

SHIV SHAKTI

**International Journal in Multidisciplinary and
Academic Research (SSIJMAR)**

**Vol. 5, No. 6, December 2016 (ISSN 2278 –
5973)**

**The Sustainable Development Of Teamwork Among Employees In Msme's At
Tiruchirappalli.District.**

Dr. B. Anitha Rani

J.J. College of Arts and Science(Autonomous) - Pudukkottai

Corresponding Author :- anithadharini@gmail.com

**Impact Factor = 3.133 (Scientific Journal Impact Factor Value for 2012 by Inno Space
Scientific Journal Impact Factor)**

Global Impact Factor (2013)= 0.326 (By GIF)

Indexing:



Abstract

The Government of India has implemented various schemes for providing support and impetus to this sector. One of the landmark measures was the enactment of The Micro, Small & Medium Enterprises Development Act 2006 (MSMED). The Act defines micro, small and medium units based on their investment in plant and machinery. Some of the important initiatives undertaken by the government are –availability of collateral free loans, cluster development for increasing productivity, capacity and competitiveness, capital subsidy scheme for technology upgradation etc.

The clear thrust of the recent policy initiatives has been three-fold: i) enhance competitiveness through encouraging an innovative ethos amongst firms and being quality conscious; ii) increase links with multiple stakeholders with a view to benefit from networks both nationally and globally; and iii) strive for a larger market presence beyond the domestic area. The policy attaches importance to networking with stakeholders both upstream and downstream in the entire global value chain, from raw material procurement to processing/manufacturing to marketing to customer services.

Keywords : Teamwork, Procurement, Innovation, MSME.

Introduction

A sustainable employee group working in a cohesive manner is an important factor affecting employee commitment to the organisations. A team is a small number of individuals with complementary skills who are committed to a common goal for which they hold themselves mutually accountable. Two types of teams are used in organisations – self-managed work team and project teams. A self-managed team is a small group of people empowered to handle a particular ongoing task. A project team, on the other hand, is organised for a non-routine task for a limited duration and ceases to exist when the job is done¹⁴.

Team members should be selected depending on the skills required to achieve the goal, like technical, problem-solving, interpersonal and organisational skills. Individuals with specific skills are recruited and the team leader must play the roles of initiator, model and coach, rewards must be used to align team members' interests with the organisational goals¹⁵.

Globalisation has brought about many changes in the business environment, organisations need to respond immediately to the market demand, and teamwork accompanied by efficient leadership is the key to counter the changes in the workplace conditions¹⁶.

Jim Billington's¹⁷ "The Three Essentials of an Effective Team" specified the three vital components: They are

Commitment

Successful teams demonstrate shared dedication to the achievement of specific performance goals and individual members commit themselves to specific targets and hold each other accountable for their outcome.

Competence

Members' core competencies determine a team's effectiveness and concentrate on these three attributes while selecting the participants – technical competence, problem-solving ability and interpersonal talents.

Common goals

Successful teams invest tremendous time and effort in exploring, shaping and agreeing on a purpose that belongs to them both collectively and individually.

In "3-D Chess: Boosting Team Productivity through emotional intelligence", Steve Barth¹⁸ focused on interpersonal skills for successful teamwork. To bring out the strengths in the team, three critical ingredients are necessary:

- 1. Trust:** Members share caring and concern for one another and view each other as honest and committed to the team's purpose.
- 2. Group identity:** Members feel that they need the group and the group needs them and that their task is worthwhile.
- 3. Group efficacy:** Participants feel confident that they can achieve their task together than working individually.

Jeffery et al¹⁹ suggested two team characteristics that impact the nature of interaction among team members that may serve as moderators of the relationship among teamwork processes and team effectiveness criteria. The first potential variable is **task interdependence**, which refers to the degree to which team members depend on one another for their efforts, information, and resources. When task interdependence in a work unit is higher, there are a larger number of interpersonal interactions and also greater complexity in coordinating these interactions. When task interdependence in a work unit is lower, members work more independently, requisite interpersonal interaction is more limited, and member contributions are pooled rather than integrated. Therefore, consistent with the logic outlined above, we expect that teamwork process should have stronger relationships with team effectiveness in teams with higher task interdependence and weaker relationships with team effectiveness in teams with lower task interdependence.

A second variable that may moderate the relationship between teamwork processes and team effectiveness is **team size**. Larger teams have more linkages among members than do smaller ones and therefore face greater coordination challenges. Larger teams are also more prone to motivation and coordination losses that further emphasize the need for effective teamwork activities. Finally, larger teams may have greater difficulty developing and maintaining role structures that replace the need for on-going mutual adjustment to integrate task contributions. Therefore, team outcomes will hinge more on effective teamwork processes among larger, as compared to smaller, teams. They are further indicate that meta analytic results also show that teamwork processes have positive relationships with team performance and member satisfaction, and that the relationships are similar across the teamwork dimensions and levels of process specificity.

Russell, Andrew and Lehman²⁰ in their article on peer justice,(which is defined as a shared perception of how individuals who work together within the same unit and who do not have any formal authority over each other judge the fairness with which they treat one another), found that peer procedural justice influence team outcome variables, including performance, through teamwork processes.

Steven and Mark (2010)²¹ in their article have discussed two basic models of collaborative teamwork – i) the ostensive approach defines how things should be done, and is said to be useful for analysis, documentation, simulation and automation, ii) the performative approach focuses on observing actual practices, and is recommended for discovering

innovative methods for using existing systems as well as monitoring deviations from normative practice.

Leaders influence the performance of the team and are responsible for identifying potential obstacles between a team and its goals, discovering solutions to those obstacles and implementing a preferred course of action. The functional perspective regards leadership as social problem solving in which leaders do whatever needs to be done for the group to succeed, which in effect increases employee morale and confidence in their work organisations.²²

Generally human resource is a crucial component in the existence and functioning of an enterprise. They form the backbone of the organisation and are instrumental in tiding over the changes both favourable and unfavourable faced by the enterprise and are the strong pillars that lay the foundation for the organisation's long term growth and sustenance. Their performance is an index that determines the profitability of an enterprise as sick companies can bounce back with the support and determination of its employees. It goes without saying that a highly motivated workforce is an invaluable asset to the continuous success of an enterprise, more specifically in the present day competitive and technology driven environment.

The first independent variable in the study is teamwork. Employee engagement is both an individual and group level phenomenon. Employers need to create an environment which encourages building relationships as they satisfy the basic need of belongingness. Moreover, they will be able to connect better with the people they see and work with every day. In other words, team work helps in promoting an environment of engagement.⁹ Employers should provide ample opportunities for frequent interaction among team members and also between teams as it will help in exchanging ideas and finding solutions to problems. Thus, team work is an important factor to be considered in promoting a culture of engagement in an organisation.

An interesting detail that highlights the importance of employee engagement in the last two decades – Brookings Institute's study (2003)¹ has identified employee engagement as the fuel that drives the value of intangible assets. Their study examined the primary source of market value in today's organisations and how it has changed over the last two decades. In 1982, 62% of the market value came from tangible assets (like machinery, products etc.) and

38% came from intangible assets (like brand, intellectual property and most importantly quality of workforce). In 2002, almost 80% of the market value came from intangible assets and a mere 20 % came from tangible assets. Products can be copied, infrastructure can be built but it is impossible to replicate the quality of an organisation's talented and passionate workforce.

Specific objectives of the study are:

1. To analyse the engagement level of employees in MSMEs based on the demographic details – age, level in the organisation, experience in the present unit, total experience and gender.
2. To study the impact of Team work on employee engagement level.
3. To determine the key factors influencing performance at work and satisfaction at work.
4. To identify the key drivers of engagement.
5. To provide suggestions to improve the engagement level of employees in MSME.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The present study has the following limitations:

- 1) The main objective of the study is to examine the perceptions of the employees on their levels of engagement in the micro, small and medium enterprises. Hence, this study did not concentrate on individual organisations.
- 2) There are many variables that influence engagement, but the study is confined to five selected variables only.
- 3) Social and religious settings of the employees have not been considered for the study.
- 4) The educational qualifications of the employees have not been considered for the study.
- 5) The study is confined to those MSMEs situated in Trichy region only.

I.15.METHOD OF RESEARCH

Survey method through structured questionnaire was adopted for the study.

I.15.1. Sampling frame and data collection procedure

Primary data required for the study was collected through questionnaires distributed to 500 employees who belonged to top management, middle management and employees in the MSMEs. They represented workforce employed in the private sector mainly in Trichy region of Tamil Nadu working in different functional areas like production, sales, marketing, finance accounts and administration departments. A total of 42 units have been covered in the study – 18 micro units, 14 small units and 10 medium units.

Convenience sampling has been adopted taking into account availability and approachability of employees for the purpose of data collection.

A total of 500 questionnaires have been distributed after translating the questions in the native language for the convenience of the employees after obtaining the consent of the owners/HR department officials. Completed questionnaires received were 445, which represents 89% response rate and only 441 questionnaires were used and the remaining were discarded as they were incomplete and could not be used for statistical purposes.

I.15.2. Data collection period

Questionnaires were circulated and collected over six months from March 2013 to August 2013. The questionnaires were checked and collected to avoid omissions and mistakes by the employees while responding to the questions.

I.16. RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

The research instrument used for this study is questionnaire. It was designed to measure engagement, team work, leadership, relation with owner/top management, work culture and compensation of the workforce. The questionnaire comprises of three sections measuring the level of engagement of the employees and determining the important factor determining satisfaction and performance at work.

Relationship between team work and other variables

Hypothesis

H₀: There is no influence between team work and other variables.

H₁: There is significant influence between team work and other variables.

Team work and other variables are entered in stepwise regression analysis as a part of this analysis. Dependent variable is team work and the independent variables are engagement, leadership and work culture.

Table 4.5

TABLE SHOWING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEAM WORK AND OTHER VARIABLES

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.623 (a)	.388	.386	9.38671
2	.669 (b)	.447	.444	8.93656
3	.674(c)	.455	.449	8.89124

a. Predictors (Constant) : Leadership

b. Predictors (Constant) : Leadership, Engagement

c. Predictors (Constant) : Leadership, Engagement and Work culture.

The above table shows the summary of the models for R, R^2 , Adjusted R^2 and standard error of estimate. R^2 value indicates the percentage variance in the dependent variable that is accounted for by the linear combination of independent variables. The R^2 values for model 1,2 and 3 are 0.388, 0.447 and 0.449 respectively which indicates the variance explained by linear combination of leadership, engagement and work culture.

Table 4.6

TABLE SHOWING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEAM WORK AND OTHER VARIABLES

ANOVA (d)						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	17839.546	1	17839.546	202.468	.000 (a)
	Residual	28107.183	319	88.110		
	Total	45946.729	320			
2	Regression	20550.559	2	10275.279	128.663	.000 (b)
	Residual	25396.170	318	79.862		
	Total	45946.729	320			
3	Regression	20886.547	3	6962.182	88.068	.000 (c)
	Residual	25060.182	317	79.054		

	Total	45946.729	320			
--	-------	-----------	-----	--	--	--

- a. Predictors (Constant) : Leadership
- b. Predictors (Constant) : Leadership, Engagement
- c. Predictors (Constant) : Leadership, Engagement, Work culture
- d. Dependent variable : Team work

Table 4.7

TABLE SHOWING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEAM WORK AND OTHER VARIABLES

Coefficients(a)						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	26.357	3.592		7.338	.000
	Leadership	.628	.044	.623	14.229	.000
2	(Constant)	7.201	4.744		1.518	.130
	Leadership	.456	.051	.452	8.871	.000
	Engagement	.382	.066	.297	5.826	.000
3	(Constant)	6.603	4.728		1.396	.164
	Leadership	.389	.060	.386	6.441	.000
	Engagement	.329	.070	.256	4.693	.000
	Work culture	.130	.063	.128	2.062	.040

a. Dependent Variable: Team work

Source: Primary data

The F test shows that the three models are statistically significant as represented in the above tables. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and there is significant relation between team work, the dependent variable and the independent variables – leadership, engagement and work culture.

1. Sample population does not differ significantly in their perceptions towards working as a team when classified on the basis of team work. However the mean values show that team spirit is better among the men as compared to the women employees.
2. There is no significant difference with regard to the perception of the employees towards team work irrespective of their experience in the same organisation or different organisations.

3. Results reveal that there is a high level of significance among team members in their perception towards coordination among the employees at different levels in an organisation.
4. Mean values highlight the fact that older the employee better the relation with his team members. The F value shows that there is no significant difference among the employees in the different age groups.
5. Employees in the manufacturing industry show greater level of team spirit. The mean score is marginally lower among the service staff. The F value shows that there is no significant difference among the employees in the different in the different type of industries.

CONCLUSION

The above conclusions throw insight into the expectations of the employees in making the workplace enjoyable and the job fulfilling, satisfying and meeting the career aspirations of employees. Teamwork processes are positively related to team effectiveness criteria. Effects of teamwork processes may depend on the nature of the interactions the teams employ to complete their work that is, when the level, mindfulness, or complexity of task work is relatively high, team processes should play a more central role in task accomplishment and thereby exhibit stronger relationships with team outcomes. In contrast, when the level, mindfulness, or complexity of task work is relatively low, team processes should evidence weaker relationships with outcomes.

1. Compensation strategies 2011. Report on salary surveys, June 2011, vol.11, Issue 6 pages 9-10
2. Duncan Brown. Measuring The Effectiveness Of Pay And Rewards: The Achilles' Heel Of Contemporary Reward Professionals. By: Brown, Duncan. Compensation & Benefits Review, Sep/Oct2008, Vol. 40 Issue 5, p23-41.
3. Gene Raymondi. Strength in numbers: Maximize benefits by coordinating EAP, work-life programs. Employee Benefit News, Apr2011, Vol. 25 Issue 5, pages14-15.
4. Compensation and Benefits. <http://hrcouncil.ca/hr-toolkit/planning-compensation.cfm>
5. CFO Innovation staff. Low employee engagement troubles a third of companies. July 2010. <http://www.cfoinnovation.com/content/low-employee-engagement-troubles-third-companies-global-survey-finds>.

6. Schermerhorn Jr., James C. Management For Productivity, John Wiley & Sons, 1986, pages 216,217.
7. LaurainneTheogaraj.Op.cit., Page. 23-43.
8. Rachna Gupta. Op. cit., pages 56 – 60.
9. Paul L. Marciano(2010). Carrots and sticks don't work – Build a culture of employee engagement with the principles of RESPECT, pages 79 – 80.