

IMPACT OF TEAMWORK ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE: THE CASE OF COMMERCIAL BANKS IN LAGOS STATE, NIGERIA

Ezekiel Oluwadare Adeleye

Department of Business Administration, Ajayi Crowther University, Oyo Town, Oyo State, Nigeria

Corresponding Author's email: eo.adeleye@acu.edu.ng



Abstract

This paper examined the impact of teamwork on employee performance among deposit money banks in Lagos, Nigeria. The survey research design was adopted for this paper. The sample size of one hundred respondents was selected from five selected banks in the study area, using the purposive sampling procedure. The study revealed that teamwork leads to better quality and speed of operations which results to enhanced productivity and improved performance. In addition, teamwork was found to be vital in harnessing the energies, competencies and potentials of individual organization members in order to speedily achieve the overall business objectives. It was recommended that the team approach must exist in the micro business environment of work as a means of enhancing employees' performance. Furthermore, banking organizations should adopt policies that support team efforts within the workplace in order to encourage collaborative and stake-building knowledge sharing amongst members. Participative goal-setting should be adopted in teams to enhance commitment and to give room for employees to align their personal goals with the team goals. Moreover, managers should endeavour to ensure that the teams have the necessary skills to enable them perform effectively.

Keywords: Teamwork; Team trust; Employee development; organizational performance.

Introduction

Today, as several organizations continue to battle with the inevitable challenges of globalization and intense competition, emphases have shifted from specific abilities of individual employees and physical assembly lines to more tacit knowledge elicitation models centred on increasing amounts of teamwork among organizational members. Hence, there is today, an increasing recognition of the importance of joint efforts of individuals as a vital strategy to create synergy in the processes of harnessing the energies, competencies and potentials of employees. This is in order to speedily deliver leading-edge solutions ahead of competitors, delight the customer and achieve better business performance objectives (Fapohunda, 2013; Obiekwe, Mobolade & Akinade, 2021). A team, thus, exists to produce better results for the team members and the organization at large (Oparanma & Obiekwe, 2017).

As such, the team-based approach has become more crucial to success than ever, due to the intensity of and dynamism of the competitive business environment today, that has left several organizations scrambling and struggling for survival. The growing need for efficiency, the pressure of competition and also the complexity and speed of change has led organizations to change their management structure into team-based models to achieve a higher performing state. Hence,

teamwork has emerged as an effective way of organizing work and achieving a common purpose for the achievement of goals (Harris & Harris, 1996; Waterson et al., 1997). Team work emphasizes cooperation in the interest of the common goal by sharing knowledge, skills and competencies, as well as being flexible enough to serve in multiple roles. It also seeks to maximize both individual and group productivity by integrating the lower, middle and top levels of staff so that they can work more effectively, efficiently and profitably (Obiekwe et al., 2021; Tyler & Degoe, 1996; Williams et al, 2005).

When teams are effective, they draw on the abilities and experiences of their members to accomplish things that could not be achieved by individuals working separately or by other kinds of work group models (Jones et al, 2007). Teams are especially appropriate for conducting tasks that are high in complexity and interdependent sub-tasks. It has been argued that employees' teamwork constitute a larger group of people than what a job position describes (Purcares & RaGiu, 2011; Robbins & DeCenzo, 2008; Salas et al., 1992; Smith & Barclay, 1997). As such, teamwork is to maximize synergy between different parts of the organization, link and align the resources available towards the attainment of the organizational goals, and to facilitate group harmony.

Accordingly, many organizations especially in the banking sector now rely on team-based work structures through which it is easier to confront and overcome complex problems more effectively than when individuals work alone (Boyt et al., 2005; Costa, 2003; Delarue et al., 2008; Fukuyama, 1996). Teamwork therefore enhances cohesion among employees, leverages their skills, flexibilities and knowledge as they collaborate, thereby helping to improve their productivity and performance. Teamwork thus has been embraced by many organizations as a strategic option to encourage employee's cohesion, trust and commitment, prolong forward momentum, and achieve enhanced performance.

In spite of the foregoing theoretical justification of teamwork as an enabler of employee performance, there appears to be a shortfall of empirical evidence, particularly in the banking sector. This gap provides the motivation for this study. The aim of the paper therefore is to investigate the extent of team work and test the relationship between teamwork and employee performance among the deposit money banks in Lagos State, Nigeria. The specific objectives are to: (1) Examine the relationship between team goal setting and employees' performance; (2) Study the link between team members abilities and employees performance; (3) Examine the connection between team members' trust building and employees' performance; and (4) Examine the affiliation between team members' cohesion and employees' performance.

Literature Review

Meaning of Workgroup, Team and Teamwork

A group is defined as two or more individuals interacting and interdependent, who come together to achieve particular objectives (Sinambela, 2016; Tuckman, 1965). A workgroup is therefore one whose members interact primarily to share information and to make decisions to help one another perform within each member's area of responsibility (Smith & Barclay, 1997). Group performance therefore is the sum of all the group members' individual contributions. Whereas members of a work group interact with each other mainly to share information and make decisions that assist individual members in carrying out their duties, a work team is a group of employees whose individual efforts result in a performance that is greater than the sum of their individual inputs (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993; Robbins & Judge, 2007).

A team refers to a small number of people with complementary skills, who are committed to some performance goals, and uses an approach for which they hold themselves mutually accountable (Ingram, 2000; Nwaeke & Obiekwe, 2017; Obiwuru et al., 2011). Work team therefore generates positive synergy through coordinated effort and their individual efforts result in a level of performance that is greater than the sum of these individual inputs. Kozlowski and Ilgen (2006) precisely define a team as, “two or more individuals who socially interact face-to-face or virtually, possess one or more common goals, are brought together to perform organizationally relevant tasks. They are inter-dependent in respect to workflows, goals and outcomes, roles and responsibilities, and are together embedded in an encompassing organizational system with boundaries and linkages to the broader system context and task environment”.

Hoegl and Gemuenden (2001) defined a team as a social system of three or more people, which is embedded in an organization, whose members perceive themselves as members by others and who collaborates on common tasks. Salas et al. (1992) defined a team as a distinguishable set of two or more people who dynamically, interdependently and adaptively interact towards valued objective, mission, or goal, which have been assigned each to perform a particular function or role with a limited life-span of membership. A team has also been defined as a group of employees, which is coordinated by a team leader or a manager, who has duty to do coaching to all members to show maximum productivity by giving guidance, direction, motivation and inspiration, so that any delegated tasks can be performed well (Sinambela, 2016). Harris and Harris (1996) identified six types of teams which include quality circles, self-managed (work) teams, management teams, problem-solving teams, product development teams, and virtual teams.

Fajana (2002) asserts that teamwork is an integration of resources and inputs, working in harmony to achieve organizational goals, where roles are prescribed for every organization member, whilst challenges are equally faced and incremental improvements are sought continually. According to Kozlowski and Ilgen (2006) teamwork refers to a “collectives, who exist to perform organizationally relevant tasks, share one or more common goals, interact socially, exhibit task inter-dependencies, maintain and manage boundaries, and are embedded in an organizational context that sets boundaries, constrains the team, and influences exchanges with other units in the broader entity. Teamwork suggests that people work in an atmosphere of mutual support, trust and corporation, working together cohesively, with good inter-group relations. In essence, a work-team is a group of individuals who work interdependently to solve problems or carry out tasks (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993).

Teamwork therefore is vital since it is often necessary for colleagues to work well together and trying their best in any circumstance for the growth and sustainability of an organization. Tuckman (1965) has identified a five-stage development process that most teams follow to become high performing. These stages include: Forming stage, storming Stage, performing stage, and adjourning stage.

Benefits of Teamwork

Teamwork offers several benefits to both the organizations and employees. It helps employees to corporate, enhance their skills, provide feedback and reduce individual conflicts. The shift from working alone to working in teams require employees to cooperate, share information, confront differences, and reduce personal interests for the greater good of the team. Teams may then be portrayed as effective work groups whose effectiveness rests on the degree of motivation, co-ordination and purpose and whose synergy produces an energy/creativity which is beyond them as individuals. Recent studies by Jones et al. (2007) show that employees working within the team

can produce more output as compared to an individual. Hence, teams must possess a definable membership, group consciousness, and a sense of shared purpose (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993).

According to Fapohunda (2013), team building encompasses multiple varieties of activities; which are designed and developed to encourage team performance. The basic mission of team building is to ensure self-development, effective communication, cooperation among members, leadership skills and the ability to solve problems. Delarue et al. (2008) stated that the importance of team working in workplace cannot be underestimated in the desire for better organizational performance because teamwork is the key to cooperation, encouragement, motivation, communication, brainstorming, ideas sharing and job satisfaction. Furthermore, teamwork is the glue which keeps employees together, a bond which promotes strength, unity, reliability, support and cooperation. It is a means of improving manpower utilization and potentially raising performance of not just the individual but the organization ultimately, because it can expand the output of individuals through collaborative stake-building.

Employee Performance

Employee performance is the record of outcomes produced on a specified job function after having exerted some necessary effort over a time period (Hellriegel et al., 1999; Williams et al., 2005). Although Cummings et al. (1974) argued that environmental factors exercise a big influence on employee performance, work teams are known to whittle down, diffuse such effects and boost their motivation, satisfaction and engagement while reducing exit intentions (Whetten & Cameron, 1998). Ingram (2000) also noted that teamwork have the potential to improve the performance of individual employees, though it needs nurturing over time.

In a study of Volvo's truck plant in Umea, Northern Sweden, Kuipers and De Witte (2005) emphasis was placed on the following measures of work-team induced measures of employee performance: Attendance devoid of unnecessary sick leave, safe and injury-free work methods, quantity of work, satisfaction/morale, involvement/committed 'percentage of products without quality defects, cost efficiency, and conflict/rancor free relationships.

In line with the foregoing review of related literature, the following hypotheses in the Null form were postulated to drive the study.

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between team goals setting and employee's performance.

H₀₂: There is no significant relationship between team members' abilities and employee performance.

H₀₃: There is no significant relationship between team members' trust building employees' performance.

H₀₄: There is no significant relationship between team members' cohesion and on employees' performance.

Method

This study adopts the positivist mindset characterized by deduction, objectivity, structure, robust operationalization of concepts, and theory/hypotheses driven research process (Remenyi et al, 1998; Zikmund, 2003). It used a survey by questionnaire to collect data from the study population of nearly 600 employees of five selected banks operating in Lagos State, Nigeria. The appropriate sample size was calculated using the Gill, Johnson, and Clark formula at the 0.05 error level (Nwaeke & Obiekwe, 2017). The purposive sampling method was used to select one hundred

(100) respondents, to whom were administered the study questionnaire; which was taken through an elaborate process of design, piloting and final administration. Eighty two (82) copies of the questionnaire (82%) were returned, certified valid and used for data analysis. Using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS version 20.0) correlation and multiple regression tests were applied to test the study hypotheses at the 0.05 level of significance.

Validity and reliability tests of the study constructs as well as demographic analysis of respondents were conducted in accordance with procedures in prior studies (Obiwuru et al., 2011; Agarwal et al., 2017).

Data Analysis and Results

Demographic and data validity/reliability tests were conducted, but for parsimony and space, we report only a brief summary of the results. On gender, 43 and 39 were male and female; age, 17, 50, 11 and 4 were below 25 years, 25-40 years, 41-50, and over 50 years respectively. As for education, 14, 44 and 24 were no degree certificate, degree/HND and postgraduate in that order. The respondents were also fairly well spread across the departments, employee cadres and work experience.

The Cronbach's Alpha coefficients including the scale if item deleted measure were used to test for reliability – the internal harmony amongst the various constructs in the study. The Alpha coefficients were: 0.713 (Team goal); 0.710 (Team member abilities); 0.711 (trust); 0.716 (Cohesion) and an overall measure of 0.778. All the study constructs were retained as none of the scale if item deleted measures pushed the Alpha coefficients significantly over and above the thresholds reported above.

Next are the averages (means) and the standard deviation (in brackets) of work-team and employee performance constructs measured on a 5-point Likert scale. Team goal has a grand mean of 4.23 (0.65); team members abilities – 4.04 (0.71); Team trust – 4.14 (0.74); team spirit/cohesion – 4.00 (0.79); and employee performance – 3.98 (0.73).

The study tested four hypotheses whose results are presented in the tables below:

Table 1. Correlation between Team goal setting and employees' performance.

Variables	F- Ratio	Sig	R	R ²	Adj R ²	B	t	P
Team Goal setting	22.607	.000	.469	.220	.211	.469	4.755	.000

Source: SPSS Output of Field data, 2022

Table 1 shows that the result was significant with $F(1,202) = 22.607$, The R^2 indicates Team work accounts for about 22.0% in the variation in employees' performance. The value of correlation the coefficient shows that there exist a positive relationship between Team work and employees' performance. From the result however, a 1% increase in Team work will lead to about 46.9% increase in employees' performance.

Table 2. Correlation between team members' ability and employees' performance.

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	R	P	Remark
Team members' abilities	4.03	0.73	82	.493**	.000	Sig
Employee performance	3.98	0.74				

Source: SPSS Output of field data, 2022

Table 2 shows that there is a significant relationship between team members' abilities and employee performance ($r = .493^{**}$, $N = 82$, $P < .01$). Table 2 further shows that the mean value of 4.03 for Team members' abilities and 3.984756 for employee performance is within range. The result also shows a low standard deviation of 0.73 and .0.74 for Team members' abilities and employee performance respectively. The the results in Table 2 indicate that correlation is significant at the 0.01 level of the 2-tailed test. This result indicates $P < 0.05$ Hence, it is significant at 5%. Based on the outcome therefore, we conclude that there is a significant relationship between Team members' abilities and employee performance.

Table 3. Correlation between trust among members and employees' performance.

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	R	P	Remark
Team trust	4.14	0.76	82	.493**	.000	Sig
Employee performance	3.98	0.74				

Source: SPSS Output of field data, 2022

It is shown in the Table 3 above that there is a significant relationship between team trust and employee performance ($r = .493^{**}$, $N = 82$, $P < .01$). The table further Shows that the mean value of 4.14 for team trust and 3.98 for employee performance is within range. The result also shows a low standard deviation of 0.76 and 0.74 for team trust and employee performance respectively. However, based on the result from the correlation table, it indicates that correlation is significant at the 0.01 level with a 2 tailed test. This result indicates $P < 0.05$ since $P = 0.01$. Hence, it is significant at 5%. Based on the outcome therefore, we conclude that there is a significant relationship between the team trust and employee performance. Hence, it could be deduced team trust influence employee performance in the study.

Table 4: Correlation between team spirit and cohesion on employees' performance.

Variables	F- Ratio	Sig.	R	R ²	Adj R ²	B	t	P
Team spirit/cohesion	27.203	.000	.504	.254	.244	.504	5.216	.000

Source: SPSS Output of field data, 2022.

Table 4 shows that the result was significant with $F(1, 202) = 27.203$, The R^2 indicates Team spirit and cohesion accounts for about 25.4% in the variation in employees' performance. The value of correlation the coefficient shows that there exist a positive relationship between Team spirit and cohesion and employees' performance. From the result however, a 1% increase in Team spirit and cohesion will lead to about 50.4% increase in employees' performance.

Table 6 below shows that the linear combination of Team goal, Team members abilities, Team trust, Team spirit and cohesion regressed on Employee performance as the dependent variable of the study. The model fit measures were significant: $F = 7.295$; $R = .607$, $R^2 = .369$, $Adj. R^2 = .318$; all at $p = .000$). The independent/predictor variables jointly accounted for a variation of about 37 percent in employee performance The following shows the various relative contributions and levels of significance of the independent variables: Team goal ($\beta = .273$, $P < .05$), Team Members Ability ($\beta = .315$, $P < .05$), Team Trust ($\beta = .339$, $P < .05$), Team Spirit And Cohesion ($\beta = .314$, $P < .05$) respectively. It can be concluded that all the independent variables, (Team goal, team members' abilities, team trust, and team spirit and cohesion would independently and jointly predict employee performance.

Table 5: Summary of correlation coefficients

DIMENSIONS OF TEAMWORK		Team goal	Team member abilities	Team trust	Team spirit & cohesion
Team Goals	Pearson Corr.	1	.696**	.592**	.621**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
Team Members' Abilities	Pearson Corr.	.696**	1	.636**	.700**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
Team Trust	Pearson Corr.	.592**	.636**	1	.730**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
Team Spirit/Cohesion	Pearson Corr.	.621**	.700**	.730**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
Employees Performance	Pearson Corr.	.469**	.493**	.492**	.504**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000

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

Source: SPSS Output of field data, 2022.

Table 6: Summary of SPSS Multivariate regression tests

Variables	Model Fit Statistics				Adj R ²	B	t	P
	F-Ratio	Sig of P	R	R ²				
Team Goal	7.295	.000	.607	.369	.318	.273	2.525	.016
Team Members Ability						.315	2.743	.042
Team Trust						.339	2.931	.035
Team Spirit And Cohesion						.314	2.725	.040

Source: SPSS Output of field data, 2022.

Discussion of the Findings

All the hypotheses of the study were validated. The respondents scored most measures of team practices very highly; which means that they were widely and popularly adopted. For instance, the findings on Hypothesis 3 revealed the respondents' agreement and the strong impact of team members' abilities on employees' performance. This specific finding supports Robbins and Judge (2007), who revealed that team members' abilities have shown some fascinating insights into team structure and performance, including the need to spread workload evenly, the need to adjust prior experience to a collection of new challenges, and the need to align team skills to the task. Likewise, the findings on Hypothesis 4 show that trust among the members of the team impacts on employees' performance; which agrees with Harisalo and Miettinen's (2010), who

identified “trust capital”. According to Erdem and Ozen (2003), trust generates the behavioural basis of teamwork, which results in organizational synergy and better performance of employees.

Furthermore, the results agree with Kuipers and De Witte (2005) and Purcarea and RaGiu (2011) who found that team joint goal setting, team leadership, trust-building, skill development, and cohesion were essential ingredients towards team effectiveness and enhancement of employee performance. The findings also concur with Williams (1999) who found that organizational success depends on the ability of individuals to work effectively in dynamic well managed teams. The results are in line with the dynamic capacities and the resource-based views of the firm; which ask organisations to flexibly react to fast-paced competitive scenarios through intrinsic capacities (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2020; Teece & Pisano, 1994; Teece, Pisano, & Shuen, 1997). In other words, they need to dynamically combine and restructure intrinsic and extrinsic employee skills in order to sustain competitiveness and resilience, particularly in the fluctuating banking sector (Hammer, 2021; Jashapara, 2018; Teixeira & Werther, 2017).

The results therefore provide the evidence that teamwork produces better employee performance. This is achieved through the dividends of better decisions, better morale, greater self-actualization, and better employee development especially when team members are engaged in the setting of own team goals and are able to build common stakes and collaboration.

Conclusions and recommendations

The study found that team goal, team member’s abilities, trust, team spirit/cohesion positively correlate with and impact significantly on the dependent variable of the study (employee performance). All the independent variables were found to be instrumental to the processes of co-operative working, learning, bonding, stake-building and peer-based goal-setting amongst employees. The end result is higher productivity, better process/product quality, higher market share, and enhanced competitiveness.

In the light of the study findings, we make the following recommendations.

- i. Job design should adopt the teamwork approach to boost employee performance.
- ii. Teamwork is crucial in the private sector as resources are limited and competition is high; more so in the banking sector where operations are serially inter-dependent.
- iii. Participative goal setting is crucial to boost members’ commitment/agreeableness.
- iv. Team goal(s) and rewards should be clearly stated, understood and challenging.
- v. Team composition should reflect necessary skills, similar minds/potentials, as well as cooperation rather than competition.

References

- Agarwal, R., Sambamurthy, V., & Stair, R. (2017). Research report: The evolving relationship between general and specific computer self-efficacy? An empirical assessment. *Information Systems Research*, 11(4), p418-430.
- Boyt, T., Lusch, R., & Mejza, M. (2005). Theoretical model of the antecedents and consequences of organizational workgroup and professional esprit de corps. *European management Journal*, 23(6), p682-701
- Costa, A. (2003). Work team trust and effectiveness. *Personnel Review*, 32(5), p605-622.
- Cummings, L.L., Huber, G.P., & Arendt, E. (1974). Effects of size and spatial arrangements on group decision making. *Academy of Management Journal*, 17(3), p460-475.
- Delarue, A., Hootegeem, G.V., Proctor, S., & Burridge, M. (2008). Teamwork and organizational performance: a review of survey-based research. *International Journal of Management Reviews* 10(2), p.40-52.
- Eisenhardt, K., & Martin, J. (2020). Dynamic capabilities: What are they? *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(10-11), 1105-1121.
- Erdem, F. & Ozen, J., (2003). Cognitive and affective dimensions of trust in developing team performance. *Team Performance Management*, 9(5/6), p131-136
- Fajana, S. (2002). *Human Resource Management: An introduction*. Lagos: Labofin & Coy.
- Fapohunda, T. M. (2013). Towards effective team building in the workplace. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 1(4), p1-12.
- Fukuyama, F. (1996). Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity. *International Journal on World Peace*, 14(1), p84-87.
- Hammer, M. (2021). *The agenda: What every business must do to dominate the decade* (1st ed.). New York: Crown Business.
- Harisalo, R., & Miettinen, E. (2010). Trust: capital of capital. https://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=Harisalo+%26+Miettinen,+2010&hl=en&as_sdt=0&as_vis=1&oi=scholar
- Harris, P.R. & Harris, K.G. (1996). Managing effectively through teams. *Team Performance Management*, 2(3), p23-26.
- Hellriegel, D., Jackson, S.E., & Slocum, J.W. (1999). *Management* (8th ed.). Cincinnati, Ohio: South-Western College.
- Hoegl, M. & Gemuenden, H.G. (2001). Team quality and the success of innovative projects: a theoretical concept and empirical evidence. *Organization Science* 12(4), p435-449
- Ingram, H. (2000). Linking teamwork with performance. *Journal of Team Performance Management*, 2(4), 5-10.
- Jashapara, A. (2018). The competitive learning organization: A quest for the Holy Grail. *Management Decision*, 31(8), 52-62.
- Jones, A., Richard, B., Paul, D., Sloane, k., & Peter, F., (2007). Effectiveness of Team Building in an Organization. *Journal of Management*, 5(3), p35-37.

- Katzenbach, J.R., & Smith, D.K. (1993). The Discipline of Teams, *Harvard Business Review*, 71, March-April, p112
- Kozlowski, W.J & Ilgen, D.R (2006). Enhancing the effectiveness of work groups and teams. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 7(3), p77-124.
- Kuipers B. S. & De Witte M. C. (2005). Teamwork: A case study on Development and Performance. *Interl Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(2), p185–201.
- Nwaeke, L. I. & Obiekwe, O. (2017). Impact of manpower training and development on organizational productivity and performance: A theoretical review. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 9(4), p153-159.
- Obiekwe, O. Mobolade, G.O & Akinade, M.E. (2021). Team building and teamwork in organizations: Implications to managers and employees in work places. *International Journal of Management, Social Sciences, Peace and Conflict Studies*, 4(1), March, p261-274.
- Obiwuru, T., Okwu, A., Akpa, V., & Nwankwere, I. (2011). Effects of leadership style on organizational performance: A survey of selected small scale enterprises in Ikosi-Ketu Council development area of Lagos state, Nigeria. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1(7), p100-111.
- Oparanma, A.O. & Obiekwe, O. (2017). Impact of employees' involvement on organization performances in the workplaces. *Hezekiah University Journal of Social & Management Sciences*, 5(2), p231-239.
- Purcarea, T. V. & RaGiu M.P. (2011). Effective Teamwork and Leadership: The Key to Gaining Competitive Edge in the Nowadays Service Industry, *Business and Leadership*, 1, p107-118. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/227599865>
- Remenyi, Dan, Williams, B., Money, A., & Swartz, E. (1998). *Doing Research in Business and Management. An Introduction to Process and Method*. London: Sage Publications Limited.
- Robbins, S.P. & DeCenzo, D.A. (2008). *Fundamentals of human resource management*. 10th edition, New Jersey Pearson Educational Inc.
- Robbins, S.P. & Judge, T.A. (2007). *Organizational behavior*. Twelfth edition, New Jersey: Pearson Educational Inc.
- Salas, E., Dickinson, T.L., Converse, S.A. & Tannenbaum (1992). Towards an understanding of team performance and training. In R. W. Swezey & E. Salas (Eds.), *Teams: Their Training and Performance*, p3-29. Ablex Publishing.
- Sinambela, L. P. (2016). *Human resource management: built solid teamwork to increase performance*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Smith, J.B., & Barclay, D.W. (1997). The effects of organizational differences and trust on effectiveness of selling partner relationships. *Jrnl of Marketing*, 61(1): 3–21.
- Teece, D. J. (2019). Business models, business strategy and innovation. *Long Range Planning*, 43(2-3), 172-194.
- Teece, D., & Pisano, G. (1994). The dynamic capabilities of firms. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 3(3), 537–556.
- Teixeira, E. d., & Werther, W. B. (2017). Resilience: Continuous renewal of competitive advantages. *Business Horizons*, 56(3), 333-342.

Tuckman, B.W. (1965). Developmental sequence in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*. 63(6): 384-39.

Tyler, T. & DeGoey, P. (1996). Trust in organizational authorities: The influence of motive attributions on willingness to accept decision. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.

Waterson, P., Clegg, C., Bolden, R., Pepper, K., Warr, P. & Wall, T. (1997). The use and effectiveness of modern manufacturing practices in the United Kingdom. Sheffield, UK: Institute of Work Psychology.

Whetten, D.A. & Cameron, K.S. (1998). Developing management skills (4th ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

William, D. R., Swee-Lim, C. & Cesar, M. (2005). Job insecurity spill over to key account management: negative effects on performance, effectiveness and esprit de corps. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 19 (4), p483-50.

Williams J.k, (1999). Meta-analysis of the antecedents of personal goal level and the consequences of goal commitment. *Jrnl of Management*, 18, p595-616.

Zikmund (2003). *Business Research Methods* (7th ed.). USA: Thomson South-Western.