the heterogeneous nature of population under study. The population was divided into homogeneous group called strata, and then by systematic random sampling, items from each stratum were selected into the sample. Stratified sampling method yield a more efficient result than simple random sampling, depending on the object (Ugwuonah, 2005:15).
3.8 Data collection instrument

The research instrument used in gathering data for this study was a structured questionnaire and oral interview. The questionnaire was structured in line with the research questions and variables of the study stated in the hypothesis. The questionnaire contained 26 items which covered the issue under investigation. The question was a multiple choice question (See Appendix. (A) And (B) for the questionnaire). Response scale in respect of the question in the questionnaires was rated in five likert format.

3.9 Procedure for Data collection

The questionnaires were distributed personally by the researcher to the respondent which includes the managerial cadre and non-managerial cadre that is the entire staff of the selected manufacturing organizations. Interview was also held with some of the staff of these organizations while retrieving the completed questionnaires, through repeated appeals. The reason for the choice of these modes of distribution is to ensure a high return rate of the questionnaires by the respondents.

3.10 Validity of Research Instrument

The validity of research instrument is concerned with measurement. It deals with the soundness and the effectiveness of the measuring instrument (Ikeagwu, 1998:15). To make sure that the instrument for this study is valid, the researcher ensured that the structured questionnaire was subjected to the combination of face and content validity. Face validity, judges at the face value the appropriateness of the measuring instrument. For this the instrument was sent to validators who are experts in the field of management and the type of validation needed was specified. Content validity is the extent to which the items of an instrument are representative of the content and behaviors specified by the theoretical concept being measured. Therefore, the validators helped in checking if the instrument contains all
the aspects of the subject that should be included in the questionnaire. Finally, the design of the questionnaire was made easy for the respondents to tick their preferred choice from the options provided as it has been established that the longer the length of questionnaire, the lower the response rate (Lavine and Beverson, 1986:11).

3.11 Reliability of Research Instrument

The reliability of instrument has to do with the degree of consistency in the instrument when applied in different occasions (Ezigbo, 2011:505). Reliability on the other hand, is defined as the degree to which a given measurement procedure will give the same description of that phenomenon if the measurement is repeated (Ebo, 2009). In carrying out the reliability of the research instrument, the Cronbach’s Alpha is used. Cronbach's alpha (\( \alpha \)) is an estimate of reliability, specifically the internal consistency, of a test or scale. When internal consistency is present in a test, it is interpretable (Cronbach, 1951:297-334). Cronbach's alpha seeks to measure how closely test items are related to one another and thus measuring the same construct. The formula for Cronbach's alpha is as follows:

\[
\alpha = \left( \frac{n}{n-1} \right) \times \left( 1 - \frac{\sum s_{i}^2}{s_{T}^2} \right)
\]

where;
- \( n \) = number of items,
- \( s_{i}^2 \) = variance of the \( i \)th item, and
- \( s_{T}^2 \) = total score variance

When test items are closely related to one another, Cronbach's alpha will be closer to 1, and when test items are not closely related to one another, Cronbach's alpha will be closer to 0. An \( \alpha \) of 0.90-0.95 is desirable for clinical interpretation of tests (Bland and Altman, 1997:314-572).

To achieve this, a pilot study was carried out, in which 60 copies of the research questionnaire were pre-tested among employees of Juhel Nig. Ltd., Enugu State. Runkel and
Grath (1972:20) and Borg and Gail (1983:72) view pilot study technique as the process of a study including analysis of data following closely the procedure planned the main study before launching the said main study. The responses to the various items on the questionnaire were scored and the Cronbach Alpha was used to test the reliability of the research instruments. Upon having carried out the pilot study with the research instrument, a Cronbach Alpha of 0.871 and an inter-item (standardised) coefficient of 0.877 were obtained. These being greater than 0.7 indicate that the reliability of the test instrument is very strong. (See Appendix III for detailed result)

### 3.12 Method of Data Analysis

Data generated from the study was analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistical tools. The descriptive tools used are; Tables and percentage, means and standard deviation. While the inferential statistical tools of Z-test was used to test hypotheses two and five, Friedman Chi-square (x²) used to test hypotheses one and four and Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to test hypothesis three.

### 3.13 Decision Rule

**For the Z-test**

If $Z_{\text{calculated}} > Z_{\text{critical}}$, Reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis.

Otherwise, vice versa.

**For Chi-Square**

If $X^2_{\text{calculated}} > X^2_{\text{critical}}$, Reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis.

Otherwise, vice versa.

**For Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient**

If $r_{\text{calculated}} > r_{\text{critical}}$, Reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis.

Otherwise, vice versa.
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CHAPTER FOUR
DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.1 Introduction

The data collected in the course of this study are presented descriptively using frequency and percentage tables, mean and standard deviation, while the results of the various hypotheses testing are presented and analyzed. The inferential statistical tools of Z-test was used to test hypothesis two and five, Chi-square (x²) used to test hypothesis one and four and Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to test hypothesis three. These were done with the aid of the SPSS 17.0 statistical software.

4.2 Return Rate of Questionnaire

Out of the five hundred and ninety-eight (598) copies of questionnaire that were administered, five hundred and thirty-three copies (533) were correctly filled and returned, giving 89.1% success rate while sixty-five (65) copies were incorrectly filled or not returned, giving 10.9% failure rate. This is presented in table 4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1: Return Rate of Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctly Filled and Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrectly Filled or Not Returned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administered</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctly Filled and Returned</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrectly Filled or Not Returned</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey, 2014*

4.3 Data Presentation

The data collected from the respondents are presented and analyzed according to the various study objectives below.

**Decision Rule**

*If Mean $\geq 3.5$, the respondents agree*

*If Mean $< 3.5$, the respondents disagree*
4.3.1 Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

The job position, length of period in service and educational qualifications of the respondents are presented in tables 4.2 to 4.7.

Table 4.2: Sex Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2014

Table 4.2 reveals majority of the respondents that participated in the study are males, as represented by the 63.4% male participation and 36.6% female participation.

Table 4.3: Distribution of Respondents by Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2014

Table 4.3 shows that higher frequencies of the respondents are single and married, having 47.1% and 35.1% percentage distribution respectively.

Table 4.4: Age Distribution of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Distribution</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤ 20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 30 years</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 – 40 years</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 – 50 years</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 – 60 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2014
As presented in Table 4.4, with a percentage response of 53.1%, majority of the respondents are aged 31 to 40 years. This is followed by respondents that are aged 21 to 30 years (29.3%). This is indicative that majority of the respondents are within the active age. 60 years is the retirement age for the employees.

### Table 4.5: Respondents’ Distribution by Highest Educational Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSA/Trade certificate</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma/OND</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HND</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Degree</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Degree</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2014

As presented in Table 4.5, 192 (36%) respondents have first degree and 163 (30.6%) respondents have HND as their highest educational level. This shows that majority of the respondents have a minimum of HND as their highest educational qualification.

### Table 4.6: Length of Service distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Service</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 5 years</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10 years</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15 years</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 20 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 years and above</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2014

The data presented in Table 4.6, shows that majority of the respondents have not worked for more than 10 years in their respective organisations. This is reflected in the responses of 215
(40.3%) respondents who have worked for 1 to 5 years and 208 (39%) respondents who have worked for 6 to 10 years.

Table 4.7: Respondent’s Distribution by Staff Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top management</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle management</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower management</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2014

Table 4.7 shows that majority of the respondents (65.1%) are middle management staff, followed by 160 (30%) respondents who are lower management.

Inferences

The participation of more males in this study can be deduced to be as a result of their higher engagement in teams and assumption that they are mostly team leaders. Due to the lack of gender equality, there may likely be bias based on the personal views of the subject matter. However, the test of hypotheses eliminated these biases as they were factored into the error margin used in the test. An almost equal representation of both married and unmarried respondents participated in the study. This brings a balance between those that have families and those that are independent. This ensured that the combinations of family, societal and personal values are added to this study.

All the respondents have the basic form of education. Furthermore, with majority of the respondents having at least an HND, it shows that this group have the ability to understand the concept of the study. Also, their wealth of knowledge was added to make this work more in-depth. The length of service and cadres of the staff that were involved in the study shows that participants with wide ranging experience and all cadres were involved in the study. This impacted upon the study by ensuring that views of the respondents were not limited to the most experienced or the most senior staff, but that irrespective of the experience and
seniority, data was gotten from all. This gave more credence to the findings from this study as it showed that the findings were not based on only the observations of the most experienced and senior but all levels.

4.3.2 Presentation of Data according to Objectives of the Study

The data collected with the aid of the questionnaire are presented below according to the various study objectives. In presenting and analysing the data, the decision rule stated below are used.

**Decision Rule**

*If mean ≥ 3, the respondents are in agreement/the extent is large*

*If mean < 3, the respondents are not in agreement/the extent is not large*

4.3.2.1 Extent to which strategies for change management are compatible with teamwork approach to change

The respondents’ views on the extent to which strategies management is compatible with teamwork approach to change is presented in Table 4.8.
Table 4.8: Compatibility of Change Management to Teamwork approach to change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategies for management of organisational change through teamwork approach</td>
<td>Get to know the team</td>
<td>428 (%</td>
<td>60 (%)</td>
<td>15 (%)</td>
<td>5 (%)</td>
<td>25 (%)</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Define the team purpose</td>
<td>134 (%</td>
<td>275 (%)</td>
<td>30 (%)</td>
<td>58 (%)</td>
<td>36 (%)</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish norms</td>
<td>236 (%</td>
<td>51 (%)</td>
<td>206 (%)</td>
<td>5 (%)</td>
<td>35 (%)</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage questions</td>
<td>145 (%</td>
<td>155 (%)</td>
<td>198 (%)</td>
<td>0 (%)</td>
<td>35 (%)</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Celebrate accomplishments</td>
<td>172 (%</td>
<td>165 (%)</td>
<td>65 (%)</td>
<td>121 (%)</td>
<td>10 (%)</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Be participatory and assess team effectiveness</td>
<td>180 (%</td>
<td>273 (%)</td>
<td>45 (%)</td>
<td>5 (%)</td>
<td>30 (%)</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies for change management are compatible with teamwork approach to change management</td>
<td>Get to know the team</td>
<td>375 (%</td>
<td>88 (%)</td>
<td>50 (%)</td>
<td>5 (%)</td>
<td>15 (%)</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Define the team purpose</td>
<td>361 (%</td>
<td>142 (%)</td>
<td>30 (%)</td>
<td>0 (%)</td>
<td>0 (%)</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish norms</td>
<td>188 (%</td>
<td>235 (%)</td>
<td>105 (%)</td>
<td>0 (%)</td>
<td>5 (%)</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage questions</td>
<td>175 (%</td>
<td>180 (%)</td>
<td>178 (%)</td>
<td>0 (%)</td>
<td>0 (%)</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Celebrate accomplishments</td>
<td>121 (%</td>
<td>317 (%)</td>
<td>90 (%)</td>
<td>5 (%)</td>
<td>0 (%)</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Be participatory and assess team effectiveness</td>
<td>271 (%</td>
<td>237 (%)</td>
<td>15 (%)</td>
<td>5 (%)</td>
<td>5 (%)</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies for change management were not compatible with team approach to change management in Nigeria manufacturing organization</td>
<td>Get to know the team</td>
<td>104 (%</td>
<td>188 (%)</td>
<td>221 (%)</td>
<td>20 (%)</td>
<td>0 (%)</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Field Survey, 2014

As presented in Table 4.8, having a mean response of 4.62 ± 0.96 and 428 (80.3%) respondents strongly agreeing, 60 (11.3%) respondents agreeing, 15 (2.8%) respondents being undecided, 5 (0.9%) respondents disagreeing and 25 (4.7%) respondents strongly disagreed, the respondents noted that getting to know the team is a strategy for management of organisational change through team work approach.
As indicated by the responses of 134 (25.1%) respondents, 275 (51.6%) respondents, 30 (5.6%) respondents, 58 (10.9%) respondents and 36 (6.8%) respondents who strongly agreed, agreed, were undecided, disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively as well as the mean response score of 3.77 ± 1.14, the respondents agree that defining the team purpose is a strategy for management of organisational change through team work approach. With 236 (44.3%) respondents strongly agreeing, 51 (9.6%) respondents agreeing, 206 (38.6%) respondents being undecided, 5 (0.9%) respondents disagreeing and 35 (6.6%) respondents strongly disagreeing as well as the mean of 3.84 ± 1.20, the respondents noted that establishing norms is a strategy for management of organisational change through team work approach.

Having a mean response score of 3.70 ± 1.07 and 145 (27.2%) respondents strongly agreeing, 155 (29.1%) respondents agreeing, 198 (37.1%) respondents being undecided and 35 (6.6%) respondents strongly disagreeing, the respondents note that encouraging questions is a strategy for management of organisational change through team work approach. From the mean response score of 3.69 ± 1.20 and the responses of 172 (32.3%) respondents who strongly agreed, 165 (31%) respondents who agreed, 65 (12.2%) respondents who were undecided, 121 (22.7%) respondents who disagreed and 10 (1.9%) respondents who strongly disagreed, celebrating accomplishments who noted as a strategy for management of organisational change through team work approach.

As noted by 180 (33.8%) respondents who strongly agreed, 273 (51.2%) respondents who agreed, 45 (8.4%) respondents who were undecided, 5 (0.9%) respondents who disagreed and 30 (5.6%) respondents who strongly disagreed as well as the mean response score of 4.07 ± 0.98, being participatory and assessing team effectiveness is a strategy for management of organisational change through team work approach.
As indicated from the respondents’ responses in which 375 (70.4%) strongly agreed, 88 (16.5%) agreed, 50 (9.4%) respondents were undecided, 5 (0.9%) respondents disagreed and 15 (2.8%) respondents strongly disagreed and the mean response of 4.51 ± 0.91, the respondents agree that strategies for change management are compatible with teamwork approach to change management in their organisation.

Having a mean response of 4.70 ± 0.52 and 390 (73.2%) respondents strongly agreeing, 128 (24%) respondents agreeing and 15 (2.8%) respondents being undecided, the respondents noted that getting to know the team is a role of manager in strategy implementation through teamwork approach to change management.

As indicated by the responses of 361 (67.7%) respondents, 142 (26.6%) respondents and 30 (5.6%) respondents, who strongly agreed, agreed, were undecided, disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively as well as the mean response score of 4.62 ± 0.59, the respondents agree that defining the team purpose is a role of manager in strategy implementation through teamwork approach to change management.

With 188 (35.3%) respondents strongly agreeing, 235 (44.1%) respondents agreeing, 105 (19.7%) respondents being undecided and 5 (0.9%) respondents strongly disagreeing as well as the mean of 4.13 ± 0.79, the respondents noted that establishing norms is a role of manager in strategy implementation through teamwork approach to change management. Having a mean response score of 3.99 ± 0.81 and 175 (32.8%) respondents strongly agreeing, 180 (33.8%) respondents agreeing, and 178 (33.4%) respondents being undecided, the respondents note that encouraging questions is a role of manager in strategy implementation through teamwork approach to change management. From the mean response score of 4.04 ± 0.66 and the responses of 121 (22.7%) respondents who strongly agreed, 317 (59.5%) respondents who agreed, 90 (16.9%) respondents who were undecided, and 5 (0.9%)
respondents who disagreed, celebrating accomplishments who noted as a role of managers in strategy implementation through teamwork approach to change management.

As noted by 271 (50.8%) respondents who strongly agreed, 237 (44.5%) respondents who agreed, 15 (2.8%) respondents who were undecided, 5 (0.9%) respondents who disagreed and another 5 (0.9%) respondents who strongly disagreed as well as the mean response score of 3.71 ± 0.82, being participatory and assessing team effectiveness is a role of manager in strategy implementation through teamwork approach to change management. The respondents’ responses in which 104 (19.5%) respondents strongly agreed, 188 (35.3%) respondents agreed, 221 (41.5%) respondents were undecided and 20 (3.8%) respondents disagreed as well as the mean response score of 3.71 ± 0.82, the respondents noted that strategies for change management were not compatible with team approach to change management in Nigerian manufacturing organisation.

4.3.2.2 Extent to which teamwork approach to change management holds good prospects for sustenance and viability in Nigerian manufacturing organizations

The respondents’ views on the extent to which teamwork approach to change management holds good prospects for sustenance and viability in Nigerian manufacturing organizations is presented in Table 4.9.
Table 4.9: Extent to which teamwork approach to change management holds good prospects for sustenance and viability in Nigerian manufacturing organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>SA (%)</th>
<th>A (%)</th>
<th>U (%)</th>
<th>D (%)</th>
<th>SD (%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of the use of teamwork approach to change management in manufacturing organisation (strongly effective; effective; undecided; ineffective; strongly ineffective)</td>
<td>194 (36.4) 212 (39.8) 11 (2.1) 116 (21.8) 0 (0.0)</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork approach to change management holds good prospects for sustenance and viability in Nigerian manufacturing organisation</td>
<td>240 (45.0) 129 (24.2) 94 (17.6) 38 (7.1) 32 (6.0)</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics that are evidence in any effective team</td>
<td>Clear objective and agreed goals</td>
<td>433 (81.2) 85 (15.9) 15 (2.8) 0 (0.0) 0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate leadership</td>
<td>331 (62.1) 157 (29.5) 35 (6.6) 10 (1.9) 0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust and support</td>
<td>172 (32.3) 100 (18.8) 40 (7.5) 221 (41.5) 0 (0.0)</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular review relations</td>
<td>138 (25.9) 124 (23.3) 271 (50.8) 0 (0.0) 0 (0.0)</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict and cooperation</td>
<td>125 (23.5) 328 (61.5) 70 (13.1) 5 (0.9) 5 (0.9)</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork approach to change management holds good prospects for viability and sustainability</td>
<td>207 (38.8) 311 (58.3) 10 (1.9) 5 (0.9) 0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills required for an effective team</td>
<td>Skill of communication</td>
<td>426 (79.9) 92 (17.3) 15 (2.8) 0 (0.0) 0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill for leadership</td>
<td>337 (63.2) 161 (30.2) 35 (6.6) 0 (0.0) 0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill for resolving conflict</td>
<td>342 (64.2) 161 (30.2) 30 (5.6) 0 (0.0) 0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill for feedback and evaluation</td>
<td>150 (28.1) 338 (63.4) 25 (4.7) 20 (3.8) 0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The application of teamwork oriented-approach in management of organizational change is effective</td>
<td>303 (56.8) 147 (27.6) 72 (13.5) 6 (1.1) 5 (0.9)</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategy for teamwork approach in your organization is very effective</td>
<td>407 (76.4) 81 (15.2) 40 (7.5) 5 (0.9) 0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2014
Table 4.9 shows that the respondents agree that the use of teamwork approach to change management in manufacturing organisation is effective. This is represented in the responses of 194 (36.4%) respondents who noted strongly effective, 212 (39.8%) respondents who noted effective, 11 (2.1%) respondents who were undecided and 116 (21.8%) respondents who noted ineffective, as well as the mean response score of 3.91 ± 1.12. As indicated from the responses of 240 (45%) respondents who strongly agreed, 129 (24.25%) respondents who agreed, 94 (17.6%) respondents who were undecided, 38 (7.1%) respondents who disagreed and 32 (6%) respondents who strongly disagreed and the mean response score of 3.95 ± 1.21, the respondents are of the opinion that teamwork approach to change management holds good prospects for sustenance and viability in Nigerian manufacturing organisation.

With mean response of 4.78 ± 0.48 and 483 (81.2%) respondents strongly agreeing, 85 (15.9%) respondents agreeing and 15 (2.8%) respondents being undecided, the respondents agree that clear objective and agreed goals are characteristics that are evidenced in any effective team. As 331 (62.1%) respondents strongly agreed, 157 (29.5%) respondents agreed, 35 (6.6%) respondents were undecided and 10 (1.9%) respondents disagreed as well as the mean response of 4.52 ± 0.70, the respondents are of the opinion that appropriate leadership is a characteristics evidenced in any effective team. From the responses of 172 (32.3%) respondents who strongly agreed, 100 (18.8%) respondents who agreed, 40 (7.5%) respondents who were undecided and 221 (41.5%) respondents who disagreed and the mean response of 3.42 ± 1.32, the respondents indicated that trust and support are characteristics that are evidenced in any effective team. Regular review relations was indicated to be a characteristic that is evidenced in any effective team by 138 (25.9%) respondents who strongly agreed, 124 (23.3%) respondents who agreed and 271 (50.8%) respondents who were undecided as well as the mean response score of 3.75 ± 0.84.
Having a mean response score of 4.06 ± 0.70, and 125 (23.5%) respondents strongly agreeing, 328 (61.5%) respondents agreeing, 70 (13.1%) respondents being undecided, 5 (0.9%) respondents disagreeing and another 5 (0.9%) respondents strongly disagreeing, conflict and cooperation was indicated to be a characteristics that are evidenced in any effective team.

Teamwork approach to change management holds good prospects for viability and sustainability. This is captured in the responses of 207 (38.8%) respondents who strongly agreed, 311 (58.3%) respondents who agreed, 10 (1.9%) respondents who were undecided and 5 (0.9%) respondents who disagreed as well as the mean response of 4.34 ± 0.61. Having mean responses > 3.5, the respondents agreed that skill of communication (4.77 ± 0.48), skill for leadership (4.57 ± 0.1), skill for resolving conflict (4.59 ± 0.60) and skill for feedback and evaluation (4.16 ± 0.67) are skills required for an effective team. From the responses of 303 (56.8%) respondents, 147 (27.6%) respondents, 72 (13.5%) respondents, 6 (1.1%) respondents and 5 (0.9%) respondents who strongly agreed, agreed, were undecided, disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively, the application of teamwork oriented-approach in management of organisational change is effective. The respondents agree that strategy for teamwork approach to change in their organisation is very effective. This is captured in the responses of 407 (76.4%) respondents who strongly agreed, 81 (15.2%) respondents who agreed, 40 (7.5%) respondents who were undecided and 5 (0.9%) respondents who disagreed.

4.3.2.3 Relationship between teamwork and organizational performance in management of manufacturing firms

The respondents’ view on the relationship between teamwork and organisational performance in management of manufacturing firms is presented in Table 4.10.
Table 4.10: Relationship between teamwork and organizational performance in management of manufacturing firms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>SA (%)</th>
<th>A (%)</th>
<th>U (%)</th>
<th>D (%)</th>
<th>SD (%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>benefits accruing from teamwork in organization that might improve the performance of manufacturing organization</td>
<td>Quick response to change</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction in cost</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Production of quality goods and services</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increases psychological intimacy</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing integrated involvement</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a relationship between team-oriented approach to change management and organisational performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>352</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways teamwork increase performance in manufacturing organisation</td>
<td>Improving productivity</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving quality and encouraging innovation</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taking advantage of the opportunities provided by technological advantages</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving employed motivation and commitment</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing a pool of resources/bringing a range of complement of knowledge and expertise</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospects of teamwork approach to change management in Nigerian manufacturing organisation for survival</td>
<td>group deliberation and judgement</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination of plans and policies</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transgression and sharing of information</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motivation through participation</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combined opinion of members</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination of the department</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Security cooperation of staff</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manpower development</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2014
As presented in Table 4.10, the respondents agreed that quick response to change is a benefit that accrues from teamwork in organisation that might improve the performance of manufacturing organisation. This is captured in the responses of 370 (69.4%) respondents who strongly agreed, 138 (25.9%) respondents who agreed and 25 (4.7%) respondents who were undecided as well as the mean response of 4.65 ± 0.57.

Having a mean response score of 3.30 ± 1.15, the respondents do not agree that reduction in cost is a benefit accruing from teamwork that might improve performance in manufacturing organisations. This is confirmed by the responses of 89 (16.7%) respondents who strongly agreed, 129 (24.2%) respondents who agreed, 226 (42.4%) respondents who were undecided, 31 (5.8%) respondents who disagreed and 58 (10.9%) respondents who strongly disagreed.

With a mean response of 4.50 ± 0.71, and the 315 (59.1%) respondents strongly agreeing, 177 (33.2%) respondents agreeing, 36 (6.8%) respondents being undecided and 5 (0.9%) respondents strongly disagreeing, the respondents agree that production of quality goods and services is a benefit accruing from teamwork that might improve manufacturing organisations’ performance.

Increasing psychological intimacy is a benefit identified by the respondents that accrues from teamwork which might improve performance in manufacturing organisation. This view is captured in the responses of 120 (22.5%) respondents who strongly agreed, 167 (31.3%) respondents who agreed, 61 (11.4%) respondents who were undecided, 10 (1.9%) respondents who disagreed and 175 (32.8%) respondents who strongly disagreed. However, the mean score of 3.09 does not reflect this view. Nevertheless, with a high standard deviation of 1.59, the mean score is invalidated and the frequency responses accepted. Hence, the view of the respondents is accepted.

Having a mean score of 4.19 ± 0.60 and 142 (26.6%) respondents strongly agreeing, 361 (67.7%) respondents agreeing, 25 (4.7%) respondents being undecided and 5 (0.9%)
respondents disagreeing, the respondents are of the opinion that increasing integrated involvement is a benefit of teamwork which might improve performance of manufacturing organisations.

As reflected in the responses of 352 (66%) respondents who strongly agreed, 176 (33%) respondents who agreed and 5 (0.9%) respondents who were undecided and the mean response of 4.65 ± 0.50, the respondents agree that there is a relationship between team-oriented approach to change management and organisational performance.

With 395 (74.1%) respondents strongly agreeing, 187 (35.1%) respondents agreeing and a mean response score of 4.70 ± 0.53, improving productivity is a way teamwork increases performance in manufacturing organisations.

From the responses of 335 (62.9%) respondents who strongly agreed and 187 (35.1%) respondents who agreed and the mean score of 4.61 ± 0.53, improving quality and encouraging innovation is a way teamwork increases performance in manufacturing organisations.

Having 271 (50.8%) respondents, strongly agreeing, 179 (33.6%) respondents agreeing and a mean response score of 4.23 ± 1.01, taking advantage of the opportunities provided by technological advantages is a way teamwork increases performance in manufacturing organisations.

As indicated from the response of 260 (48.8%) respondents who strongly agreed, 237 (44.5%) respondents who agreed and the mean response score of 4.41 ± 0.64, improving employed motivation and commitment is a way teamwork increases performance in manufacturing organisations.

The responses of 196 (26.8%) respondents who strongly agreed, 267 (50.1%) respondents who agreed and the mean response score of 4.24 ± 0.67 shows that providing a pool of
resources/bringing a range of complement of knowledge and expertise is a way teamwork increases performance in manufacturing organisations.

The prospects of teamwork approach to change management in Nigerian manufacturing organisation for survival were identified by the respondents to be group deliberation and judgement (42.6% strongly agreeing, 50.8% agreeing, mean = 4.36 ± 0.60), coordination of plans and policies (56.5% strongly agreeing, 42.6% agreeing, mean = 4.55 ± 0.55), transgression and sharing of information (58.7% strongly agreeing, 33.8% agreeing, mean = 4.47 ± 0.77), motivation through participation (29.5% strongly agreeing, 30.4% agreeing, mean = 3.32 ± 1.58 – high standard deviation), combined opinion of members (58.5% strongly agreeing, 26.5% agreeing, mean = 4.42 ± 0.80), coordination of the department (55.3% strongly agreeing, 34.3% agreeing, mean = 4.45 ± 0.67), security cooperation of staff (35.8% strongly agreeing, 57.6% agreeing, mean = 4.28 ± 0.61) and manpower development (29.3% strongly agreeing, 32.8% agreeing, mean = 3.89 ± 0.85).

4.3.2.4 Level of Acceptance of Organisational Change among employees

Table 4.11 presents the respondents’ views on the level of acceptance of organizational change among employees.
Table 4.11: Level of Acceptance of Organisational Change among Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>SA (%)</th>
<th>A (%)</th>
<th>U (%)</th>
<th>D (%)</th>
<th>SD (%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of acceptance of organisational change among employees in the organisations are high</td>
<td>148 (27.8)</td>
<td>320 (60.0)</td>
<td>60 (11.3)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>5 (0.9)</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees accept change when they are duly informed about proposed change and are allowed to participate in the implementation of change</td>
<td>390 (73.2)</td>
<td>103 (19.3)</td>
<td>15 (2.8)</td>
<td>25 (4.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance to change often becomes less when organizations allow participation and involvement of employees</td>
<td>212 (39.8)</td>
<td>117 (22.0)</td>
<td>30 (5.6)</td>
<td>20 (3.8)</td>
<td>154 (28.9)</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employees resist change if they fear that they will not be able to develop the competencies required to be effective in the new situation</td>
<td>357 (67.0)</td>
<td>101 (18.9)</td>
<td>45 (8.4)</td>
<td>10 (1.9)</td>
<td>20 (3.8)</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employees would accept change more if training and development programmes are done, before the organizations undergoes major changes</td>
<td>375 (70.4)</td>
<td>108 (20.3)</td>
<td>45 (8.4)</td>
<td>5 (0.9)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Field Survey, 2014

As presented in Table 4.11, 148 (27.8%) respondents strongly agree that the level of acceptance of organisational change among employees in the organisations is high, 320 (60%) respondents agree, 60 (11.3%) respondents were undecided and 5 (0.9%) respondents strongly disagree. Having a mean response of $4.14 \pm 0.68$, it is the general opinion of the respondents that acceptance level of organisational change among employee in the studied organisations is high.

As 390 (73.2%) respondents strongly agreed, 103 (19.3%) respondents agreed, 15 (2.8%) respondents were undecided and 25 (4.7%) respondents disagreed, and in line with the mean response of $4.61 \pm 0.76$, the respondents generally agreed that when employees are duly informed about proposed change and are allowed to participate in the implementation of such change, they accept the change.

Though the mean response is 3.40, the standard deviation of 1.69 shows that with 212 (39.8%) respondents strongly agreeing, 117 (22%) respondents agreeing, 30 (5.6%) respondents being undecided, 20 (3.8%) respondents disagreeing and 154 (28.9%) respondents strongly disagreeing, it is the determination of the respondents that resistance to
change often becomes less when organisations allow participation and involvement of employees.

As provided by the responses of 357 (67%) respondents who strongly agreed, 101 (18.9%) respondents who agreed, 45 (8.4%) respondents who were undecided, 10 (1.9%) respondents who disagreed and 20 (3.8%) respondents who strongly disagreed and the mean response of 4.44 ± 0.99, the respondents agree that employees resist change if they fear that they will not be able to develop the competencies required to be effective in the new situation.

The respondents are of the opinion that employees would accept change more if training and development programmes are done, before the organizations undergoes major changes. This is reflected in the mean response of 4.59 ± 0.72, as well as the responses of 375 (70.4%) respondents who strongly agreed, 108 (20.3%) respondents who agreed, 45 (8.4%) respondents who were undecided and 5 (0.9%) respondents who disagreed.
### 4.3.2.5 Hindrance of Organisational Change Management by Inability to cope with Challenges of Teamwork approach

Table 4.12 shows the respondents’ responses on the hindrances posed to organizational change management by inability to cope with challenges of teamwork approach

**Table 4.12: Hindrances posed by inability to cope with challenges of teamwork approach on organisational change management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>SA (%)</th>
<th>A (%)</th>
<th>U (%)</th>
<th>D (%)</th>
<th>SD (%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>challenges of teamwork approach to change management that might hinder organizational survival</td>
<td>They are costly</td>
<td>270 (50.7)</td>
<td>80 (15.0)</td>
<td>91 (17.1)</td>
<td>40 (7.5)</td>
<td>52 (9.8)</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compromise</td>
<td>303 (56.8)</td>
<td>185 (34.7)</td>
<td>45 (8.4)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risky-shift</td>
<td>243 (45.6)</td>
<td>235 (44.1)</td>
<td>45 (8.4)</td>
<td>5 (0.9)</td>
<td>5 (0.9)</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group thinking</td>
<td>123 (23.1)</td>
<td>191 (35.8)</td>
<td>35 (6.6)</td>
<td>15 (2.8)</td>
<td>169 (31.7)</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social loafing</td>
<td>195 (36.6)</td>
<td>197 (37.0)</td>
<td>81 (15.2)</td>
<td>50 (9.4)</td>
<td>10 (1.9)</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management of organizational change hindered by inability to cope with the challenges of teamwork approach in Nigerian manufacturing organizations</td>
<td>351 (65.9)</td>
<td>127 (23.8)</td>
<td>50 (9.4)</td>
<td>5 (0.9)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways teamwork approach to change management increases competitiveness in the management of organization</td>
<td>Improving productivity</td>
<td>317 (59.5)</td>
<td>109 (20.5)</td>
<td>60 (11.3)</td>
<td>47 (8.8)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving employee motivation</td>
<td>347 (65.1)</td>
<td>156 (29.3)</td>
<td>25 (4.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>5 (0.9)</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving quality</td>
<td>367 (68.9)</td>
<td>121 (22.7)</td>
<td>10 (1.9)</td>
<td>30 (5.6)</td>
<td>5 (0.9)</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encouraging innovation</td>
<td>115 (21.6)</td>
<td>328 (61.5)</td>
<td>15 (2.8)</td>
<td>35 (6.6)</td>
<td>40 (7.5)</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being proactive rather than reactive</td>
<td>143 (26.8)</td>
<td>300 (56.3)</td>
<td>75 (14.1)</td>
<td>10 (1.9)</td>
<td>5 (0.9)</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for resisting change in manufacturing organisation</td>
<td>Selective perception</td>
<td>337 (63.2)</td>
<td>181 (34.0)</td>
<td>10 (1.9)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>5 (0.9)</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insecurity</td>
<td>303 (56.8)</td>
<td>195 (36.6)</td>
<td>30 (5.6)</td>
<td>5 (0.9)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Habit</td>
<td>230 (43.2)</td>
<td>222 (41.7)</td>
<td>35 (6.6)</td>
<td>40 (7.5)</td>
<td>6 (1.1)</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic implication</td>
<td>131 (24.6)</td>
<td>256 (48.0)</td>
<td>90 (16.9)</td>
<td>15 (2.8)</td>
<td>41 (7.7)</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inconvenience or loss of freedom</td>
<td>204 (38.3)</td>
<td>238 (44.7)</td>
<td>71 (13.3)</td>
<td>10 (1.9)</td>
<td>10 (1.9)</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fear of the unknown</td>
<td>243 (45.6)</td>
<td>160 (30.0)</td>
<td>105 (19.7)</td>
<td>20 (3.8)</td>
<td>5 (0.9)</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing resistance to change in manufacturing organisations</td>
<td>Education and communication</td>
<td>428 (80.3)</td>
<td>85 (15.9)</td>
<td>20 (3.8)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitation and support</td>
<td>398 (74.7)</td>
<td>115 (21.6)</td>
<td>20 (3.8)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiation and agreement</td>
<td>271 (50.8)</td>
<td>217 (40.7)</td>
<td>45 (8.4)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation and involvement</td>
<td>122 (22.9)</td>
<td>132 (24.8)</td>
<td>45 (8.4)</td>
<td>146 (27.4)</td>
<td>88 (16.5)</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manipulation and cooperation</td>
<td>15 (2.8)</td>
<td>65 (12.2)</td>
<td>55 (10.3)</td>
<td>250 (46.9)</td>
<td>148 (27.8)</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intimidation/Force</td>
<td>10 (1.9)</td>
<td>65 (12.2)</td>
<td>66 (12.4)</td>
<td>250 (46.9)</td>
<td>142 (26.6)</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational change is communicated to employees to a large extent</td>
<td>189 (35.5)</td>
<td>299 (56.1)</td>
<td>45 (8.4)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey, 2014*
As presented in Table 4.12, the challenges that teamwork approach might pose to change management that might hinder organisational survival are they are costly (50.7% strongly agreeing, 15% agreeing, mean = 3.89 ± 1.36), compromise (56.8% strongly agreeing, 34.7% agreeing, mean = 4.48 ± 0.65), risky-shift (45.6% strongly agreeing, 44.1% agreeing, mean = 4.32 ± 0.75), group thinking (23.1% strongly agreeing, 35.8% agreeing, mean = 3.16 ± 1.60) and social loafing (36.6% strongly agreeing, 37% agreeing, mean = 3.97 ± 1.03).

As indicated from the responses of 351 (65.9%) respondents who strongly agreed, 127 (23.8%) respondents who agreed, 50 (9.4%) respondents who were undecided and 5 (0.9%) respondents who disagreed as well as the mean response of 4.55 ± 0.70, the respondents agree that management of organizational change hindered by inability to cope with the challenges of teamwork approach in Nigerian manufacturing organizations.

The respondents agree that teamwork approach to change management increases competitiveness in the management of the organisation by improving productivity (mean = 4.31 ± 0.98, 59.5% strongly agreeing, 20.5% agreeing), improving employee motivation (65.1% strongly agreeing, 29.3% agreeing, mean = 4.58 ± 0.67), improving quality (68.9% strongly agreeing, 22.7% agreeing, mean = 4.53 ± 0.86) encouraging innovation (21.6% strongly agreeing, 61.5% agreeing, mean = 3.83 ± 1.08) and being proactive rather than reactive (26.8% strongly agreeing, 56.3% agreeing, mean = 4.06 ± 0.75).

The reasons the respondents agree are responsible for resisting change in manufacturing organisations are selective perception (mean = 4.59 ± 0.63), insecurity (mean = 4.49 ± 0.65), habit (mean = 4.18 ± 0.93), economic implication (mean = 3.79 ± 1.09), inconvenience or loss of freedom (mean = 4.16 ± 0.86) and fear of the unknown (mean = 4.16 ± 0.93).

From the respondents’ responses, resistance to change in manufacturing organisations can be best managed by education and communication (80.3% strongly agreeing, 15.9% agreeing, mean = 4.77 ± 0.51), facilitation and support (74.7% strongly agreeing, 21.6% agreeing,
mean = 4.71 ± 0.53), and negotiation and agreement (50.8% strongly agreeing, 40.7% agreeing, mean = 4.42 ± 0.64).

Having 189 (35.5%) respondents strongly agreeing, 299 (56.1%) respondents agreeing and 45 (8.4%) respondents being undecided as well as mean response of 4.27 ± 0.61, the respondents agree that organisational change is communicated to the employees to a large extent.

### 4.3.3 Responses from Oral Interview

An oral interview was conducted from a key staff of each of the sampled organisation, using the oral interview schedule (see appendix). Their responses were very much similar.

They all noted that their organisations have been involved in change programme at one time or the other, and the change was mainly product innovation changes. These changes, they indicated, were communicated to their respective employees. While other organisations noted that as long as they communicated properly the change, they do not experience resistance from their employees, Hardis & Dromedas noted that the employees resist the change because they view working in the factory section as “punishment for staff”.

It was gathered that to solve the problem of resistance to change, there is need for “education and communication”. Monetary incentive was proffered by Hardis & Dromedas, who pointed out that, “resistance to change is serious here; if you post them to bad places they don’t like, some of them resign. We add money to motivate the staff to avoid resistance to change”. Hence, the organisations use communication and motivation as approaches to introduce organisational change.

The organisations have teams and these teams have been very effective as they have generally achieved the objective of setting them up. In the words of one of the interviewees, “It is very effective when they group (them) into teams”. Hence, it is noted that the teamwork approach to management of organisational change increases productivity in the manufacturing organisations.
The interviewees rated the relationship between employees’ participation in the management of change and the effectiveness of programmes designed to manage change very high. An interviewee said, “they give 100% result”. Thus, noting that teamwork approach to change management holds good prospects for their organisations’ survival.

Nevertheless, all the interviewees agreed that there are challenges that are encountered while using teamwork approach to manage change in their organisations. Some of these challenges were highlighted to be “conflict of interest”, “delay in evaluation of feedback”, “issues with team leaders”, and “taking authority from employee at same level is a problem”.

However, the interviewees all agree that teamwork approach to change management holds good prospects for sustenance and viability of their organisations, and the teamwork approach strategies they employ in their organisation to the management of change is very effective.

4.3 Test of Hypotheses

The results from the tests of the various hypotheses are presented below.

4.3.1 Test of Hypothesis One

Strategies for change management are significantly compatible with teamwork approach to change management in Nigerian manufacturing organizations

In testing this hypothesis, the data presented in Table 4.8 were tested using Chi-square.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>13.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SPSS 17.0 Output File
**Decision Rule**

If $X^2_{\text{cal}} > X^2_{\text{critical}}$, reject the null and accept the alternative hypothesis, otherwise vice-versa.

**Result/Decision**

The calculated $X^2$-value is 13.781. This value is greater than the critical $X^2$-value of 9.49. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted. Hence, strategies for change management are significantly compatible with teamwork approach to change management in Nigerian manufacturing organizations.

### 4.4.2 Test of Hypothesis Two

Teamwork approach to change management in Nigeria manufacturing organizations to a large extent holds good prospects for sustenance and viability.

In testing this hypothesis, the data presented in Table 4.14 were tested using Z-test.

**Table 4.14: One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov (Z) Test Result for Hypothesis Two**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mean response on teamwork approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Parameters(^{a,b})</td>
<td>Mean 4.2759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation .35049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Extreme Differences</td>
<td>Absolute .150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive .150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative -.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z</td>
<td>5.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Test distribution is Normal.*

*b. Calculated from data.*

**Decision Rule**

If $Z_{\text{cal}} > Z_{\text{critical}}$, reject the null and accept the alternative hypothesis, otherwise vice-versa.
Result/Decision

The calculated Z-value is 5.763. This value is greater than the critical Z-value of 1.96. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted. Hence, teamwork approach to change management in Nigeria manufacturing organizations to a large extent holds good prospects for sustenance and viability.

4.4.3 Test of Hypothesis Three

There is significant positive relationship between teamwork and organizational performance in the management of manufacturing firms

In testing this hypothesis, the data presented in Table 4.15 were tested using Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team-oriented approach</th>
<th>hypot3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.890**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hypot3</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>.890**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>533</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Decision Rule

If $r_{cal} > r_{critical}$, reject the null and accept the alternative hypothesis, otherwise vice-versa.

Result/Decision

The calculated r-value is 0.89. This value is greater than the critical r-value of 0.09. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted. Hence,
there is significant positive relationship between teamwork and organizational performance in the management of manufacturing firms.

### 4.4.4 Test of Hypothesis Four

The employees of Nigerian manufacturing organizations to a large extent accept organizational change

In testing this hypothesis, the data presented in Table 4.16 were tested using Chi-square.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>9.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Decision Rule**

If $X^2_{\text{cal}} > X^2_{\text{critical}}$, reject the null and accept the alternative hypothesis, otherwise vice-versa.

**Result/Decision**

The calculated $X^2$-value is 9.76. This value is greater than the critical $X^2$-value of 9.49. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted. Hence, the employees of Nigerian manufacturing organizations to a large extent accept organizational change.

### 4.4.5 Test of Hypothesis Five

Management of organizational change is severely hindered by inability to cope with the challenges of teamwork approach in Nigerian manufacturing organizations

In testing this hypothesis, the data presented in Table 4.17 were tested using Z-test.
Table 4.17: One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov (Z) Test Result for Hypothesis Five

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mean response on challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Parameters&lt;sup&gt;a,b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.0260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.35679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Extreme Differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>-.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z</td>
<td>4.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.

**Decision Rule**

If $Z_{cal} > Z_{critical}$, reject the null and accept the alternative hypothesis, otherwise vice-versa.

**Result/Decision**

The calculated Z-value is 4.553. This value is greater than the critical Z-value of 1.96. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted. Hence, management of organizational change is severely hindered by inability to cope with the challenges of teamwork approach in Nigerian manufacturing organizations.

**4.5 Discussion of Findings**

The findings of this study are discussed under the various objectives of the study.

**4.5.1 Extent to which strategies for change management are compatible with teamwork approach to change**

As presented in Table 4.8, strategies for change management are compatible with teamwork approach to change. This shows that teamwork approach can be used as a strategy for change management. This is achievable when managers play their roles of knowing the team, defining the purpose of the team, establishing team norms, encouraging questions among team members, celebrating accomplishment, allowing teamwork to be participatory and
regularly assessing team effectiveness. These roles ensure that team members understand their roles thoroughly and are part of the team process, as a strategy for ensuring effective management of change.

This is in line with the findings of Bacon and Blyton (2005), Zhang (2000) and Van der Wiele and Brown (2002) who showed that employees themselves belief that productivity improves when work is completed in groups, and ultimately impacts on change management.

4.5.2 Extent to which teamwork approach to change management holds good prospects for sustenance and viability in Nigerian manufacturing organisations

Teamwork approach to change management is very effective in manufacturing organizations. This being so because it has good prospects for sustenance and viability in the Nigerian manufacturing industry. These prospects are based on the characteristics that every effective team has. These characteristics are clear objective and agreed goals, appropriate leadership, trust and support, regular review relations, and conflict and cooperation. To exhibit these characteristics that will ensure that the team is effective, it is paramount that the team possesses the skills of communication, leadership, conflict resolution, and feedback and evaluation. When these are done, the application of teamwork oriented-approach in the management of organizational change will be very effective, not minding the unique attributes of such organisation.

This finding is in line with the findings by Kuhlmann, Sperling and Balzert (2004), Oeij and Wiezer (2002) who noted that the key issues are the integration of work organization and teamwork with the overall company organization and payment system, and thus successful organizations today know that teams make a big difference in achievement of strategic goals.
4.5.3  Relationship between teamwork and organizational performance in management of manufacturing firms

From the findings of this study, it is established that teamwork has a relationship with organizational performance, when it is used as an approach to change management. This is predicated upon the benefits derivable from the use of team-oriented approach to change management. These benefits include quick response to change, cost reduction, production of quality goods and services, increased psychological intimacy and increased integrated involvement. Particularly teamwork increases performance in the areas of productivity, innovation, technological advantages, employee motivation and commitment, and knowledge and expertise-base resources. Based on these benefits, teamwork-oriented approach to change management has the prospects of group deliberation and judgment, coordination of plans and policies, transgression and sharing of information, motivation through participation, combined opinion of members, coordination of the department, security cooperation of staff and manpower development. These go a long way in ensuring process optimization in any manufacturing organisation.

This is in agreement with the findings of Efi (2010), Hoegl and Gemuenden (2001) and Delarue, Gryp and Van Hootegem (2003) who revealed that there is a positive relationship between teamwork and improved organizational performance; and that the quality collaborativeness within the organisation may only be positively associated with team performance.

4.5.4  Level of Acceptance of Organisational Change among employee

Having established the relevance and role teamwork can play in change management, it is paramount that the change is accepted by employees of the implementing organisation. This study showed that the level of employee acceptance of change is high. This is majorly due to the fact these organizations communicate properly and involve the employees in any change process. Hence, resistance to change is less as when organizations allow participation and
involvement of employees. This participation and involvement allows the employees address the issues of development of competencies, so as to ensure that they are adequately trained and their capacities developed to meet up with the challenges of the new change.

This result is in consonance with the findings of Ormiston and Lapiz (2008), Adeyeye (2009) and Dubey and Sanjeev Bansal (2012) show some level of employee acceptance of innovations existed in organizations when the employees are properly communicated about the change and are involved in the change process.

4.5.5 Hindrance of Organisational Change Management by Inability to cope with Challenges of Teamwork approach

Despite the laudable benefits and effects of teamwork approach to change management, the teamwork approach is not without any challenges. These challenges include cost-implication, compromise, risky-shift, group thinking and social loafing. When these challenges are handled properly or when the organisation cannot cope with these challenges, they negatively impact on the ability of teamwork approach in change management. Also, other challenges facing teamwork approach, which has to be tackled adequate are selective perception, insecurity, habit, economic implication, inconvenience or loss of freedom, and fear of the unknown. These challenges can be effectively mitigated through the process of education and communication, facilitation and support, negotiation and agreement, and participation and involvement. This finding is in accordance with the finding of the study carried out by Weihrich and Koontz (2005) and Ezigbo (2006) who revealed that teams inevitably face obstacles which if not overcome, can waste the organization’s resources, hamper morale and ultimately lead to the organization’s demise and that it is costly to implement, may result in compromises, may lead to indecision, can split responsibilities and they may lead to a situation in which a few persons impose their will on the majority, not allowing participation of other members.
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CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary of Findings

The findings of this study are:

- strategies for change management are significantly compatible with teamwork approach to change management in Nigerian manufacturing organizations ($X^2_{\text{cal}} = 13.78 > X^2_{\text{critical}} = 9.49, p < 0.05$);
- teamwork approach to change management in Nigeria manufacturing organizations to a large extent holds good prospects for sustenance and viability ($Z_{\text{cal}} = 5.76 > Z_{\text{critical}} = 1.96, p < 0.05$);
- there is significant positive relationship between teamwork and organizational performance in the management of manufacturing organisations ($r_{\text{cal}} = 0.89 > r_{\text{critical}} = 0.09, p < 0.05$);
- the employees of Nigerian manufacturing organizations to a large extent accept organizational change ($X^2_{\text{cal}} = 9.76 > X^2_{\text{critical}} = 9.49, p < 0.05$); and
- management of organizational change is severely hindered by inability to cope with the challenges of teamwork approach in Nigerian manufacturing organizations ($Z_{\text{cal}} = 4.55 > Z_{\text{critical}} = 1.96, p < 0.05$).

5.2 Conclusion

This study on “Teamwork approach to the management of change in selected manufacturing organizations in Nigeria: challenges, strategies and prospects”, is very timely and unequivocally relevant, considering particularly the recent drive in the country to ensure the revitalization of the ailing manufacturing industries in Nigeria. Various policies have been formulated to ensure the growth of this sector, and various strategies are being put in place and implemented to ensure its success. Albeit, an important aspect that would go a long way
in ensuring that these policy and strategy formulations have the desired effect on the manufacturing industry in Nigeria, is being able to handle the outcomes that these changes (policies and strategies) will present.

Of all the resources required in any production process, only the human resource remains very unpredictable, volatile, erratic, and can resist any new process being implemented. Hence, the importance and need for the effective management of change in manufacturing organizations. To this end, emphasis is laid on being able to devise reliable approaches to the management of change with a view to ensuring the compliance and cooperation of staff and ultimately achieve organizational aims and objectives, vis-à-vis profit maximization and cost minimization.

Consequent upon this, teamwork as an approach to the management of change is studied. This study shows that teamwork approach to the management of change has the prospect of making the manufacturing organisations very effective, viable and sustainable. Specifically, it has the benefits of improved productivity and product quality innovativeness and manpower development amongst others. However, it is not a smooth ride all the way, as the teamwork approach to the management of change is faced with the challenge of cost implication, social loafing, and group-thinking which could result to resistance.

Nevertheless, when appropriate teamwork strategies are adopted, it ensures that the teamwork approach to the management of change is very effective. All in all, the teamwork approach, which entails the involvement of employee in any change process discussion and implementation, has the advantage of curbing resistance to change, thereby giving the organisation the opportunity to be innovative, which will ensure its viability, sustainability and survival.

5.3 Recommendations

Based on the findings and result of this study, the following recommendations were made:
1. Teamwork approach should be adopted by manufacturing organizations as an integral concept within their organizations, particularly as interventionist strategy to the management of change.

2. An effective team should be built by applying practical skills/strategies to maximize team performance and development. These skills/strategies should include, but not limited to, getting to know the team, defining the team purpose, establishing norms, encouraging questions, celebrating accomplishments and being participatory and assessing team effectiveness.

3. Manufacturing organizations leaders should encourage their organizations to anticipate change, to understand the nature of change and to manage change well.

4. People affected by change should be incorporated into the change programme, this involves the change agents empowering their subordinates to action by removing obstacles, enabling constructive feedback and rewarding and recognizing progress and achievements.

5. Team members should interact with one another in order to understand their weaknesses and strengths, by doing so, they will build trust and support for each other, which will make their team more cohesive.

6. For an improved product design with high quality that will appeal to customers’ satisfaction any day, teamwork should be encouraged in Nigerian manufacturing organizations.

7. It is also recommended that team incentives and rewards should be strictly adhered to in order to boost team performance and effectiveness.

8. Team members should be carefully selected so that members with requisite skills are selected to work towards achieving the required change objectives.
9. Reduction in resistance can be achieved in many ways; involvement of members in the change, proper communication, patience and tolerance are also required to help people in strong resistance to understand and accept the change programme.

10. Managers of manufacturing organizations should swerve team members from time to time to inject new ideas into the team, they should also make available all the necessary resources required by team member to work optimally for them to achieve their objectives.

11. Managers of manufacturing organizations should encourage employees to undergo constant training, development, workshops and seminars. This is to keep them abreast of current issues and changes as it concerns their organizations, as such they will be proactive rather than reactive in dealing with challenges that might come up.

5.4 Contribution to Knowledge

This study reveals the undeniable role teamwork plays as an approach to change management, particularly in manufacturing organizations. This role is revealed in the prospect of sustenance and viability, which teamwork approach to change management has for manufacturing organizations. Organisations achieve sustainability and viability when change is effectively managed. This is only achievable when the organisation has the ability to and can cope with challenges, unique to the organisation, that are encountered in the course of change management. The ability or inability to cope with the challenges faced in managing change is based on the strategies being adopted which has a direct bearing on teamwork and is related to organizational performance.
5.5 Suggestion for Further Studies

While this study was thoroughly conducted, it is not conclusive in itself as there are areas of this study that should be exhaustively research on. To this end, it is suggested that further studies should be carried out on:

i. “the relevance of teamwork as a tool in implementing change in the Nigerian service industry”

ii. “a multivariate analysis of change management and teamwork approach as predicatos to process optimization in manufacturing organizations in Nigeria”.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

ACAS (2007) Teamwork: Success Through people advisory booklet,


Blanckard, K. and Bowles, S 2001) “High Five: None of us is as smart as all of us”, Harper Collins Business Review.


Foster, B. (1991) “Creating a Vision That Employee Can See.” Presentation made at the University of Georgia Center for Continuing Education, Athens, GA.


MAN (2012) Manufacturers Association of Nigeria Imo/Abia branch, 25th Annual General Meeting held on Thursday, November 22, 2012 at City Global Hotel Aba, Abia state


Tuckman, B.W. and Jensen M.C (1977) “Stages of Small Group Development Revised”; *Group and Organizational Studies*, 2(3)


Dear Sir/Madam

I am a post graduate student of University of Nigeria Enugu Campus in the Department of Management.

I am conducting a research work on Teamwork Approach to Management of Change in Selected Manufacturing Organizations in Nigeria, for the award of Ph.D in Management.

Kindly assist in filling this questionnaire, the answers, comments, and contributions are purely for academic purposes and will be treated with absolute confidence.

Thank you for your invaluable assistance.

Ekeowa, Lovlyn Nnenna

PG/Ph.D/10/55043.
SECTION A: PERSONAL DATA

1. Sex: (a) male (b) female
2. Marital status: (a) married (b) single (c) Divorced (d) widowed (e) Separated
3. Age: (a) Less than 20years (b) 21-30years (c) 31-40years (d) 41-50years (e) 51-60 (f) 61years and above
4. Highest Education Qualification: (a) Senior School Certificate (b) R.S.A / Trade Certificate (c) Diploma /OND (d) H.N.D (e) First Degree (f) Second Degree (g) Ph.D (h) A CA
5. Length of Service in years: (a) 1-5years (b) 6-10 years (c) 11-15 years (d) 16-20years (e) 21-years and above
6. What category of Staff are you? (a) Managerial Cadre (b) Non- managerial Cadre

SECTION B: RESPONDENTS VIEWS ON THE SUBJECT OF INVESTIGATION

(1) To establish the extent to which strategies for change management are compatible with teamwork approach to change.

1. What are the strategies for management of organizational change through teamwork approach?
   (a) Get to know the team
   (b) define the team purpose
   (c) Establish norms
   (d) Encourage questions
   (e) Celebrate accomplishments
   (f) Be participatory and assess team effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Are strategies for change management compatible with teamwork approach to change management in your organization?
   (a) Strongly compatible
3. What are the roles of manager in strategy implementation through teamwork approach to change management?

(a) Get to know the team
(b) Define the team purpose
(c) Establish norms
(d) Encourage questions
(e) Celebrate accomplishments
(f) Be participatory and assess team effectiveness

4. Strategies for change management were not compatible with team approach to change management in Nigeria manufacturing organization?

(a) Strongly compatible
(b) Compatible
(c) Undecided
(d) Not compatible
(e) Strongly not compatible

5. How would you rate the effectiveness of the use of teamwork approach to change management in manufacturing organizations?

(a) Strongly effective
(b) Effective
(c) Undecided
(d) Ineffective
(e) Strongly ineffective

6. Teamwork approach to change management does not hold good prospects for sustenance and viability in Nigerian manufacturing organizations

(a) Strongly agree
(b) Agree
(c) Undecided
(d) Disagree
(e) Strongly disagree

7. What are characteristics that are evident in any effective team?

(a) Clear objective and agreed Goals
(b) Appropriate leadership
(c) Trust and support
(d) Regular review relations
(e) Conflict and cooperation
8. Do you agree that teamwork approach to change management holds good prospects for viability and sustainability?
   (a) Strongly effective
   (b) Agree
   (c) Undecided
   (d) Disagree
   (e) Strongly disagree

9. What are the skills required for an effective team?
   (a) Skill of communication
   (b) Skill for leadership
   (c) Skill for resolving conflict
   (d) Skill for feedback and evaluation

10. The application of teamwork oriented-approach in management of organizational change is not effective?
    (a) Strongly effective
    (b) Effective
    (c) Undecided
    (d) Ineffective
    (e) Strongly ineffective

11. Do you agree that the strategy for teamwork approach to change in your organization is very effective?
    (a) Strongly effective
    (b) Effective
    (c) Undecided
    (d) Ineffective
    (e) Strongly ineffective

(3) To identify the relationship between teamwork and organizational performance in management of manufacturing firms under study.

12. What are the benefit accruing from teamwork in organization that might improve the performance of manufacturing organization?
    (a) Quick response to change
    (b) Reduction in cost
    (c) Production of quality goods and services
    (d) Increases psychological intimacy
    (e) Increasing integrated involvement

13. Do you agree that there is relationship between team-oriented approach to change management and organizational performance?
    (a) Strongly agree
    (b) Agree
    (c) Undecided
    (d) Disagree
    (e) Strongly disagree
14. How can teamwork increase performance in manufacturing organizations?

(a) Improving productivity
(b) Improving quality and encouraging innovation
(c) Taking advantage of the opportunities provided by technological advantages
(d) Improving employed motivation and commitment
(e) Providing a pooling of resources/bringing a range of complement of knowledge and expertise

15. What good prospects does teamwork approach to change management hold in Nigerian manufacturing organizations for survival?

(a) Group deliberation and judgment
(b) Coordination of plans & policies
(c) Transgression and sharing of information
(d) Motivation through participation
(e) Combined opinion of members
(f) Coordination of the department
(g) Security co-operation of staff
(h) Manpower development

16. The level of acceptance of organizational change among employees in the organizations are high?

(a) Strongly agree
(b) Agree
(c) Undecided
(d) Disagree
(e) Strongly disagree

17. Employees accept change when they are fully informed about proposed change and are allowed to participate in the implementation of change.

(a) Strongly agree
(b) Agree
(c) Undecided
(d) Disagree
(e) Strongly disagree

18. Resistance to change often becomes less when organizations allow participation and involvement of employees

(a) Strongly agree
(b) Agree
(c) Undecided
(d) Disagree
(e) Strongly disagree

19. Do you agree that employees resist change if they fear that they will not be able to develop the competencies required to be effective in the new situation?
20. Do you agree that employees would accept change more if training and development programmes are done, before the organizations undergoes major changes?  
(a) Strongly agree  
(b) Agree  
(c) Undecided  
(d) Disagree  
(e) Strongly disagree

(5) To find out if the management of organizational change is hindered by the inability to cope with the challenges of teamwork approach.

21. What are the challenges of teamwork approach to change management that might hinder organizational survival?  
SD  
(a) They are costly  
(b) Compromise  
(C) Risky-shift  
(d) Groupthink  
(e) Social loafing

22. Is the management of organizational change hindered by inability to cope with the challenges of teamwork approach in Nigerian manufacturing organizations?  
(a) Strongly agree  
(b) Agree  
(c) Undecided  
(d) Disagree  
(e) Strongly disagree

23. How can teamwork approach to change management increase competitiveness in the management of organization?  
(a) Improving productivity  
(b) Improving employee motivation  
(C) Improving quality  
(d) Encouraging innovation  
(e) Being proactive rather than reactive

24. Why do individuals resist change in manufacturing organizations?  
(a) Selective perception  
(b) Insecurity  
(C) Habit  
(d) Economic implication  
(e) Inconvenience or loss of freedom  
(f) Fear of the unknown
25. How best do you manage resistance to change in manufacturing organization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Education and communication</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) Facilitation and support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Negotiation and agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Participation and involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Manipulation and cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Intimidation/Force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. To what extent is organizational change communicated to your employees?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Very Large extent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) Large extent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Undecided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Little extent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Very little extent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX II
ORAL INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

(1) Have your organization been involved in any change programme?
(2) Can you name some of the change programmes your organization has undergone?
(3) Do your managers communicate organizational change to your employees?
(4) Have your organization noticed resistance to change from employees?
(5) What do you consider the reasons for resistance to change in your organization?
(6) How would the problem for resistance to change in your organization be solved?
(7) What are the approaches used by your organization to introduce organizational change?
(8) Do you have teams in your organization?
(9) How would you rate the effectiveness of the use of teamwork approach in change management in manufacturing organization?
(10) Would you say that teams in your organization have generally achieved the objective of setting them up?
(11) Does teamwork approach to management of organizational change increase productivity in manufacturing organizations?
(12) How would you rate the relationship between employees’ participation in the management of change and the effectiveness of programmes designed to manage change?
(13) Would you say that teamwork approach to change management holds good prospects in your organization, for survival?
(14) What are the challenges encountered while using teamwork approach to manage change in your organization?
(15) Can you say that teamwork approach to change management holds good prospects for sustenance and viability in your organization?
(16) Are the strategies for teamwork approach to the management of change very effective in your organization?
### APPENDIX III

**Reliability Analysis**

**Case Processing Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded(^a^)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a^\) Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

**Reliability Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.871</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX IV

MANUFACTURERS’ ASSOCIATION OF NIGERIA
IMO/ABIA BRANCH
LIST OF MEMBERS IN SECTORAL GROUPS

FOOD; BEVERAGES AND TOBACCO SECTORAL GROUP
1. AFROBEVERAGE AND DISTILLERS LTD
2. BINEZ BOTTLING & HEALTH PRODUCTS CO. LTD
3. CONSOLIDATED BREWERIES PLC
4. GUINNESS NIGERIA PLC
5. NIGERIA BREWERIES PLC
6. TWINSET INDUSTRIES LTD
7. ZANDOB INDUSTRIES LTD
8. SEVEN-UP BPTTLING COMPANY PLC
9. JACOBS WINES LIMITED
10. HYDRO RESOURCES INDUSTRIES LTD

CHEMICAL AND PHARMACEUTICAL AND HEALTH SECTORAL GROUP
1. ALBA SOAP INDUSTRIES LIMITED
2. BEAUTY BASE LIMITED
3. BUNDI INTERNATIONAL DIAGNOSTICS LTD
4. CAMELA VEGETABLE OIL CO. LTD
5. CENT SOAP AND CHEMICAL INDUSTRIES LTD
6. CHEMLAP NIGERIA
7. CHRISANTO INDUSTRIES LTD
8. DYNAMIC SOLVENT EXTRACTION PLANT LTD
9. EMPRESA JOEMEG LIMITED
10. GODREJ NIGERIA LIMITED
11. JHOEPET COSMETICS INDUSTRY (NIG.) LTD
12. KITCHEN VEGETABLE OIL LTD
13. KORAMA CLOVER INDUSTRIES LTD
14. MAWATEC INDUSTRIES LTD
15. NICEN INDUSTRIES LTD
16. POLEMA OIL & INDUSTRIES LIMITED
17. ROKANA INDUSTRIES PLC
18. SACLUX INDUSTRIES LTD
19. SEAMASTER INDUSTRIES NIG. LTD.
20. STARLINE NIGERIA LIMITED
21. TONMAS NIGERIA LIMITED
22. ZAN COSMETIC IND. LTD
PULP PAPER & PAPER PRODUCT, PRINTING & PUBLISHING SECTORAL GROUP
1. CONVERSIONS NIGERIA LTD
2. STAR PAPER MILL LIMITED

TEXTILE, WEARING APPAREL, CARPET, LEATHER AND LEATHER FOOTWEAR SECTORIAL GROUP
1. ADAD LIMITED
2. ANAHSONS INDUSTRIES C.LTD
3. ANZZY INDUSTRIAL CO.LTD
4. CASCAMITE GLUE LIMITED
5. ROSIES TEXTILE MILLS LIMITED.

DOMESTIC AND INDUSTRIAL PLASTIC AND BUBBER SECTORAL GROUP
1. ADAOBI NIGERIA LIMITED
2. EAGLESTAR PLASTICS LTD
3. PITOCIN PETROLEUM & IND. LTD
4. ZANDOB INDUSTRIES LTD

BASIC METAL, IRON AND STEEL AND FABRICATED METAL PRODUCTS
1. ALUMINUM EXTRUSION IND. PLC
2. DACHIAFOR INDUSTRIES LTD
3. GMICORD INTERBIZ LIMITED
4. KARISTO INDUSTRIAL SYSTEMS LIMITED
5. PGN LIMITED
6. TEEGEE ENG.ENG &MFG. CO.LTD
7. UCIKO NIGERIA LIMITED
8. VEE-TEK NIGERIA LIMITED

ELECTRICAL AND ELECTRONICS SECTORAL GROUP
1. MT DILLYS INDUSTRIES LIMITED
2. KARISTO INDUSTRIES SYSTEMS LTD
3. VEE-TEEK NIGERIA LIMITED