TEAM BUILDING AND EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE IN SELECTED BREWERIES IN SOUTH EAST, NIGERIA

Dr. Ikon Michael A, Dr. Onwuchekwa Faith C and Okolie-Osemene Martha

Department of Business Administration, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria

ABSTRACT: *Individual and socio-cultural differences among team members in breweries in the South East in particular and Nigeria in general constitute a challenge to effective teamwork, thereby giving rise to inconsistencies among team members. It becomes important to ascertain the relationship between harmonization and service delivery in selected breweries in South East, Nigeria. The general objective of the study is to examine team building and employee performance in selected breweries in South East, Nigeria, while the study specifically ascertained the relationship between harmonization and service delivery of the selected breweries in South East, Nigeria. The study used descriptive survey design with a sample size of 262 respondents. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient on SPSS ver.22 was used to test the hypothesis at 0.05 level of significance. The study revealed that when there is harmony among the employees of an organization, there is always cohesion, trust, commitment, and understanding of the team dynamics, thereby improving the service delivery of employees of the selected breweries in South East, Nigeria. It was therefore recommended that breweries in South East, Nigeria should employ managers that would be saddled with the responsibility of building harmony through trust among the employees while building teams for effective service delivery; and also ensure that team building should go with policy that would checkmate the excesses of the teams.*

KEYWORDS: Team Building, Harmonization, Service Delivery, Employee Performance

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Team building is an important agendum in the current business climate as organizations are looking to team-based structures to stimulate further improvements of their performance. The importance of building teams for improving employee performance has been a major topic of many researches done by academics and practitioners for the past decades. One possible reason for this interest is the widespread belief that building teams can influence the performance of the employees of organizations such as, in the areas of service delivery, competitive advantage, organizational responsiveness, and market value creation for its products and services among others. The composition of a team is considered by some researchers (Oloyede, 2009, Evans & Lindsay, 2013; Brun & Dugas, 2008) to be particularly important in achieving organizational goals and in evoking performance among subordinates. Several reasons indicate that there should be a relationship between team building and performance. Scholars and practitioners opine that effective team behaviours could facilitate the improvement of performance when organizations face new challenges. Understanding the effect of team building on performance is important because teambuilding is viewed by some researchers (Long & Shields 2010; Ajayi & Modupe, 2014) as one of the key driving forces for improving employees' performance. In developed countries, according to Agbonna,

Yusuf, and Onifade (2009), many companies appear to have employed team building as a corporate tool in market value creation for their products and service delivery.

In Nigeria, especially in the South East, some manufacturing companies including breweries such as Nigerian Breweries Plc, Enugu and SABMiller Brewery Plc (producer of Hero Lager beer), Onitsha seem to have imbibed the culture of building teams, which have accounted for their success, though not yet established and the essence of this study. These breweries were established for the purpose of processing natural resources into liquefied drinks for consumption and export. The liquefied processing activities appear to be a function organized and performed by a series of interrelated team building. Osterman (2014) and Waterson (2007) posit that teamwork has emerged in recent years as one of the most important ways of organizing work. Harris and Harris (2012) define team building as creating a work group with a common purpose for the achievement of goals/tasks. It implies that individuals work in a co-operative environment in the interest of a common goal by sharing knowledge, skills and being flexible enough to serve multiple roles. Hence, emerging work culture features more autonomy and control by workers for greater involvement in the company. Ingram (2010) sees team building as a strategy of bringing employees together for improving the organizational market value. In essence, team building involves allowing the employees participate in decision-making through effectively harmonizing of the employees to be in a team for the purpose of competitive advantage of the organization. Adejuwon and Okewale (2009) explain that team building is all about participation, harmonization, cooperation, dedication, clarity of expectations and objectives, cultural exchange, energizing employees, and demonstrating of trust and loyalty among others.

Onyekwelu (2015) posits that team building involves a wide variety of activities, presented to organizations and aimed at improving team performance. Chukwura (2014) adds that team building is a philosophy of job design that sees employees as members of interdependent teams rather than as individual workers. Uchendu, Anijaobi and Odigwe (2010) assert that team building is an important factor in any environment as its focus is to specialize in bringing out the best in a team to ensure self-development, positive communication, leadership skills, and the ability to work closely together as a team to solve problems. While work environments often target individuals and personal goals, with reward and recognition singling out the achievements of individual employees, with good team-building skills, employees can be united around a common goal to generate greater performance. In the absence of teams, employees are limited to individual efforts alone but with teambuilding, workgroups evolve into cohesive units and share expectations for accomplishing group tasks, added to trust and support for one another and respect for individual differences. From the early 1980s, team-based structures have been replacing the highly formalized, centralized, and departmentalized mechanistic structures that were previously the norm in work organizations.

The use of teams has spread rapidly arising from the belief that the development of strong and effective production and managerial teams will lead to the potential for higher performance and increased job satisfaction as there are synergies to be gained from greater levels of involvement in the workforce (Shanks 2015; Bessel, 2013; Eshun & Duah, 2016). Team building aims at increasing employees' skills that have a direct impact on their attitudes and as well, lead to motivation, commitment and satisfaction (Wright, 2013). Specifically, a large body of research considers team building to be a key determinant of employee service delivery and in all, organizational responsiveness (Hardre, 2013). Employees' attitudes and

behaviours generally depend on the teamwork approach the organization is using. However, Lee and Bruvold (2013) state that teamwork is positively associated with employee performance.

Akanji, (2015) argues that the performance of an employee is paramount to the survival of the organization. According to Daft (2016), employee performance is the employee's ability to attain his goals in achieving organizational responsiveness, market value, and profitability. Similarly, Richardo (2011) defines employee performance as the ability of the employee to achieve his goals and objectives through better service delivery. According to Brindle (2012), employee performance of a firm can be measured using financial and non-financial indicators such as service delivery, organizational competitive advantage, market value, market analysis, profitability, sales growth, corporate reputation, innovative organizational culture and responsiveness among others. Uzohuo (2016) opines that an employee performance is made possible due to the collective efforts of everybody involved in the organization and that organizations that strive towards building teams always have optimal level of employee performance.

It is against this back drop that it becomes imperative to understand whether team building in big manufacturing companies especially in the South East is an added advantage. This is because, according to Uchendu, Anijaobi and Odigwe (2010), team building seems to be one of the biggest problems faced by managers, organizations, and institutions in general. This is because team building involves getting workers of different diversity such as educational background, culture, and skill among others to do what they need to do in order to achieve organizational targets, goals, and objectives with the efficiency it deserves. Nnabuife (2009) adds that the complexity of human behaviour and dynamics of organizational circumstances of an organizational management seem to make team building for achieving service delivery, profitability, market value, and responsiveness among others difficult. The inability to harmonize and allow participation of the employees in organizational decisions might undoubtedly produce sub-optimal results, thereby jeopardizing the chances of the organizations realizing their set goals and objectives efficiently. It therefore becomes important to examine team building and employee performance in selected breweries in South East, Nigeria.

Statement of the Problem

Organizations are increasingly becoming dynamic and unstable. This evolution has given rise to greater reliance on teams and increased complexity in terms of team composition, skills required, and degree of risks involved. Uzohuo (2016) opines that the major challenge of teamwork in the breweries especially those in South East, Nigeria are the differences in the level of competence, energizing employees, and capability of team members. While highly competent team members try to increase the work pace in service delivery and organizational responsiveness, the lowly competent ones try to slow down the work pace. This leads to the over working/stressing of highly competent team members while the less competent ones are relaxed. In addition, individual and socio-cultural differences among team members constitute a challenge to effective teamwork. A Moslem may not be comfortable working with a Christian team member though both may be grouped in the same work team. The existence of lack of harmonization, communication, cultural exchange, trust, and loyalty, may lead to lack of cohesion among team members resulting to loss of organizational service delivery, market value creation, and profitability. More so, differences in the employment contract of team members constitute another impediment to effective teamwork as this

creates a feeling of inequality among team members resulting in loss of team spirit. The zeal to participate in accomplishing performance such as service delivery and profitability diminishes. The aforementioned inconsistencies among team members may result in loss of organizational profitability, competitive advantage and corporate benchmarking. It is against this backdrop that this study seeks to examine team building and employee performance in breweries in South East, Nigeria with particular study of Nigerian Breweries Plc, Enugu and SABMiller Brewery Plc, Onitsha.

Objective of the Study

The general aim of the study is to examine team building and employee performance in South East, Nigeria with particular study of Nigerian Breweries Plc, Enugu and SABMiller Brewery Plc, Onitsha.

Specifically, this study seeks to:

1. Examine the relationship between harmonization and service delivery of Nigerian Breweries Plc, Enugu and SABMiller Brewery Plc, Onitsha.

Decomposition of Variables

Independent Variable

Team Building

Decomposed Variable – Harmonization

Dependent Variable

Employee Performance

Decomposed Variable - Service delivery

Research Question

This study is guided by the following research question:

1) What is the relationship between harmonization and service delivery of employees of Nigerian Breweries Plc, Enugu and SABMiller Brewery Plc, Onitsha?

Hypothesis

This study will test the following null hypothesis:

1. **H_01:** There is no significant positive relationship between harmonization and service delivery of employees of Nigerian Breweries Plc, Enugu and SABMiller Brewery Plc, Onitsha.

Significance of the Study

The result of this study will help the management of Nigerian Breweries Plc, Enugu and SABMiller Brewery Plc, Onitsha, in particular, and manufacturing firms in Nigeria in general, as it would help to build better teams within the organizations that would improve the performance of the employees. In addition, the findings of this study would serve as a

source of materials for researchers and as well guide them in the completion of their research work in similar area of study.

Scope of the Study

The study is focused on the type of relationship that exists between harmonization and service delivery of employees in Nigerian Breweries Plc, Enugu and SABMiller Breweries Plc, Onitsha.

Limitations of the Study

This study encountered draws backs and limitations due to the unyielding attitude of the respondents. Some of the respondents were unwelcoming and refused to fill the copies of the questionnaire as a result of fear of loss of their jobs. The problem was however, mitigated by revisiting the respondents and convincing them on the need to assist in completing the copies of the questionnaire as the information would be used strictly for academic purpose.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Conceptual Review

Team Building

A team is a group of people working towards a common goal (Dianna, 2016). Katzenbach and Smith (2013) note that a team can simply be defined as a small number of people, with a set of performance goals, who have a commitment to a common purpose and an approach for which they hold themselves mutually accountable. Teambuilding involves the process of enabling the group of people to reach their goals. It consists of steps like clarification of team goals; identification of hindrances to goal achievements; facing the identified challenges and enabling the achievement of the goals (Brower, 2015). Fajana (2012) asserts that team building is a process of creating an integration of resources and inputs, working in harmony to achieve organizational goals, where roles are prescribed for every organization member, challenges are equally faced and incremental improvements are sought continually. Tracy (2016) found that team building is a way of building an activity that is managed and carried out by a group of people who are members of the organization; it is the forming of work group that would be managed properly which is essential in realizing the unity of a team in order to perform effectively and efficiently. The statement was supported by Burn (2014), which states that the effectiveness of a team or an effective team is a work team whose members collaborate to achieve common goals and have an attitude of mutual support. Team building is a way of forming teamwork within an organization.

Dianna (2016) affirms that teamwork is a form of collective work that might involve individual tasks, but usually involves some kind of collective task where each member is contributing part of a collectively written document that is supposed to reflect the collective wisdom of the group. As opposed to group work, which relies on exchange, teamwork relies on discussion. Discussion occurs when each member shares his view, and is heard by the rest of the group. Discussion requires fairness so that each member's ideas are aired and shared in a balanced way. It can take more time than exchange, but with practice, a time keeper, and a few rules, groups can create fair discussions that are also time efficient. The suggestion here

is that teams must be of a manageable size and that all team members must be committed to reach team goals. In addition, the team members must be jointly accountable for their actions and the outcomes of these actions. There are two basic skills in the team building process. The first involves recognizing the right issues, and the second has to do with tackling them in an appropriate way and order.

Team building has various forms depending on the size and nature of the team. For instance, in situations where team composition is continually changing, the emphasis is on developing the skills in individuals to be effective team members and it endeavours to change the skills and abilities of the individual at operating within a team or within multiple teams. However, where team membership is relatively static like in management teams the emphasis is on efforts aimed at improving relationships between team members.

Schultz (2008) asserts that team building improves compatibility between the members of a group and as well forms a synergy that improves the service delivery and profitability of the organization; he argues that it is possible to predict how well a group will come together by looking at the compatibility of the group members. He suggests that there must be a degree of implicit agreement on the extent of closeness within teams concerning the personal feelings of the members of the group, and therefore, important to match personality types and balance levels of skill, knowledge, and expertise so that potential conflict can be minimized. Zaltman and Duncan (2017) contend that though, team building can help an organization in achieving its objectives such as customer satisfaction, good reputation, competitiveness, market share, profitability, and mission success, but it can also frustrate the growth and change process of the organization by rejecting and resisting changes that do not conform to the groups' norms and culture. This 'parochial' thinking is a feature of cohesive task groups that are common in organizations where work is allocated by department. Team building also creates inter-group rivalry, which is also important as a means of promoting inter-group unity, but needs to be carefully managed (Staw, 2011). Despite the benefits that may accrue from teamwork, Uzohuo (2016) argues that implementing a programme of team building is far from easy and that a mutually supportive environment cannot simply be wished into existence.

Employee Performance

Employee performance is defined as the record of outcomes produced on a specified job function or activity during a specified time by an employee (Kuvaas, 2016). According to Motta (2015), employee performance is the consequence of capability and motivation, ability framed through education, equipment, training, involvement and experience ease in assignment and two types of capacities that is, mental and physical. Performance of an employee is an individual thing, because each employee has a different ability levels different in their jobs. Management can measure the employees for their performance based on the performance of each employee. Basically, performance is something that is individualized, because each employee has a different ability levels in his job. Performance depends on a combination of ability, effort, and opportunity gained. Mostly researchers use the term performance to express the range of measurements of transactional efficiency and input and output efficiency. Organizational performance can be measured by different variables such as service delivery, market analysis, competitive advantage, sales growth and returns on investment, corporate reputation, innovative organizational culture and profitability among others. However, for the sake of this study, it would be limited to service delivery of the employee. According to Posti (2015), service delivery is the ability of the employee to deliver services to the organization effectively and efficiently. It serves as one that would make the

customers patronize the organization; and is geared towards improving the delivery of services. The employee performance would increase service delivery only when the teamwork among the employees is fully effective.

Harmonization and Service Delivery

Harmonization involves the synchronization of teams by a central leadership team that assists the groups in obtaining what they need for success. Wilson (2016) states that harmonization involves the planning of priorities and resource allocation across departments. Cross-functional and multi-department teams should be coordinated to work together effectively. Carr (2012) observes that managers and supervisors who become team leaders experience a significant change of role because team leaders do not direct or control work, but instead work as coaches and mentors; effective communication, leadership, a new mindset, and consulting skills will be required which may necessitate training and development. Team leaders concerned with a loss of power need to understand that their new role is pertinent to the success of the teams, and that their knowledge is required now more than ever. Harmonization has to do with the team members understanding team dynamics and group processes. They must understand the stages of group development, their roles and responsibilities as team members and be able to work together effectively at the interpersonal level. Roufaiel and Meissner (2015) assert that harmonization brings about cooperation, which also involves the team being able to approach problem-solving, process improvement, goal setting, and measurement jointly. Furthermore, Heap (2016) posits that harmonization is a way by which team members cooperate to accomplish the team contract and obligation through the use of established group norms or rules of conduct in areas such as conflict resolution, consensus, decision-making, and meeting management.

There are large and growing body of literature that shows a positive linkage between harmonization and employee's service delivery. The emphasis on harmonization reflects the view that organizational market value depends less on tangible resources, but rather on intangible ones, particularly teamwork (Stiles & Kulvisaechana, 2015). Conti and Kleiner (2013) report that teams offer greater participation, challenges, and feelings of accomplishment. Organizations with harmonized teams will attract and retain the best people for service delivery. This in turn will create a high performance organization that is flexible, efficient and most importantly, profitable. Teamwork is an important factor for smooth functioning of an organization. Team members enhance their skills, knowledge and abilities while working in harmonized teams (Froebel & Marchington, 2015). Organizations, which emphasize more on harmonized teams, have results in increased employee service delivery, greater productivity and better problem-solving at work.

According to Ingram (2014), harmonized teamwork is a strategy that has the potential of improving the performance of individuals and organizations, though it needs to be nurtured over time. Organizations need to look at various strategies of improving performance in the light of increasingly competitive environments; top managers need to have the vision to introduce teamwork within their organizations, the sensitivity to nourish it and the courage to permit teams to play an important part in decision-making. Effective team performance may therefore, be attributed to both effective management and effective internal team processes. Katzenbach and Smith (2013) argue that harmonized teams are the essential organizational units for achieving performance results as well as accelerating personal growth; and that groups sometimes make better decisions than individuals do, but this depends upon the task selected. Lawler (2016) contends that harmonized team can help organizations gain synergy

in the accomplishment of important tasks, especially when no individual 'expert' exists, for complex tasks that can be subdivided and when risk is desirable. Lawler's work implies that certain types of task; complex, 'one-off' or with high potential rewards, may be effectively tackled by harmonized team.

Team effectiveness was studied by Schultz (1958) in Brindle (2012) who derived the notion of compatibility between the members of harmonized team. He argues that it is possible to predict how well a team will come together by looking at the compatibility of the team members. He suggests that there must be degree of implicit agreement on the degree of closeness within teams concerning the personal feelings of the members of the group. It was, therefore, deemed important to match personality types and balance levels of skill, knowledge, and expertise so that potential conflict can be minimized. Team building which involves high harmonization aimed at increasing employees skills have a direct impact on their attitude that is, motivation, commitment and satisfaction. Specifically, a large body of research considers motivation to be a key determinant of employee service delivery; employees' attitudes and behaviours generally depend on the teamwork approach the organization is using; also, harmonization in teamwork is positively associated with employee productivity, reduced employee intention to leave and organizational effectiveness (Lee & Bruvold, 2013). A harmonized team gives employees increased autonomy, increased participation, and ownership regarding decisions, they can therefore maximize organizational innovation. Rather than being told what to do, employees are given goals, or they develop goals with their team leaders, and are then free to decide on the best method of achieving the goals. Teams also provide other attractions for the organizations where they operate. First, teams optimize the use of human resources by allowing organizations to gain access to individual knowledge and skills. Second, Wageman (2015) asserts that teams embedded in harmonization enhance organizational learning because employees are able to experiment and create strategies that are best suited to their work. The resultant effects of these include reduced staff turnover and absenteeism and consequently reduction in organizational costs and improved organizational knowledge base.

Theoretical Framework

The Five Dysfunctions of a Team

This study adopted the theory of the Five Dysfunctions of a Team developed by Lencioni (2005); which describes the relationship that exists among team members in their work environment. According to the theory, it is neither finance, nor strategy, or technology, but teamwork that remains the ultimate competitive advantage for a better team, because it is so powerful and so rare. Lencioni (2005) adds that all teams have the potential to be dysfunctional. To improve the functioning of a team, it is critical to understand the type and level of dysfunction. A pyramid is used to demonstrate the hierarchical progression of team development. Similar to Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory (1954), there are five levels and each must be completed to move on to the next one.

Fig. 1: The Five Dysfunctions of a Team

Source: Lencioni (2005) Overcoming the Five Dysfunctions of a Team.

The five dysfunctions of a team according to Lencioni (2005) are discussed below:

Trust

Trust lies at the heart of a functioning, cohesive team and can only happen when team members are willing to be completely vulnerable with one another. This includes saying things like "I'm sorry" or "Your idea was better than mine." A personality assessment can help people gain insight on their peers and develop empathy, two important qualities that allow a team to build trust. Team members who trust one another are comfortable being open, even exposed, to one another about their failures, weaknesses and fears.

Conflict: Conflict is naturally uncomfortable, but productive conflict focused on concepts and ideas is essential for any great team to grow. When teams have a foundation of vulnerability-based trust, conflict simply becomes an attempt to find the best possible solution in the shortest period of time. When trust is present, teams are able to engage in unfiltered ideological debate around ideas, issues, and decisions that must be made.

Commitment: Commitment is clarity around decisions, not consensus. With commitment, teams move forward with complete buy-in from every team member - including those who may initially disagree. The ability to engage in conflict and provide input enables team members to buy-in or commit to decisions.

Accountability: It is easy to avoid difficult conversations, but calling out peers on performance or behaviours that might hurt the team is essential to productivity. By "entering the danger" with one another, team members feel trusted, respected, and responsible for getting things done right. After commitment is established, team members must be willing to hold one another accountable and remind each other when actions are counterproductive to the team.

Results: One of the greatest challenges to team success is the inattention to results. Great teams ensure all members, regardless of their individual responsibilities and areas of

expertise, are doing their best to help accomplish team goals. Collective team results must supersede any departmental or personal objectives or pursuits.

According to Pulko (2009), Lencioni focuses on the interpersonal relationships in a team. Pulko further stated that Lencioni believes that the five conditions to success are trust, being able to have a constructive conflict, commitment to the common goal, accountability and focusing on common results. The team cannot move up the pyramid if bottom characteristics are not achieved.

In relation to this study, team building goes with these five dysfunctions of Lencioni. These five characteristics must be essential for harmonization to take place in a workplace. According to Cohen and Bailey (2015), a team is a collection of individuals who are interdependent in the tasks and who share responsibility for the outcomes. Team building with these five dysfunctions of Lencioni (2005), employees would be able to harmonize through cooperation, enhance individual skills, and provide constructive feedback without any conflict among individuals. A team that cooperates enhances service delivery because all hands have to be on deck to enable the performance of each of the employees to improve.

Empirical Review

This study reviewed some related studies carried out by different authors. Some of the related studies include: Kobla (2015) investigated the relationship between harmonization and service delivery in brewing firms in Lagos. Correlation survey was used for the study and Pearson Product Moment-Correlation was used to examine the relationship between harmonization and service delivery of the firms. The study has a sample size of 305 participants. The study found that harmonization is positively related to organizational service delivery. It was recommended that company executives should see teambuilding as a strategy for bringing about harmonization and cooperation which will result to motivation, commitment, satisfaction, organizational competitive advantage, and profitability among others as team building based on harmonization has a great impact on the service delivery of employees.

Mba (2012) carried out a survey study on teamwork and employee performance in the Bonny Nigeria Liquefied Natural Gas Plant Port Harcourt. Data was collected using a descriptive survey design on a population of 86 respondents. Chi-square statistical tool was used in analyzing the data. The study concluded that teamwork influences employee performance especially in service delivery.

Onyeneke and Iruo (2015) carried out a cross-sectional study on the relationship between effective harmonization, commitment, organizational performance and service delivery of employees in the workplace in Benin, Edo State in which a questionnaire survey was conducted on 250 participants. The results show that there is a significant relationship between effective harmonization, commitment, organizational performance and employee service delivery as effective harmonization increases commitment, organizational performance and employee service delivery.

Yahaya (2011) investigated the impact of integrity and harmonization on team building on employee service delivery in an organization in Kano. T - test and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were adopted for the study and a sample size of 445 employees was used for the

study. The study concluded that integrity and harmonization enhance the service delivery of an employee and that workers in a team will depend to a large extent on harmonization.

Oni and Daniya (2013) conducted a survey study on the impact of empowerment and teambuilding on employee service delivery: A study of a Nigerian bank in Ibadan. Survey design was used for the study which was made up of 315 participants and One Way ANOVA was used to test the hypotheses. From the findings of the study, it was concluded that teambuilding brings about empowerment and thereby increasing employee service delivery.

Adekunle, Adegbite, Fakayode (2012) examined the influence of harmonization on employee service delivery in organizations in Ilorin, Oyo State. Data were collected from a total of 320 employees of 2 pharmaceutical firms. Data collected were analyzed using regression analysis on SPSS version 21 to test the hypotheses; it was found that harmonization in a team encourages motivation and commitment, which influence service delivery of employees.

Salamatu (2014) studied the role of team building on employee performance. The study focused on harmonization and service delivery of employees in Kaduna. Cross-sectional survey design was adopted for the study which had a sample size of 150 participants of a bottled water manufacturing firm. The data were collected from both primary and secondary source. T-test was used to test the hypotheses. It was found that team building focuses on and integrates harmonization and helps to increase service delivery of a firm.

Ayopo (2011) examined the effect of teamwork on employee service delivery in Osun State. Qualitative and survey designs were used in gathering data from 243 employees of micro enterprises. Data collected were analyzed with mean values and simple percentages. The results show predictors (teamwork) have positive impact on the response variable (service delivery).

Akande (2016) conducted a survey study on harmonization and its impact on employee efficiency and service delivery in firms in Delta State. Correlation survey design was adopted for the study and Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to investigate the type of relationship that exists between harmonization and employee efficiency and service delivery of those firms which involved a sample size of 200 employees. The study concluded from its findings that there exists an evidence of positive significant relationship between harmonization and employee efficiency and service delivery.

Kirkman and Shapiro (2011) investigated the relationship between harmonization and service delivery of employees from a sample of 275 brewing firm employees in Kenya using correlational analysis to test the hypothesis and they found that there was a positive relationship between harmonization and service delivery.

Karrem, Arigbabu, Akintaro and Badmus (2012) examined the impact of team building on employee performance using a survey data collected from 240 employees of two confectionery firms in Accra, Ghana. Descriptive survey design was adopted. One way ANOVA was used to test the hypotheses. Based on the findings, it shows that team building improves employee performance more especially, their service delivery.

Nanor (2010) carried out a descriptive research on the impact of team building on achievement of service delivery in bottling companies in Canada. The study has a population of 280 participants. Data collected were analyzed with the aid of SPSS version 20 in which

correlation and regression analysis were conducted. The study established that team building that encourages harmonization increases service delivery of employee.

Irfan and Lodhi (2015) investigated the impact of harmonization of employees in a team on service delivery and organizational effectiveness - a case of a bank in Pakistan. Data was collected from a total of 300 participants. Data collected were analyzed using correlation and regression analysis on SPSS version 21. The result indicates that there exists a positive relationship between harmonized employees and employee service delivery. Thus, he concluded that team building should be employed for assessing service delivery and organizational effectiveness.

Gap in Knowledge

Based on the findings of the literature reviewed, it is observed that most of the studies on team building and employee performance both within and outside the country concentrated on team building as it relates to organizational performance, motivation, service delivery, commitment, harmonization, compatibility, organizational effectiveness, organizational knowledge base, staff turnover and absenteeism; however, none examined how harmonization relates with service delivery of employees in selected breweries in South East, Nigeria. Therefore, it is against this background that this study seeks to examine the type of relationship that exists between harmonization and service delivery of employees of Nigerian Breweries Plc, Enugu and SABMiller Brewery Plc, Onitsha.

METHODS

Research Design

The study used descriptive survey design to examine the nature of relationship that exists between the dependent variable (employee performance) and independent variable (team building).

Population of the Study

In this study, the target population comprised employees of Nigerian Breweries Plc, Enugu and SABMiller Brewery Plc, Onitsha. Nigerian Breweries Plc, Enugu has a total population of 474 employees while SABMiller Brewery Plc, Onitsha has 289 employees. Hence, the total population of the study was 763.

Table 3.1: The Selected Breweries in South East, Nigeria

S/N		Number of Employees
1	Nigerian Breweries Plc, Enugu	474
2	SABMiller Brewery Plc, Onitsha	289
	Total	**763**

Source: Field Survey, September 2017.

Sample Size and Sampling Technique

Proportional sampling technique was adopted in administering the research instrument to the respondents. This technique helped an equal proportion of the employees within the sample frame to have equal chance of being selected. The sample size was obtained through Taro Yamane's formula, which is given as:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Where:

n = Sample size

N = Total Population

e = sampling error (0.05) or 5%

Where N = 763

Substituting in the formula, we have

$$n = \frac{763}{1 + 763(0.05)^2}$$

$$n = \frac{763}{1 + 763(0.0025)}$$

$$n = \frac{763}{1 + 1.9075}$$

$$n = \frac{763}{2.9075} = 262.42$$

Hence, the sample size of the study is approximately 262.

Thus, the sample size is 262 employees of the two selected breweries in South East, Nigeria. This study made use of judgment sampling technique in selecting participants for the study. However, the proportion of the questionnaire to be administered to each of the selected breweries was determined using Bowley's proportional allocation formula.

Thus,

$$nh = \frac{n \times Nh}{N}$$

Where, nh = Number of questionnaire allocated to each of the companies.

n = Total sample size.

Nh = Number of employees in each of the selected breweries.

N = Population size.

For Nigerian Breweries Plc, Enugu,

n = 262

Nh = 474

N = 763

$$nh = \frac{262 \times 474}{763}$$

$$nh = \frac{124188}{763}$$

Thus, nh = 163.03

163 copies of questionnaire were distributed to Nigerian Breweries Plc, Enugu.

For SABMiller Brewery Plc, Onitsha,

n = 262

Nh = 289

N = 763

$$nh = \frac{262 \times 289}{763}$$

$$nh = \frac{75718}{763}$$

Thus, nh = 99.24

99 copies of questionnaire were distributed to SABMiller Brewery Plc, Onitsha.

Table 3.2: Questionnaire Allocation to Each of the Two Selected Breweries in South East, Nigeria

S/N	Institutions	Population	Questionnaire Allocated
1	Nigerian Breweries Plc, Enugu	474	163
2	SABMiller Brewery Plc, Onitsha	289	99
	Total	**763**	**262**

Source: Field Survey, September 2017.

Instrument for Data Collection

Both primary and secondary sources of data were explored in getting important and useful information for the study. The primary data were gathered from respondents through questionnaire instrument structured on a 5-point likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. However, overt attempts were made to compliment the primary data with

the secondary information obtained through literature review, websites of the firms, journals and text books.

Validity of Instrument

The questionnaire developed for this study was subjected to content validity. Content validity is the extent to which measuring instrument provides adequate coverage of the topic under study (Onyeizugbe, 2013). The questionnaire was designed in a very simple language to avoid ambiguity, misinterpretations, or misunderstanding of the questions or statements. The questionnaire items were well structured in line with the specific objective of the study, research questions and hypothesis. The instrument was submitted to the researchers' supervisor and also subjected to experts' evaluation in measurement and management from which necessary corrections were made before the questionnaire was distributed to respondents.

Reliability of Instrument

The reliability of items used in the research instrument was measured using the Cronbach's Alpha test at 0.05 level of significance. The results of the reliability test are as shown in table 3.2 below:

Table 3.2: Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.771	.771	10

Source: Field Survey, September 2017 (Computation: SPSS ver. 22)

A correlation coefficient of 0.771 was obtained with the aid of Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 22. The result revealed that the instrument was reliable (see Appendix C for more details).

Method of Data Analysis

The data obtained from the copies of the questionnaire were presented in frequency tables and analyzed using weighted mean. The study adopted 5 Likert scale which ranges from:

Strongly Agree (SA) – 5

Agree (A)   - 4

Disagree (D)   - 3

Strongly Disagree   - 2

Neutral   - 1

$$\mu = \frac{5 + 4 + 3 + 2 + 1}{5} = \frac{15}{5} = 3.0$$

From the analysis of the questionnaire items, the mean scores between 3.0 and above were considered agreed whereas the means scores below 3.0 were considered disagreed.

More so, Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to test the hypothesis formulated for the study with the help of Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS, version 22). The hypothesis was tested at 5% level of significance and the confidence interval of 95%.

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

This section presents and analyses the data collected from the administered questionnaire in line with the research hypothesis using appropriate testing statistics. A total number of 262 copies of the questionnaire were administered. Two hundred and fifty (250) copies of the questionnaire that were fully and properly filled were retrieved. That means 95.42% of the sample size of the study was used in presentation and analysis of data.

Analysis of Questionnaire

Table 4.1: Analysis of the Responses to the Research Question

S/N	Question Items	Responses							
	What is the relationship between harmonization and service delivery of employees in selected bottling companies in South East, Nigeria	SA	A	D	SD	N	T	$\overline{X}$	Decision
		5	4	3	2	1			
	Harmonization of Employees								
1	My team has created an environment where vulnerability and openness are the norm	110 (550)	88 (352)	22 (66)	19 (38)	11 (11)	250 (1017)	4.07	Agreed
2	My team is comfortable engaging in unfiltered conversation about important topics	107 (535)	99 (396)	22 (66)	18 (36)	4 (4)	250 (1037)	4.15	Agreed
3	My team has the ability to buy into clear decisions leaving little room for ambiguity and second guessing	96 (480)	102 (408)	27 (81)	17 (34)	8 (8)	250 (1011)	4.04	Agreed
4	My team does not hesitate to confront one another about performance related and behavioural concerns. The givers and receivers of such feedback are able to handle it maturely	95 (475)	118 (472)	15 (45)	13 (26)	9 (9)	250 (1027)	4.11	Agreed

5	My team values collective outcomes and results more than individual recognition and attainment of status	94 (470)	103 (412)	22 (66)	19 (38)	12 (12)	250 (998)	3.99	Agreed
	Service Delivery of Employees								
6	My team's cooperation has increased the service delivery of the employees	116 (580)	91 (364)	22 (66)	15 (30)	6 (6)	250 (1046)	4.18	Agreed
7	Reduction of conflicts among employees has improved the service delivery of my team.	105 (525)	101 (404)	25 (75)	16 (32)	3 (3)	250 (1039)	4.16	Agreed
8	Working in harmony has increased my team's services we deliver	104 (520)	105 (420)	21 (63)	12 (24)	8 (8)	250 (1035)	4.14	Agreed
9	The trust my team has among our employees has improved the services we deliver	97 (485)	101 (404)	34 (102)	15 (30)	3 (3)	250 (1024)	4.10	Agreed
10	The commitment that exists in my team has improved harmony and service delivery	106 (530)	97 (388)	27 (81)	14 (28)	6 (6)	250 (1033)	4.13	Agreed

Source: Field Survey, September 2017.

Table 4.1 shows the statistical analysis of the relationship between harmonization and service delivery of employees in selected breweries in South East, Nigeria. The results revealed that the mean scores of items 1 to 10 were 4.07, 4.15, 4.04, 4.11, 3.99, 4.18, 4.16, 4.14, 4.10, and 4.13 respectively and were all agreed. Thus, this result implies that there is a significant relationship between harmonization and service delivery of employees in selected breweries in South East, Nigeria.

Test of Hypothesis

The study would test the following hypotheses:

H_0: There is no significant positive relationship between harmonization and service delivery of employees in selected breweries in South East, Nigeria

H_1: There is significant positive relationship between harmonization and service delivery of employees in selected breweries in South East, Nigeria.

Table 7: Summary of the Correlation Analysis of the Hypothesis

Correlations

		Harmonization of employees	Performance of Employees
Harmonization of employees	Pearson Correlation	1	.987**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	250	250
Performance of employees	Pearson Correlation	.987**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	250	250

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Source: Field Survey, September 2017 (SPSS ver. 22)

The result reveals that the Pearson's Product-Moment correlation coefficient, r, is 0.987, and that it is statistically significant (p = 0.005). This implies that there is significant positive relationship between harmonization and service delivery of employees in the selected breweries in South East, Nigeria (r = .987, n = 250, p(.000) < .005).

T- Test Procedure.

$$\text{t-cal.} \quad = \quad t\sqrt{\frac{n-2}{1-r^2}}$$

Where

r = 0.987 (correlation co-efficient)

n = 5n (No. of options)

Substituting we have:

$$\text{t-cal.} \quad = \quad 0.987\sqrt{\frac{5-2}{1-(0.987)^2}}$$

$$= \quad 123.65$$

The critical value of t at 0.05 level of significance and 3 degree of freedom (df) is 3.182.

Decision Rule

From the calculated and critical t value, the calculated t-value, 123.65 is greater than the critical t-value, 3.182. Hence, the null hypothesis was rejected while the alternative hypothesis was accepted. This implies that there is significant positive relationship between harmonization and service delivery of employees in the selected breweries in South East, Nigeria.

Discussion of Findings

Based on the findings of this study, it was revealed that there is significant positive relationship between harmonization and service delivery of employees in a team in the selected breweries of South East, Nigeria. This implies that when there is harmony among the employees of an organization, there is always cohesion, trust, commitment, and understanding of the team dynamics, thereby improving the service delivery of the employees. More so, the result implies that as harmony exists among the employees, trust, lesser conflict, accountability, and commitment give way to results of better service delivery in the organization. This finding is in line with the previous findings of Kirkman and Shapiro (2011) who investigated the relationship that exists between harmonization and service delivery of a brewing firm in Kenya; the result showed that employee service delivery improved as a result of harmonization, commitment, cohesion and understanding of the team dynamics. This is because harmonization among employees in a team expands the output of individuals through collaboration. In affirmation to this finding, Onyeneke and Iruo (2015) confirm that a significant relationship exists between effective harmonization, commitment, and organizational performance and employee service delivery.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of Findings

The result for test of the hypothesis using Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient reveals that there is significant positive relationship between harmonization and service delivery of employees in breweries in South East, Nigeria ($r = .987$, $n = 250$, $p(.000) < .005$). This shows that when there is harmony among the employees of an organization, there is always cohesion, trust, commitment, and understanding of the team dynamics, thereby improving the service delivery of the employees. Based on this result, the research hypothesis which states that there is significant relationship between harmonization and employee service delivery in selected breweries in South East, Nigeria is therefore accepted.

Conclusion

Based on the summary of findings, it would be deduced that as harmony exists among the employees in a team, trust, lesser conflict, accountability, and commitment give way to results of better service delivery in the organization; the researcher concludes that harmonization among employees of an organization always gives rise to better employee service delivery. This is because harmonization among employees in a team expands the output of individuals through collaboration, which leads to an increase in employee service delivery. The researchers conclude that harmonization plays an important role in improving employee service delivery.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made based on the findings of the study:

1. The selected breweries in South East, Nigeria namely: Nigerian Breweries Plc, Enugu and SABMiller Breweries should employ managers that would be saddled with the

responsibility of building harmony through trust and accountability among the employees while building teams for effective service delivery.

2. The selected breweries in South East, Nigeria should ensure that while building teams, the process should be transparent as it would ensure harmony among the employees which should always be an inbuilt factor in building teams thereby increasing commitment for better service delivery.

3. The selected breweries in South East, Nigeria should ensure that team building should go with policy that would checkmate the excesses of the teams otherwise, the teams would form "cabals" that would resist change and growth of the organization that is not in line with their interests.

Contribution to Knowledge

This work contributes a conceptual framework that links harmonization to employee service delivery and also provides empirical result on the linkage and the nature of relationship that exists between the constructs in selected breweries in South East, Nigeria.

REFERENCES

Adejuwon, N. & Okewale, J. (2009). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organisation. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18.

Adekunle, O., Adegbite, A., & Fakayode, M. (2012). *Influence of harmonization on employee service delivery in organizations*. Oyo State, Ilorin: Bendal Publishers Ltd

Agbonna, C., Yusuf, A., & Onifade, O. (2009). Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 63(3), 308-323.

Ajayi, Z. & Modupe, R. (2014). Impact of culture on human resource management practices: a 10-country comparison. *Applied Psychology*, 49(1), 192-221.

Akande, M. (2016). *Harmonization of and its impact on employee efficiency of service delivery in firms*. Delta State: Beckers Publishers

Akanji, E. (2015). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International*, 13(3), 209-223.

Ayopo, L. (2011). Effect of teamwork on employee service delivery. *Public Productivity and Management Review*, 29, 256-277.

Bessel, T. (2013). Flexible and Compressed Workweek Schedules: A Meta-analysis of Their Effects on Work-Related Criteria. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(4), 496-513.

Brindle, L. (2012). Handing out the Oscars: a new look at team building. *Human Resources*, 23(1), 92-96.

Brower, M. J. (2015). Empowering Teams: What, Why and How. *Empowerment in Organizations*, 3(1), 13-25.

Brun, P. & Dugas, D. (2008). Organizational commitment: Antecedents and outcomes in public organizations. *Public Productivity and Management Review*, 29, 256-277.

Burn, S.M. (2014). Group: Theory and Practice. Canada: Wadsworth. How to increase teamwork in organizations. *Journal of Quality,* 5(1), 26-29

Carr, C. (2012). Planning Priorities for Empowered Teams. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 13(5), 43-52

Chukwura, O. (2014). Explaining the relationship between job characteristics, burnout and engagement: the role of basic psychological need satisfaction. *Work & Stress*, 22(3), 277-294.

Cohen, S. G. & Bailey, D. E. (2015). What makes teams work: group effectiveness research from the shop floor to the executive suite. *Journal of Management*, 23(3), 239-90.

Conti, B., and Kleiner, B. (2013). How to increase teamwork in organizations. *Journal of Quality*, 5(1), 26-29.

Daft, K. (2000). Business unit - level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 268-279.

Dianna, N. (2016). *Teams: Teamwork and Teambuilding*, Prentice Hall,New York.

Eshun, P. & Duah, S. (2016). *Human Resource Management in Developing Countries*. London: Routledge, pp. 1-15

Evans, V. & Lindsay, S. (2013). Impact of performance appraisal justice on employee engagement: a study of Indian professionals. *Employee Relations*, 35(1), 61-78.

Fajana S. (2012) Human Resources Management: An Introductory, Labofin and Company, Lagos.

Froebel, P. & Marchington, M. (2015). Teamwork structures and worker perception: a cross national study in pharmaceuticals. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(2), 256-276.

Hardre, P. L. (2013). Beyond two decades of motivation: A review of the research and practice in instructional design and human performance technology. *Human Resource Development Review*, 2(1), 54-81.

Harris, P. R. & Harris, K. G. (2012). Managing effectively through teams. *Team Performance Management*, 2(3), 23-26.

Heap, N. (2016). Building the Organizational Team. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 28(3), 3-7.

Ingram, H. (2014). Linking teamwork with performance. *Journal of Team Performance Management*, 2(4), 5-10.

Irfan, M. & Lodhi, E. (2015). Impact of harmonization of employees in a teambuilding on service delivery. A meta-anlaysis. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 64, 253-268.

Kareem, N., Arigbabu, L., Akintaro, P., & Badmus, T. (2012). Impact of teambuilding on employee performance. *Employee Relations*, 18 (1), 36-49.

Katzenbach, J. R. & Smith, D. K. (2013). *Follow this Path: how the world's greatest organizations drive growth by unleashing human potential*. New York: The Wisdom of Teams, McKinsey & Company.

Kirkman and Shapiro (2011). Relationship between harmonization and service delivery of employees in Kenya

Kobla. G. (2015). The effect of harmonized employee and employee service delivery performance: a longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(1), 174-182.

Kuvaas, B. (2016). Performance appraisal satisfaction and employee outcomes: mediating and moderating roles of work motivation, *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17(3), 504-522.

Lawler, E. E. (2016). *High-Involvement Management*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Lee, C. H. & Bruvold, N. T. (2013). Creating value for employees' investment in employee development. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 14(2), 981-1000.

Lencioni, P. (2005). *Overcoming the Five Dysfunctions of a Team*. Jossey Bass

Long, P. & Shields, J. (2010). On the dimensionality of organizational justice : a construct validation of a measure. *Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425-445.

Mba, A. (2012). *Teamwork and Employee Performance in The bonny Nigeria Liquefied Natural Gas Plant*. Onitsha: McHill Publishers

Motta, S. (2015). Managing the Changing Pscyhological Contract. *Employee Relations*, 18(1), 36-49.

Nanor, N. (2010). *Impact of teambuilding on the achievement of service delivery in organizations*. Kenya: Beck Publishers

Nnabuife, N. (2009). *Diversity and organizational performance*. Enugu: Rex Charles & Patrick Publications.

Oloyede, M. S. (2009). Influence of ethnic diversity in organizational service delivery. *Diversity and Performance*, 2(18), 63-68.

Oni, C. & Daniya, W. (2013). Examining the effects of empowerment and teambuilding on employee service delivery. What Engages Employees the Most or, the Ten C's of Employee Engagement. *P. Ivey Business Journal*, 8(2), 56-78

Onyeizugbe, U. C. (2013). *Practical guide to research methodology in Management*. Department of Business Administration, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka. Good Success Press, Onitsha. Pp.87-88.

Onyekwelu, D. H. (2015). *A Brief Analysis of 20 Years of Emotional Intelligence: An Introduction to Current Advances in EI Assessment and Application*. New York: Springer.

Onyeneke and Iruo (2015). Towards effective harmonization and service delivery of employees in the Workplace in Benin, Edo State. *Journal of Management*, 31, 874-900.

Osterman, P. (2014). How common is work place transformation and who adopts it? *Industrial and Labour Relations Review,* 47(2), 173–188.

Posti, D. K. (2015). The contribution of workforce diversity to organizational performance. *Strategic Management Journal*. 11, 479-492.

Pulko, W. (2009). Testing the robustness of the job demands resource model. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 13(3), 378-391.

Richardo, N. (2011). Leveraging Employee Engagement for Competitive Advantage: HR's Strategic Role. *Human Resource Magazine*, 52 (3), 1-11.

Roufaiel, N. S. & Meissner, M. (2015). Self-Managing Teams: A Pipeline to Quality and Technology Management. *Benchmarking for Quality*, 2(1), 21-37.

Salamatu, H. (2014). The role of teambuilding on employee performance. The Kaduna case. *Journal of Management Development*, 27(7), 708-726.

Schultz, W. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 3-30.

Shanks, J. (2015). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organisational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 171-194.

Staw, B. M. (2011). Organizational psychology and the pursuit of the happy/productive worker. *California Management Review*, 6(3), 40-53.

Stiles, P. & Kulvisaechana, S. (2015). *Human Capital and Performance: A Literature Review*. Judge Institute of Management, University of Cambridge, UK.

Tracy, B. (2016). *Successful Leader*, Moulds Sixth, Translator: Suharsono Delapatrasa Pustaka, Jakarta.

Uchendu, C., Anijaobi, A., & Odigwe, S. (2010). Engaging People who Drive Execution and Organizational Performance. *American Journal of Economics and Business Administration*, 3(3), 569-575.

Uzohuo, A. U. (2016). *Effect of gender diversity on organizational performance*. Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka. Unpublished Thesis.

Wageman, R. (2015). Critical Success Factors for Creating Superb Self-managing Teams. *Organizational Dynamics*, 26(1), 49-60.

Waterson (2007) Waterson, P., Clegg, C., Bolden, R., Pepper, K., Warr,P. and Wall, T. (1997). The Use and Effectiveness of Modern Manufacturing Practices in the United Kingdom. Sheffield: Institute of Work Psychology.

Wilson, F. (2016), 'Great Teams Build Themselves. *Team Performance Management: An International Journal*, 2(2), 27-31.

Wright, D. (2013). Servant leadership and paternalistic leadership styles in the Turkish business context: a comparative empirical study. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 33(3), 300-316.

Yahaya, B. (2011) The Impact of integrating harmonization in teambuilding on employee's service delivery in an organization: A study in Kano. European Journal of Business of Management, 3(8), 53- 60.

Zaltman, G. & Duncan, R.(2017) *Strategies for Planned Change.* New York: Wiley.

APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRE

PERSONAL INFORMATION

PART A

Instruction: Tick (√) on the option that best describe you;

1. Gender: Male ( )　　　　Female ( )

2. Educational Qualifications: O'Level ( ), S.S.C.E. ( ), B.Sc./B.Ed. ( ), M.Sc. ( )

PART B

Please kindly indicate your opinion by ticking (√) for each question from the list of options provided that is most appropriate to you;

SA = Strongly Agree; A =Agree; D= Disagree; SD= Strongly Disagree; N = Neutral

S/N	Item Descriptions	SA	A	D	SD	U
	Harmonization of employees	5	4	3	2	1
1	My team has created an environment where vulnerability and openness are the norm					
2	My team is comfortable engaging in unfiltered conversation about important topics					
3	My team has the ability to buy into clear decisions leaving little room for ambiguity and second guessing					
4	My team does not hesitate to confront one another about performance related and behavioural concerns. The givers and receivers of such feedback are able to handle it maturely					
5	My team values collective outcomes and results more than individual recognition and attainment of status					
	Performance of Employees					
6	My team's cooperation has increased the Service delivery of the employees					
7	Reduction of conflicts between employees has the services my team deliver					
8	Working in harmony has increased my team's services we deliver					
9	The trust my team has among our employees has improved the services we delivery					
10	The commitment of my team has improved harmony and service delivery					

APPENDIX B: RESULTS OF CRONBACH'S ALPHA

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	10	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	10	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.771	.771	10

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Pretest Responses	36.60	1.647	10
Post-Test Responses	36.30	1.636	10

Summary Item Statistics

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum / Minimum	Variance
Inter-Item Correlations	.627	.627	.627	.000	1.000	.000

APPENDIX C: RESULTS OF THE TEST OF HYPOTHESIS

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Harmonization of employees	20.36	5.100	250
Performance of employees	20.71	4.741	250

Correlations

		Harmonization of employees	Performance of employees
Harmonization of employees	Pearson Correlation	1	.987**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	250	250
Performance of employees	Pearson Correlation	.987**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	250	250

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