EMPLOYEE INVOLVEMENT: A TOOL FOR WORK TEAM EFFECTIVENESS

M Mahabeer*, P Govender**

Abstract

The study aims to investigate effective employee involvement as a tool for work team effectiveness. The quantitative approach to the study was conducted using a sample of 150 employees in a construction company, in Kwa-Zulu Natal, South Africa. The data was conducted using a questionnaire and validity and reliability was assessed using Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha. Data was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Statistical techniques were utilized to test the hypotheses. Either partial acceptance or acceptance of all hypotheses is evident in the study. The results were compared and contrasted with that of other researchers. The research indicates that the sub-dimensions of employee involvement significantly impact on the sub-dimensions of work team effectiveness in varying degrees, and employee involvement is an imperative tool for work team effectiveness.

Keywords: Employee Involvement, Team Effectiveness, Organizational Productivity, Team Effectiveness, Employee Contribution

*School of Management, Information Technology & Governance, University of KwaZulu Natal (Westville campus), Private Bag X54001, Durban 4000, South Africa
**School of Management, Information Technology & Governance, University of KwaZulu Natal (Westville campus), Private Bag X54001, Durban 4000, South Africa
Tel: +27 31 2607335
Email: govenderpa@ukzn.ac.za*

1 Introduction

The global economic meltdown compels a refocus on businesses processes. The strategic focus of organizations is profits, productivity, effectiveness and efficiency with employee contributions being the fulcrum of business leverage. With job satisfaction, employee involvement and motivation and the honing of employees skills, the end result is effective teamwork and long-term organizational success. Employees pilot organizational processes, and employee involvement and teamwork is posited as a key issue in today's competitive and strategic work environment. Wu, Wang and Tsai (2010) assert that the effectiveness of teams cannot be analyzed within a vacuum, but as part of a larger economic, strategic and technological arena. The study embraces and notes scholarly views in order to outline challenges in an organizational environment.

2 Literature Review

Understanding the key roles of effective work teams stem from the rampant tendency for contemporary organizations to restructure, re-invent and downsize, creating new roles. Fostering team efforts require proper guidance and support for team unit cohesiveness. In this light, high-involvement team practices can instigate proactive attitudes which enhances performance, including quality and effectiveness which ultimately leads to overall organizational goals. Hence, teamwork can be used strategically by organizations.

According to Kozlowski and Ilgen (2006), the emergence of a contemporary perspective over the last decade of work team effectiveness revolves around the organizational context of the team, where work team effectiveness is a direct outcome of the organisational framework which impacts on team dynamics. Salas, Stagle and Burke (2004) express work team effectiveness according to its members attributes, the nature of the task, work structure and changes and emphasize organizational situational factors which determine the outcome of work team effectiveness, such as, reward systems, management control, team interventions and resource scarcity. Overall a team is the organizing of employees in an attempt to capitalise on their collective competencies (Bagraim, Cunningham, Potgieter & Viedge, 2007).

Work teams are responsible for the production of goods or the provision of services (Cohen & Bailey, 1999). They are carefully composed, share high levels of commitment and build on each other's competencies (Khan, Ahmed, Akbar, Khan & Hijazi, 2011). Cross-functional teams are used regularly by team-based and conventional organizations, whereas parallel teams performs functions which the regular organization is not equipped to perform optimally and

is associated with problem-solving and improvement-oriented activities. Time limited project teams may be specialized to perform an array of activities simultaneously as opposed to sequentially which saves the organization's time, which is important for time-based competition (Cohen & Bailey, 1999). Management teams highlight the hierarchical structures and for upper management to share responsibility and work towards the overall organizational goals; whereas problem-solving teams rarely have the authority to unilaterally implement any of their suggested actions (Robbins, Judge, Odendaal & Roodt, 2009). Self-managed teams solve problems, implement solutions and take responsibility for outcomes (Robbins et al., 2009); whereas virtual teams increases the effectiveness of performance by the ease of access across time zones and in the pooling of specific talent. They help in dealing with these fast paced environments (Tyson & York, 2000).

The models of work team effectiveness support organizational success, such as, group dynamics and composition. Earlier models of work team effectiveness are based on the mutual accountability, skills and commitment of teams whereas more contemporary models, such as LaFasto and Larson (2001), Hackman (2002) and Lencioni (2005) propose teamwork models as active entities. LaFasto and Larson (2001) developed a model of work team effectiveness, which stems from an investigation carried out with 600 teams in various industries. They base their model of work team effectiveness around five dynamics and when it is aligned with organizational goals it makes the culture conducive to achieving those goals. The key lies in selecting the right people for the composition of the team, thereafter building on the five dynamics of effective teamwork: organizational environment, team leadership, team problem-solving, team relationships, and team members.

Hackman (2002) proposes that for work team effectiveness to be at optimum levels, certain conditions must be met, which are expressed in the suggestion that it is not only a team by name but a 'real' active, working team. The team understands its direction and works as a cohesive unit; the structure of the organization is one which facilitates teamwork; the organizational context supports the operation of the team and there is a vast pool of expert coaches available for mentoring. Hackman (2002) suggests further that there are five essential conditions for work team effectiveness, namely:

- A 'real' team has four features: a task, defined boundaries, autonomy and stability.
- Goals of the team are clear and challenging, focusing on the results rather than the means to achieving them.
- An effective structure refers to whether the norms of the organization elevate or impede teamwork.

- A supportive organizational framework refers to whether the team has access to sufficient resources, information, rewards and support members to accomplish their tasks.
- Valuable coaching refers to the availability of an expert coach for guidance and support which improves coordination and collaboration and aids in taking advantage of emerging opportunities.

According to the Lencioni Model all teams possess the potential to be dysfunctional and to improve team functioning. Furthermore, the five potential dysfunctions of a team are absence of trust; fear of conflict; lack of commitment; avoidance of accountability and inattention to results. Some team conflict is necessary or it becomes difficult for team members to commit to decisions.

Certain criteria leads to greater levels of work team effectiveness and self-managing team behaviours are a conceived set of actions which enhances team effectiveness and portrays the outcome of the team's activity (Kozlowski & Ilgen, 2006). They emphasize team performance, team viability and team process improvement as the three dimensions of team effectiveness. Team performance is established through measures such as quality, quantity and working within an allocated budget (Ulrich & Brockbank, 2005). Knowledge, skills and abilities (KSA's) of the team needs continuous improvement through team training for an organizational climate where teams learn by virtue of doing (Mei, 2008). Team viability becomes a component of team self-managing behaviours as it represents the team members' ability to deal with difficulties which impede their social stability. A viable team is able to sustain effective levels of performance over time (Kozlowski & Bell, 2003). With team process improvement team members refine current processes and engineer innovative solutions to optimize task outcomes (Hinds & Mortensen, 2005). De Dreu's (2007) view is that team process improvement fosters a sense of encouragement where members are able to distinguish performance gaps and set improvement gaps for themselves, leading to a more complete and comprehensive understanding of tasks (Bushe & Coetzer, 2007).

Employee involvement is a foundational element in building a culture of effective teamwork, for growth and organizational productivity. Employee involvement empowers employees to appropriate levels in order to participate in managerial decision-making and improvement activities relevant to their levels within the organization (Apostolou, 2000). According to Sun, Hui, Tam and Frick (2000), employee involvement also entails the closest proximity to the problem or opportunity as employees are equipped for decision-making and problem-solving.

According to Richardson, Vandenberg and Richardson, 2005), Edward Lawler identified four interconnected principles for a high-involvement work

system, that is power, information, knowledge and rewards. Employees must perceive high levels of all four attributes for optimal employee involvement (Bowen & Ostroff, 2004). Power without knowledge, information and rewards may lead to poor decision-making. Information and knowledge without power leads to individuals feeling aggravated because they are unable to use their capabilities fully. Rewards for organizational performance without power, knowledge and information can lead to aggravation and decreased motivation. Information, knowledge and power without rewards for organizational performance are detrimental because there will be no leverage or incentive to ensure that employees exercise their individual resources that will contribute to organizational effectiveness (Riordan, Vandenberg & Richardson, 2005).

Employee involvement with other human resource management practices cannot be viewed in a vacuum (Kim, 2002). To ensure the successful implementation of high-involvement systems, management needs to ensure that virtually every major feature of the organization is designed differently. This can be solved by either adopting a 'self-design' approach (encompassing high amounts of learning and investigation) or participatory change processes (emphasizing beliefs, attitudes and behaviours of employees) (Kim, 2002). An influential organizational climate can be viewed in conjunction with the four principles of employee involvement: participative decision-making (power), information sharing (information), training (knowledge), and performance-based rewards (rewards) (Richardson & Vandenberg, 2005).

Employees who notice a climate of employee involvement should partake in the 'knowledgeable and informed application of creativity' and relevant perspectives in their daily work activities' (Riordan et al., 2005:474). Furthermore, employee involvement processes are shaped by other human resource practices (Ogungbamila, Adepeju & Adetula, 2010), where the perceived climate of employee involvement is able to provide a competitive advantage that is not easy to replicate. Human relations theorists argue that involvement-oriented work environments influence the attitudes of employees (Loo & Thorpe, 2002). These theorists suggest that the climate of employee involvement improves in its meaning when it is directly associated to an overall improved working environment, where employees will respond with positive emotions to an environment.

According to Cox, Zagelmeyer and Marchington (2006), the first indicator of embeddedness in employee involvement is 'breadth', which is measured by the number of employee involvement practices in the workplace. By emphasizing a culture of importance towards the breadth of employee involvement, this leads to the fostering of a network of embeddedness where multiple practices are interdependent for their successful operation.

Kessler's (2004) view is that the greater the 'breadth' of employee involvement practices within an organization, the more employees will feel committed with increased levels of job satisfaction. The second dimension is the 'depth' of employee involvement practice embeddedness. The 'depth' is an indicator of how embedded any single employee involvement practice is. This can be measured, for example, by the frequency of meetings and employee contributions, such as the regularity and thoroughness with which practices are applied can have a significant impact on the embeddedness of employee involvement practices (Cox et al., 2006).

Direct employee involvement requires individual participation, for example, in problem-solving groups or team-briefings, and indirect employee involvement practices entail, for example in workplace committees. The degree of influence attached to each technique also varies significantly (Duch, Waitzman & Amaral, 2010). Employees perceive employee involvement practices as more significant if they are given opportunities to exercise influence over an array of issues. Batt (2004) found that employees operate differently depending on whether they are used individually (direct) or in combination (indirect). According to Vandenberg et al. (1999), an organization may have a plethora of formal written policies on involvement, and managers may believe it is being practiced, but these policies and beliefs are worthless until the employees themselves perceive these as being imperative to their organizational well-being.

With participation in work decisions, employee involvement is evident as it encourages employees to express their views make valuable contributions. Consultive participation practices render a lesser level of employee influence than employees who merely participate in work decisions. Furthermore, employees are able to voice their opinion but may have complete decision-making power (Leana, Locke & Schweiger et al., 2000). Short-term participative decision-making management involves, for example, training sessions over several days or single laboratory sessions, which is formal and direct. Short-term participation does not seem to affect the perceived goal difficulty or acceptance by employees. Informal participation concerns the participative decision-making practices which occur without intent between managers and subordinates, such as interpersonal relationships (Leana et al., 2000). With employee ownership, employees are able to influence management decisions through mechanisms such as shareholder meetings. Attributes, such as, employee satisfaction, commitment, motivation and involvement are higher in employee-owned firms as it fosters a sense of employee accountability, leading to high levels of productivity and performance (Hall, Liu, Combs & Ketchen, 2006). Representative participation is similar to employee ownership, the influence is lower and it covers an array of issues as

the board of directors or worker councils cover all areas of content (Kim, 2002).

Employee involvement can be used strategically and an organization can optimize employee competencies for team development and effectiveness. Employee involvement affects every sphere of human resource management, including overall growth, productivity and organizational success. Employees would not only have the fulfillment and benefit of their own strengths, but as members of a team. Hence, with employee involvement, employees are proactive, committed and dedicated to their respective organizations.

Objectives of the study:

• to determine the perceptions of administrative employees regarding employee involvement and work team effectiveness;

• to determine whether employee involvement as a tool can impact work team effectiveness in a construction company.

3 Methodology

3.1 Respondents

The population comprised of all employees in a large construction company in Kwa-Zulu Natal, South Africa. The sample of 150 subjects (managers, supervisors and employees) was drawn using a stratified random sampling technique to ensure proportionate representation from the strata of the designated groups of interest. In terms of the composition, 23.3% of the sample consisted of

managers, 29.3% were supervisors and 47.4 % were employees.

3.2 Measuring Instrument

A self-developed questionnaire was utilized for data collection, consisting of two sections. Section A relates to the biographical data, which was measured using a nominal scale with pre-coded option categories. Section B comprised of 50 items relating to employee involvement and work team effectiveness, and was measured using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), neither agree/nor disagree (3), agree (4) to strongly agree (5).

3.3 Research Procedure

The study was conducted after Ethical Clearance was granted for the study.

3.4 Measures/Statistical Analysis of the Questionnaire

The validity of the questionnaire was assessed using Factor Analysis. A principal component analysis was used to extract initial factors. Factor analysis was performed using SPSS with an Orthogonal Varimax Rotation. In terms of the core areas impacting work team effectiveness five factors were extracted from the factor loading matrix. When items were significantly loaded on more than one factor, the item with the highest value was considered.

Table 1. Factor Analysis: The Validity of the Instrument Measuring Employee Involvement

Factor	Dimension	Eigen value	% of Total Variance
1	Job satisfaction	3.51	14.50
2	Empowerment	3.26	13.05
3	Employee commitment	3.028	12.11
4	Participative decision-making	2.60	10.40
5	Motivation	2.00	8.00

Table 2. Factor Analysis: The Validity of the Instrument Measuring Work Team Effectiveness

Factor	Dimension	Eigenvalue	% of Total Variance
1	Communication	3.70	14.80
2	Innovation	3.42	13.70
3	Teams Output	3.08	12.33
4	Performance Objectives	2.74	10.94
5	Team Member Skills	2.70	10.71

The reliability of the questionnaire was determined using Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha. The overall alpha coefficient was 0.611 for both employee involvement and work team effectiveness reflecting internal consistency and reliability. Descriptive statistics, using percentages, mean analyses and standard deviations were utilized for the study.

Inferential statistics included intercorrelations and multiple regression.

3.5 Administration of the Questionnaire

The questionnaires were administered by a departmental manager in the target organization. With personal administration of the questionnaire,

respondents had clarity about the questionnaire. Data was collected over two weeks. Anonymity and confidentiality was assured. The total of 150 questionnaires were returned from the distribution of 150 printed copies.

3.6 Statistical Analysis

Descriptive statistics and inferential statistics was utilized to evaluate objectives and hypotheses of the study.

4 Results

Employees were required to respond to the items assessing employee involvement and work team effectiveness using the 5 point Likert scale, which were analysed using descriptive statistics (Table 3).

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics: Key Dimensions of Employee Involvement and Work Team Effectiveness

Dimension	Mean	95 % Confidence Interval		Variance	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
		Lower Bound	Upper Bound				
Employee Involvement							
Empowerment	4.5275	4.4681	4.5869	0.135	0.3670	3.60	5.00
Participative Decision-making	4.4685	4.4109	4.5260	0.126	0.3555	3.20	5.00
Employee Commitment	4.4899	4.4279	4.5519	0.147	0.3830	3.60	5.00
Job Satisfaction	3.8980	3.8480	3.9480	0.095	0.3090	3.40	5.00
Motivation	3.8805	3.8354	3.9257	0.078	0.2790	3.20	5.00
Work Team Effectiveness							
Communication	4.5293	4.4678	4.5909	0.146	0.3182	3.20	5.00
Team Member Skills	4.5227	4.4643	4.5810	0.131	0.3618	3.80	5.00
Performance Objectives	4.4373	4.3800	4.4947	0.126	0.3555	3.60	5.00
Innovation	4.5093	4.4475	4.5712	0.147	0.3833	3.60	5.00
Teams Output	4.5987	4.5376	4.6597	0.143	0.3783	3.80	5.00

Table 3 indicates that the dimensions of employee involvement in this organization are occurring at varying degrees. Based on mean analyses the attainment of the dimensions of employee involvement are shown in descending order:
- Empowerment (Mean = 4.5275);
- Employee Commitment (Mean = 4.4899);
- Participative Decision-making (Mean = 4.4685);
- Job Satisfaction (Mean = 3.8980);
- Motivation (Mean = 3.8805).

The results indicate that for each of the dimensions there is room for improvement, as evidenced when the mean score value is compared against a maximum attainable score of 5. The analysis of the employee involvement sub-variables as indicated in Table 3 reflects that improvement is needed in terms of motivation and job satisfaction. However, very little improvement is needed with empowerment, participative decision-making and employee commitment, hence employees in this organization feel empowered in their jobs.

Table 3 indicates that the dimensions of work team effectiveness in this organization are also accomplished at varying degrees. Based on mean analyses the attainment of the dimensions of work team effectiveness are as follows in descending order:
- Teams output (Mean = 4.5987);
- Communication (Mean = 4.5293);
- Team members' skills (Mean = 4.5227);
- Innovation (Mean = 4.5093);
- Performance objectives (Mean = 4.4373).

The results indicate that for each of the dimensions there is room for improvement as evidenced when the mean score value is compared against a maximum attainable score of 5. This implies that the sub-dimension of the teams output require the least amount of improvement as opposed to performance objectives, which require a greater room for level of room for enhancement in this organization. Hence, the teams output in this organization is fairly high as very little improvement is required.

The discussions focus on the five dimensions of employee involvement (empowerment, participative decision-making, employee commitment, job satisfaction and motivation); and work team effectiveness (communication, the skills of team

members, performance objectives, innovation and the output of teams).

When assessing employee involvement, it was found that empowerment was first out of five dimensions determining employee involvement. Clearly empowerment is evident in this organization. In addition, against a maximum attainable score of 5, empowerment (Mean = 4.5275) reflects that the least amount of attention is needed in comparison to the other dimensions in this study. A similar view of Bagraim et al. (2007) is that empowerment can be utilised strategically and elevated through employees. Furthermore, Kirkman and Rosen (2000) indicate that the capability of employees is to make decisions regarding processes which increases employee responsibility and encourages empowerment.

When assessing employee involvement in this study, it was found employee commitment was second out of five dimensions determining employee involvement. Employee commitment is seen to be high within this organization. When compared against the maximum attainable score of 5 (Mean = 4.4899), the commitment of employees to their jobs and to the organization is clearly high although there is room for improvement. Whitener (2001) associates the degree of commitment amongst employees to the working conditions and employment practices which encompass the organization and the job. Employee commitment is the driving force behind any successful organization. Enhancing commitment to escalate employee involvement entails building relationships with employees, so that they feel valued within the organization.

In assessing employee involvement, it was found that participative decision-making was third out of five dimensions in determining employee involvement. Participative decision-making forms a great part of this organization. When compared against the maximum attainable score of 5, participative decision-making (Mean = 4.4685) reflects that although there is room for improvement with regards to this dimension, but there is a positive culture of participative decision-making in this organization. Vandenberg et al. (1999) emphasize that participative decision-making cannot be merely laid out in written policies, it must be actively practiced and continuously improved in order to remain effective. Leana et al. (2000) suggest that participative decision-making within organizations encourages employees to express their views and feel valuable to the organization. Buchanan and Huczynski (2004) add that participative decision-making should not be used as a method to comfort employees and ensure their retention, but as a strategic organizational tool.

In assessing employee involvement, it was found that job satisfaction was fourth out of five dimensions in determining employee involvement. When compared against a maximum attainable score of 5, job satisfaction (Mean = 3.8980) requires much improvement within this organization. Job satisfaction

is the relationship between expectations and outcome (Zwick, 2004). Although the obvious contributions to job satisfaction such as pay, working conditions and work content form a great deal of what increases job satisfaction, it is an ongoing process (Quagraine, 2010) which must be nurtured so that individuals morale is increased, including their overall satisfaction with their work and their organization.

In assessing employee involvement, it was found that motivation was fifth out of five dimensions in determining employee involvement. When compared against a maximum attainable score of 5, motivation (Mean = 3.8805) reflects that the most improvement is needed in motivating people in this organization. Gagne and Deci (2005) attribute the levels of employee motivation to the intrinsic and extrinsic aspects of the job and the setting of realistic goals for employees. Motivation is to ensure that employees remain committed to a task and are eager for the emergence of positive outcomes. By providing individuals with variety and change, creative tasks, power and influence and recognition, this acts as a catalyst to high levels of self-development and motivation (Buchanan & Huczynski, 2004).

In this study, when assessing work team effectiveness, the teams output was first out of five dimensions in determining work team effectiveness. The output of teams is high. In addition, against a maximum attainable score of 5, the output of teams (Mean = 4.5987) indicates that the least amount of improvement was needed. Hinds and Mortensen (2005) propose that the quality of the teams output depends on the input, process and overall product factors used. For optimum team output a correlation must exist between individuals and team goals, team climate and high level of interaction between team members (Naquin & Tynan, 2003). The culture of the organization is a major component in team output, as the value of their work is recognised with success (Gray & Densten, 2012).

In this study, when assessing work team effectiveness, it was found that communication was second out of five dimensions in determining work team effectiveness. Communication is importannt for work team effectiveness. Against a maximum attainable score of 5 communication (Mean = 4.5293) reflects that this area needs improvement in this organization and it is a high priority. Communication is a strategic tool, whereas conflict creates openness and honesty. Brooks (2003) indicates that a climate of free-flowing communication allows for quality improvement. The structure of the organization dictates the degree, consistency and the methods in which team members make use of communication strategies (Quigley, 2003).

When assessing work team effectiveness in this study, it was found that team member skills was third out of five dimensions. Against a maximum attainable score of 5, team member skills (Mean = 4.5227) indicates that some improvement is required in this

area. Bagraim et al. (2007) suggests that the strength of team members' skills lies in the roles team members take upon themselves. The interdependency of teamwork contributes to the development of knowledge, skills and the abilities of team members.

When assessing work team effectiveness, it was found that innovation was fourth out of five dimensions in determining work team effectiveness. Against a maximum score of 5, innovation (Mean = 4.5093) reflects that there is room for improvement with innovative methods. The degree of innovation amongst team members must be viewed in terms of the characteristics which are congruent to effective teams and leads to greater innovation (Mickan & Rodger, 2000). The innovative nature of teams and processes should be flexibile to deal with the unpredictable workforce of the 21st century (Buchanan & Huczynsk, 2004).

In this study, when assessing work team effectiveness, it was found that performance objectives was fifth out of five dimensions in determining work team effectiveness. Against a maximum attainable score of 5, performance objectives (Mean = 4.4373) needs the most improvement. Colquitt, Lepine & Wesson, (2009) affirm that performance objectives provide tailored strategic purpose for team members and guides team development. Brooks (2003) argues that the most

imperative part of performance objectives regarding team effectiveness is Management By Objectives (MBO). MBO base employees evaluations on whether they achieve specific performance goals according to mutually agreed upon objectives that are measurable and specific (Youssef & Luthans, 2007). Also, Behaviourally Anchored Rating Scales (BARS) assesses performance by directly assessing performance behaviours (Gray & Densten, 2012). The BARS approach uses critical incidents to create a measurement instrument to evaluate performance (Colquitt et al., 2009). The authors advocate for the use of a 360 degree feedback system when planning for the success of performance objectives.

5 Inferential Statistics

5.1 Hypothesis 1

There exists significant intercorrelations amongst the sub-dimensions of employee involvement (empowerment, participative decision-making, employee commitment, job satisfaction, motivation) and the sub-dimensions of work team effectiveness (communication, the skills of team members, performance objectives, innovation, output of teams), respectively.

Table 4. Intercorrelations amongst the sub-dimensions of Employee Involvement and Work Team Effectiveness

Sub-dimensions of Employee Involvement and Work Team Effectiveness		Empower-ment	Participative Decision-making	Employee Commit-ment	Job Satisfaction	Motivation
Communication	r	0.065	0.002	0.187*	-0.068	-0.108
	p	0.427	0.982	0.22	0.406	0.190
Team Member Skills	r	0.042	0.078	-0.019	0.146	-0.184*
	p	0.608	0.342	0.816	0.074	0.025
Performance Objectives	r	0.048	0.119	-0.024	0.026	0.054
	p	0.560	0.147	0.771	0.749	0.511
Innovation	r	-0.021	-0.10	0.151	-0.100	-0.008
	p	0.794	0.899	0.064	0.225	0.927
Teams Output	r	0.048	0.132	-0.032	0.076	0.055
	p	0.561	0.107	0.700	0.358	0.506

*$p<0.05$

Table 4 indicates that:

• Employee commitment correlates significantly but inversely with communication at the 5% level of significance.

• Furthermore, motivation correlates significantly but inversely with team member skills at the 5% level of significance.

However, Table 4 indicates that no significant intercorrelations exist between the sub-dimensions of

employee involvement and the sub-dimensions of work team effectiveness.

Hence, Hypothesis 1 may be partially accepted.

5.2 Hypothesis 2

The sub-dimensions of empowerment, participative decision-making, employee commitment, job satisfaction and motivation significantly account for the variance in determining employee involvement.

Table 5. Multiple Regression: Employee Involvement

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimation
1	0.418[a]	0.175	0.170	0.12040
2	0.639[b]	0.408	0.400	0.10235
3	0.776[c]	0.602	0.594	0.08416
4	0.913[d]	0.833	0.828	0.05476
5	1.000[e]	1.000	1.000	0.00000
Model	Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	
	B	Std. Error	Beta	P
Empowerment	0.200	0.000	0.556	0.000
Participative Decision-making	0.200	0.000	0.538	0.000
Job Satisfaction	0.200	0.000	0.468	0.000
Employee Commitment	0.200	0.000	0.580	0.000
Motivation	0.200	0.000	0.422	0.000

Table 5 indicates that the sub-dimensions of empowerment, participative decision-making, job satisfaction, employee commitment and motivation account for 100% of the variance (Adjusted R Square = 1.000) in determining employee involvement.

Hence, Hypothesis 2 may be accepted.

5.3 Hypothesis 3

The sub-dimensions of empowerment, participative decision-making, employee commitment, job satisfaction and motivation significantly account for the variance in determining employee involvement.

Table 6. Multiple Regression: Employee Involvement

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimation
1	0.418[a]	0.175	0.170	0.12040
2	0.639[b]	0.408	0.400	0.10235
3	0.776[c]	0.602	0.594	0.08416
4	0.913[d]	0.833	0.828	0.05476
5	1.000[e]	1.000	1.000	0.00000
Model	Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	
	B	Std. Error	Beta	P
Empowerment	0.200	0.000	0.556	0.000
Participative Decision-making	0.200	0.000	0.538	0.000
Job Satisfaction	0.200	0.000	0.468	0.000
Employee Commitment	0.200	0.000	0.580	0.000
Motivation	0.200	0.000	0.422	0.000

Table 6 indicates that the sub-dimensions of empowerment, participative decision-making, job satisfaction, employee commitment and motivation account for 100% of the variance (Adjusted R Square = 1.000) in determining employee involvement.

Hence, Hypothesis 3 may be accepted.

However, each of these sub-dimensions impact on employee involvement to varying degrees. Based on the Beta loadings in Table 3, it is evident that employee commitment (Beta = 0.580), followed by empowerment, participative decision-making, job satisfaction and motivation impact on employee involvement at a diminishing level.

- Employee Commitment (Beta = 0.580);
- Empowerment (Beta = 0.556);
- Participative Decision-making (Beta = 0.538);
- Job Satisfaction (Beta = 0.468);
- Motivation (Beta = 0.422).

5.4 Hypothesis 4

The sub-dimensions of communication, the skills of team members, performance objectives, innovation and the output of teams significantly accounts for the variance in determining work team effectiveness.

Table 7. Multiple Regression: Work Team Effectiveness

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimation
1	0.509[a]	0.259	0.254	0.13412
2	0.688[b]	0.473	0.466	0.11348
3	0.793[c]	0.628	0.621	0.09564
4	0.893[d]	0.797	0.791	0.07098
5	1.000[e]	1.000	1.000	.00000
Model	Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	
	B	Std. Error	Beta	P
Teams Output	0.200	0.000	0.487	0.000
Communication	0.200	0.000	0.491	0.000
Performance Objectives	0.200	0.000	0.458	0.000
Innovation	0.200	0.000	0.494	0.000
Team Members Skills	0.200	0.000	0.466	0.000

Table 7 indicates that the sub-dimensions of the output of teams, communication, performance objectives, innovation and team member skills significantly account for 100% of the variances (Adjusted R Square = 100) in determining work team effectiveness.

Hence, Hypothesis 4 may be accepted.

However, the Beta loadings in Table 7 indicates that these five sub-dimensions impact on work team effectiveness to varying degrees. These sub-dimensions in decreasing levels impact work team effectiveness are:

- Innovation (Beta = 0.494);
- Communication (Beta = 0.491);
- Teams Output (Beta = 0.487);
- Team Member Skills (Beta = 0.466);
- Performance Objectives (Beta = 0.458).

The reliability of Section B of the questionnaire relating to the core factors of employee involvement and work team effectiveness was determined using Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha. Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha for both reflected 0.611. This indicates that items for both employee involvement and work team effectiveness have internal consistency and is reliable.

6 Recommendations

In this study, a lack of empowerment by a number of respondents may be attributed to them not being involved in processes in this organization. To enhance employees' feelings of involvement, organizations should embark on including employees in decision-making processes and make their jobs more interesting. Cognizance should be taken of employee recognition for the jobs that they perform. Bagraim et al. (2007) emphasize the need for a balance of power, where empowerment should allow for a better treatment of people, where all individuals are treated as being important, hence ultimately increasing empowerment within the organization.

Participative decision-making shows that employees require more opportunities to be more involvement regarding decision-making. Organizations who wish to increase participative decision-making should seek methods of cooperative task involvement and governance. Quagraine (2010) suggests that participative decision-making can be improved within organizations by increasing opportunities for flexibility and authority amongst staff.

Employee commitment in this study is lacking. Although the study shows that the feeling of commitment amongst staff is adequate, it warrants room for improvement. A decreased level of commitment affects them negatively by impeding their ability to produce their best. Employee commitment is essential for goal attainment and in decreasing the frequency of labour turnover. The commitment of employees within this organization can be improved through providing career path mentoring and other incentive tools such as opportunities for advancement.

In this study, a lack of job satisfaction leads to a decreased level of employee involvement. Low levels of job satisfaction impede job performance. Job satisfaction can be increased through obvious methods, such as, improving pay and working conditions or through employee stimulation. and job rotation. Job satisfaction can be increased through leadership creating a positive working climate, and receiving feedback regarding performance and contribution.

Low levels of motivation amongst employees in this organization are attributed to employees not feeling adequately involved. Employees who are not sufficiently motivated will not exert the greatest amount of effort in order for the optimum success of the organization. Motivation can be improved through

effective leadership, improving the structure of working units, enabling support, rewards and an improvement in job design (Bagraim et al., 2007).

In this study, a lack of communication impedes work team effectiveness. Employees who feel that communication is hindered are unable to perform to their optimum capabilities. Brooks (2003) states that communication in teams may be improved through constant feedback programmes, regular reviews on team performance which requires a two-way stance of communication and group solutions to issues.

The skills of team members require improvement, although it is perceived as adequate amongst employees. This may be attributed to team members not being equipped with the adequate skills or the incorrect individuals composing the team. The skills of team members require constant revision and improvement to adapt to an unpredictable work environment. The matching of skills to team tasks lead to an increased competitive advantage. Hegar (2012) suggests that the skills of team members need to be regularly reviewed and updated to deal with the ever-changing landscape of the workforce and its accompanying technological implications.

In this study, the performance objectives of teams are low. Team members who lack focus and to reach toward a common goal are unable to meet performance objectives. By improving clarity of purpose and allowing for the creative solution of problems, performance objectives can be met through the emphasis of the value the team is making to organizational success (De Dreu, 2007).

Innovation in this study is seen as adequate in increasing work team effectiveness, yet room for improvement is required. This may be attributed to employees perceiving the innovation levels in this organization to be insufficient to adequately contribute to effective teams. Team members who feel they are not able to practice innovation to the fullest feel frustrated and confined in their jobs. Hence, alternative methods and encouraging creativity within teams.

Although the output of teams is perceived to be the highest contributing factor to work team effectiveness in this organization, it still requires room for improvement. Team members require the product of their efforts to be valued as a contributing factor to the overall success of the organization in order for team members to work efficiently towards their output.

The sub-dimensions of employee involvement, namely, empowerment, participative decision-making, employee commitment, job satisfaction and motivation impact on work team effectiveness to varying degrees with employee commitment having the greatest impact, followed by empowerment, participative decision-making, job satisfaction and motivation, respectively. Likewise communication, team members skills, teams output, performance objectives and innovation are the sub-dimensions of

work team effectiveness but impact on work team effectiveness to varying degrees, with the greatest impact being innovation, followed by communication, teams output, team members skills and teams output, respectively.

7 Conclusion

This study has explored the impact of employee involvement on work team effectiveness. The research indicates that the sub-dimensions of employee involvement (empowerment, participative decision-making, employee commitment, job satisfaction and motivation) significantly impact on work team effectiveness (communication, team member's skills, performance objectives, innovation and the output of teams) although in varying degrees. Employee involvement is an effective tool for work team effectiveness

Employees and work teams bring in a synergy of ideas to organizations that are striving to keep afloat during competitive times and as globalization is setting new boundaries. Companies need to continuously change strategy.

References

1. Apostolou, A. (2000). Employee Involvement.*Technical University of Crete*. 84(3), 437-444.
2. Bae, J. & Lawler, J.J. (2000). Organizational and HRM Strategies in Korea: Impact on Firm Performance in an Emerging Economy. *Academy of Management Journal*. 43 (3), 502-507.
3. Bagraim, J., Cunningham, P., Potgieter, T. & Viedge, C. (2007).*Organisational Behaviour: A Contemporary South African Perspective*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.
4. Batt, R. (2004). Who Benefits from Teams? Comparing Workers, Supervisors and Managers.*Industrial Relations Journal*. 43(1), 183-211.
5. Bowen, D. & Ostroff, C. (2004).Understanding HRM-Firm Performance Linkages: The Role of the Strength of the HRM System. *Mendeley Journals*. 29(2), 203-221.
6. Buchanan, D. & Huczynski, A. (2004).*Organisational Behaviour – An Introduction*. United Kingdom: Prentice Hall.
7. Bushe, G. R. & Coetzer, G.H. (2007).Group Development and Team Effectiveness.The *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*. 43(2), 184-212.
8. Cohen, S.G.& Bailey, D.E. (1999). What Makes Teams Work: Group Effectiveness Research from the Shop Floor to the Executive Suite. *Journal of Management*. 23(3), 239-290.
9. Coldwell, D. & Herbst, F. (2004).*Business Research*. Cape Town: Juta & Co.
10. Colquitt, J. A., Lepine, J.A. & Wesson, M.J. (2009).*Organizational Behaviour: Improving Performance and Commitment in the Workplace*. United States of America: McGraw Hill Publishers.
11. Cox, A., Zagelmeyer, S. & Marchington, M. (2006).Embedding Employee Involvement and

Participation at Work.*Human Resource Management Journal*. 16(3), 250-267.

12. De Dreu, C. (2007). Evidence for a Curvilinear Relationship Between Task Conflict and Innovation in Teams. *Journal of Management*. 32(1), 83-107.

13. De Dreu, C.K.W. (2010). Team Innovation and Team Effectiveness.*Journal of Organisational Psychology.*11(3), 285-298.

14. Duch, J, Waitzman, J.S. & Amaral, L.A.N. (2010).Quantifying the Performance of Individual Players in a Team Activity. *Plos One Journals*. 5(6), 1-7.

15. Gagne, M. & Deci, E.L. (2005).Self-Determination Theory and Work Motivation. *Wiley Interscience.* (26), 331-362.

16. Guest, D.E., Michie, J., Conway, N. & Sheehan, M. (2003).Human Resource Management and Corporate Performance in the UK. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*. 41(2), 291-314.

17. Hackett, R.D.& Laurent, M.L. (2001). Understanding the Links Between Work Commitment Constructs. *Human Resource Management Journal*. (58), 392-413.

18. Hackman, J. R. (2002). *Leading Teams: Setting The Stage For Great Performances*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

19. Hackman, J., Oldham, G., Jansen, R.& Purdy, K. (2002). Motivation Through the Design of Work. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*. 16(1), 250-279.

20. Hall, A., Liu, Y., Combs, J. & Ketchen, D. (2006). How Much Do High-Performance Work Practices Matter? A Meta-Analysis of Their Effects on Organizational Performance. *Personnel Psychology*. 59 (3), 501-528.

21. Hinds, P.J. & Mortensen, M. (2005). Understanding Conflict in Geographically Distributed Teams: The Moderating Effects of Shared Identity, Shared Context and Spontaneous Communication. *Organization Science*. 16(3), 290-307.

22. Kessler, I. (2004). Employee Perspectives on Communication and Consultation, International *Journal of human resource management*. 2 (15), 512-532.

23. Khan, T.I., Ahmed, J.F., Akbar, A., Khan, M.B. & Hijazi, S.T. (2011).Job Involvement as a Predictor of Employee Commitment. *International Journal of Business and Management*. 6(4), 252-262.

24. Kim, S. (2002). Participative Management and Job Satisfaction: Lessons for Management Leadership. *Public Administrator Review*. 62(2), 231-241.

25. Kirkman, B. & Rosen, B. (2000). Powering Up Teams, Organizational Dynamics. *Human Resource Management Journal.* 38 (3), 48-66.

26. Konrad, A.M. (2006). Engaging Employees Through High-Involvement Work Practices. *Richard Ivey School of Business*. 16 (1), 4-20.

27. Kozlowski, S.W.J & Ilgen, D.R. (2006).Enhancing the Effectiveness of Work Groups and Teams. *Michigan State University.* 7(3), 77-123.

28. Kozlowski, S.W.J.& Bell, B.S. (2003). Work Groups and Teams in Organizations. *Handbook of Psychology.* 12(1), 333-375.

29. LaFasto, F., & Larson, C. (2001).*When Teams Work Best: 6000 Team Members and Leaders Tell What It Takes To Succeed*. California: Sage.

30. Leana, C.R., Locke, E.A. & Schweiger, D.M. (2000).*Fact and Fiction in Analyzing Research on Participative Decision-Making, The Academy of Management Review*. 15(1), 137-146.

31. Lencioni, P. (2005). *The Five Dysfunctions of a Team: A Leadership Fable*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

32. Loo, R.& Thorpe, K. (2002).Using Reflective Learning Journals to Improve Individual and Team Performance, Team Performance Management. *An International Journal*. 8(6), 134-139.

33. Mei, L. (2008). Research on How Training Influences Administrative Staff Job Involvement and Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Human Resource and Adult Learning*. 4(2), 115-121.

34. Naquin, C. E., & Tynan, R. O. (2003). The Team Halo Effect: Why Teams Are Not Blamed For Their Failures. Journal of Applied Psychology. 88 (2), 332-340.

35. Ogungbamila, B., Adepeju, O. & Adetula, G. (2010).*Effects of Team Size and Work Team Perception on Workplace Commitment: Evidence From 23 Production Teams*. Sage Publications. 41(6), 725-745.

36. Ozaralli, N. (2003). Leadership and Organisational Development.*Leadership and Organisational Development Journal.*24(6), 335-344.

37. Quagraine, T.L. (2010). Employee Involvement as an Effective Management Tool In Decision-Making. *Unpublished Dissertation*.1-85.

38. Quigley, N. R. (2003). The Relationship between Leader Core Self-Evaluations, Team Feedback, Leader Efficacy, Transformational Leadership, Team Efficacy, Team Goals, Team Action and Transition Processes and Team Performance. *Unpublished Dissertation*: University of Maryland, 1-12.

39. Reis, D. & Pena, L. (2001).Reengineering the Motivation to Work. Management Decision. *Human Resource Management Journal.*39(8), 666 – 675.

40. Richardson, H.A. & Vandenberg, R.J. (2005).Integrating Managerial Perceptions and Transformational Leadership into a Work-Unit Level Model of Employee Involvement.Journal of Organisational Behaviour. 7 (26), 561-589.

41. Riordan, C.M., Vandenberg, R.J.& Richardson, H.A. (2005).Employee Involvement Climate and Organisational Effectiveness. *Wiley Interscience*. 21 (4), 48-56.

42. Robbins, S.P., Judge, T.A., Odendaal, A. & Roodt, G. (2009).*Organisational Behaviour – Global and Southern African Perspective.* Cape Town: Pearson Education Limited.

43. Salas, E, Stagle, K.C & Burke, C.S. (2004). 25 Years of Team Effectiveness in Organizations. *International Review of Industrial and Organisational Psychology*. 19 (1), 47-91.

44. Salas, E. (2010). How Can You Turn a Team of Experts into an Expert Team?.Department of Psychology. *University of Florida*. Slides 1-36.

45. Sun, H., Hui, I.K. & Tam, A.Y.K. (2000). Employee Involvement and Quality Management. *The TQM Magazine*. 12(5), 350-354.

46. Sundstrom, E., DeMeuse, K.P. & Futell, D. (2000). Work Teams. *American Psychologist*.8 (45), 120-33.

47. Tyson, S.& York, A. (2000*).Essentials of HRM – 4th edition*. Great Britain: British Library.

48. Ulrich, D. & Brockbank, W. (2005).*The HR Value Proposition*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

49. Vandenberg, R.J., Richardson, H.A, & Eastman, L.J. (1999). The Impact of High Involvement Work

Processes Upon Organisational Effectiveness: A 2nd Order Latent Variable Approach. *Group and Organisation Management.* 4 (24), 300-339.

50. Whitener, E.M. (2001). Do High-Commitment Human Resource Practices Affect Employee Commitment?: A Cross-Level Analysis Using Hierarchical Linear Modeling. *Journal of Management.* 27(5), 515-535.

51. Wu, C., Wang, P & Tsai, L. (2010). The Effect of Organizational Culture on Team Interaction and Team Effectiveness: Team Leadership as a Medium. *The Journal of International Management Studies.*5(2), 190-198.

52. Youssef, C.M. & Luthans, F. (2007).Positive Organizational Behaviour in the Workplace. *Management Department Publications*. 10 (7), 770-785.

53. Zwick, T. (2004).Employee Participation and Productivity. *Labour Economics Journal*. 9 (11), 715-740.