

Ability to Cope with the Challenges of Teamwork in Managing Change in Selected Manufacturing Organizations in South Eastern Nigeria

Lovlyn Ekeowa Kelvin-Iloafu, (Mrs), Ph.D Anthony Obiora Ude, Ph.D
Department of Management, University of Nigeria, Enugu Campus, Enugu State, Nigeria

Abstract

This study on ability to cope with the challenges of teamwork in managing change in selected manufacturing organization in South Eastern Nigeria focuses on establishing the extent to which management of organizational change is hindered by inability to cope with the challenges of teamwork approach to change management. The study adopted the survey research design, using ten (10) manufacturing organizations in the South-Eastern Nigeria. The population was 13,623 and the sample size was 598 using stratified sampling method. A questionnaire and oral interview were the research instruments used for the study. Data collected were presented descriptively using tables and means, and hypotheses were tested using Z-test statistic. The findings were that management of organizational change is severely hindered by inability to cope with the challenges of teamwork in Nigerian manufacturing organizations ($Z_{cal} = 4.55 > Z_{critical} = 1.96$, $p < 0.05$). In conclusion, the implementation of teamwork in manufacturing organizations has a lot of challenges it faces from the results of this analysis. It is not a smooth sail for its utilization, but with effective communication, employee involvement, and staff training and development, these challenges can be mitigated thereby ensuring successful utilization of teamwork in managing change in manufacturing organization in south Eastern Nigeria. Based on the results and conclusions the study recommended among others that; people affected by change should be incorporated into the change programme; this involves the change agents empowering their subordinates to action by removing obstacles, enabling constructive feedback and rewarding and recognizing progress and achievements, that team leaders should be able to protect their team members through using proper means of communication to enlighten them about the changes in the organization, encourage them to think critically and ask questions as a part of the process and that members with requisite skill should be selected as members of the team; this will reduce the incidence of social loafing.

Keywords: Challenges of Teamwork, change management, manufacturing organizations.

1. Introduction

Building an effective team is a challenge for many manufacturing organizations. Implementing teamwork in organizations is an element of a gradual transfer of the company's steering from coordination by hierarchy to a form of harmonization which can be characterized as discursive coordination. This generates an increasing density of communication which is the actual challenge for the team members as well as for the manufacturing organizations as a whole. Workers all over the world and especially in the South Eastern part of Nigeria to be precise, are often unused to communicating at work and they have to guarantee cooperation and control by self-regulating and also are forced to communicate more than they are previously used to. Superiors who are afraid of losing their influence, status, power and at worst their jobs have to treat workers as experts rather than as recipients of orders. A major problem obtained in teamwork is the concept of social loafing. The tendency for individuals in teams to hide inside team and coast in the team's effort and success because their individual contributions cannot be identified (Robbins and Judge, 2007). Social loafing can occur in all kinds of team and in all kinds of organization. It can result in lower team performance and may even prevent team from attaining its goals. Successful teams make members individually and jointly accountable for the team's purpose, goals, and approach. Hall (2001) maintains that, there is a danger of elevating teams into a "silver bullet" a magic solution to all business problems. He went further by saying that, "The truth is that teams are not always the right answer to a problem. Often, a well-briefed and well-managed group of individuals will do a task fine; he concludes that some very skilled individuals are not good team players'.

In other words, many manufacturing organizations in south Eastern Nigeria are finding it difficult to implement change using teamwork in their organizations; this is because there are lots of challenges encountered in the course of doing so. Kelvin-Iloafu (2016a) posits that most changes can disrupt teamwork, unless people are involved, committed and prepared to adapt and learn; if not, objectives, plans and future desired state may likely be resisted.

Furthermore, it must be appreciated that teamwork may not always produce satisfactory result due to both internal factors (the how and who of the team) and external factors (unforeseen and intervening). That is why Woodcock and Francis (1993) suggest that teamwork takes more time and often more resources than individual work. So the benefits of using team work have to exceed the costs of implementing teamwork. Nevertheless

Hopper and Potter (2000) observe that team members often takes much longer time than individuals in taking decisions. Therefore Chukwu (2007) maintains that under emergency situations, team decision making is not required. Also while many managers and executives view teams as the most effective design for involving all employees in the success of a company. Efi (2010) asserts that team members may not altogether be skilled in the group dynamics needed to perform work in a team effectively. While at best, work teams operate to increase performance, but these challenges mentioned above can make frustrated human resource managers to abandon team work effort entirely. It has been observed that, in the excitement to enjoy the benefits of a team, some managers have introduced teamwork into situations in which the work is better done by individuals (Naqium and Tynan, 2003). Therefore before team implementation, one should carefully assess whether the work requires or will benefit from a collective and collaborative effort. It has been suggested that three test be applied to see if a team fits the situation, Drexter and Forrester (1998) identify the three test to be applied as;

1. Firstly, can the work be done better by more than one person? Simple task are better left for individuals while complex and work requiring different perspectives should require teams to achieve it.
2. Secondly, does the work create a common purpose or set of goals for the people in the team that is more than the aggregate of individual goals?
3. The final test to assess whether teams fit the situation is to ascertain if the members of the group are Interdependent? Teams make sense when there is interdependence between tasks; when the success of the whole depends on the success of each one, and the success of each one depends on the overall success of others e.g. soccer.

According to Kelvin-Iloafu (2016b), the technological revolution which is characterized by an increasing rate of technological change, diffusion, greater knowledge intensity and the importance of knowledge to competitive advantage has affected Public Sector Organizations in Nigeria, and also manufacturing organizations in the South Eastern Nigeria. Change is constant and unless carefully managed, it can be detrimental to teamwork and results. Change starts and ends with communication. Whenever you think you have communicated enough, you need to communicate additionally and it must be interactive: listen, talk and involve. Be aware of the change curve, or the four predictable stages of change: denial/resistance, emotional, hopeful, commitment, (Flint and Vinberg Hearn, 2016). Each stage is needed, but how long someone stays at each stage can be managed and kept at a minimum.

While in other developed countries, major infrastructural facilities, example water, electricity and transportation system work efficiently and are taken for granted. However in Africa and most specifically in Nigeria, the manufacturing industry shoulder a lot of burden ranging from, inadequate Capital, high lending rate, poor transportation system, currency devaluation, terrorism, militancy, Fulani Herdsmen attacks, and occasional bearish run on the Nigerian stock exchange. Obviously most of the aforementioned challenges have compounded and escalated the cost of doing business in Nigeria. According to Kelvin-Iloafu, (2017) today, manufacturers in the country provide their own water through boreholes, shoulder their transportation needs by having fleet of vehicles, spends heavily outside normal overhead for security at personal and organizational levels, grades the roads leading to their factories, buys and runs generators for a dedicated power supply amongst others. The cost of manufacturing in Nigeria therefore is nine times that of China, four times that of Europe, four times above the figure in South Africa and twice the figure in Ghana (MAN, 2010). Therefore in order to address these challenges facing manufacturing organizations in our country; it will be pertinent to study the ability to cope with the challenges of teamwork in managing change in selected manufacturing organizations in South Eastern Nigeria.

2. Objective

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

3. Review of Related Literature

3.1 Challenges of Organizational Change

Planning and managing change, both culturally and technologically, is one of the most challenging elements of a manager's job. Obviously, the more a manager can plan in anticipation of a change, the better he or she serves their subordinates and the organization. Diagnosing the causes of change and structuring a programme to promote a smooth transition to the new process, structure, and so on, is critical to a manager's success.

Managers must be aware that organizations change in a number of dimensions that often relate to one another. These dimensions according to Pearce and Smith Jr, (2002) include the following;

- **Extent of planning:** Although experts differ about how much change can be planned, managers still need to take steps to set up conditions that permit and even encourage change to occur.
- **Degree of change:** Changes may be incremental (relatively small, involving fine tuning processes and

behaviours within just one system or level of the organization) or quantum (significant change altering how a company operates).

- **Degree of learning:** This dimension relates to the degree to which organizational members are actively involved in learning how to plan and implement change while helping to solve an existing problem.
- **Target of change:** Organizational change programs can vary with respect to the hierarchical level or functional area of which the change is targeted. Some changes are designed to influence top management and assist them in becoming stronger leaders. Other change programs may involve basic learning, such as customer services techniques for lower level employees.
- **Organization's structure:** Is it very stiff and bureaucratic? Is there a need for emphasis on policies, procedures, and rules? Some organizations are very stiff and bureaucratic and may need to "loosen up." Other organizations may suffer from lack of organizational structure. They may need to emphasize policies, procedures, and rules.

3.2 Concept of Resistance to Change in an organization.

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

Against this backdrop, [Mullins (2010), Moorhead and Griffin (1995), Robbins and Judge (2007) and Armstrong (2006)] identify the following as the reasons why individuals and organizations resist change;

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

- **Habit:** Doing a job the same way every day is easy. If the steps in the job are repeated over and over, the job becomes increasingly easier. But learning an entirely new set of steps increases the jobs difficulty. For the same amount of return (pay), most people prefer to do easy and routine jobs rather than hard and challenging work.
- **Security:** Some employees like the comfort and security of doing things the same old way. They gain a feeling of constancy and safety in knowing that some things stay the same despite all the change going on around them. Thus, people who believe that their security is threatened by a change are likely to resist the change with every available means and tactics.
- **Economic Factors:** Change may also threaten employees steady pay checks. Workers may fear that change will make their jobs obsolete and a threat of redundancy and unproductive with its economical consequences.
- **Fear of the unknown:** Some people fear anything unfamiliar. Employees become familiar with their boss, their job, and relationships with others within the organization. Such as contact people for certain situations. These relationships and contacts help to facilitate their work. Any disruption of familiar patterns may create fear because it can cause delays and the belief that nothing is getting accomplished. Threat of breaking and conquering new grounds is always resisted among workers.
- **Lack of Awareness:** Because of perceptual limitation, such as lack of attention or selective attention, a person may not recognize a change in rule or procedure and thus may not alter behaviour. People may pay attention only to those things that support their point of view; they therefore may continue the current practice as long as it is possible and practicable.
- **Social Factor:** People may resist change for fear of what others will think. Employees may believe that change will hurt their image, result in ostracism from the group, or simply make them "different". For example, an employee who agrees to conform to work rules established by management may be ridiculed by others who openly disobey the rules. Dislocations and indispensability assumptions are some of the core reasons for resisting change.
- **Inconvenience or loss of freedom:** If the change is seen as likely to prove inconvenient and make life more difficult. Reduce freedom of action or result in increased control, there will be resistance.
- **Competence fear:** Concern about the ability to cope with new demands or to acquire new skill can make people resist change. Un-trainable and some semi-skilled workers find it difficult to learn progressively.
- **Threat to status or skill:** If the change is perceived as reducing the status of individual or as de-skilling them, it is bound to be resisted by employees involved. It could mean the possibility of relinquishing or diminishing of one's span of control and authority. Change can demystify the competency level of some superior officers.
- **Wrong timing:** This concerns when change efforts are introduced. If it is at a time when workers are busy or have a bad relationship with management, they are going to resist the change efforts. Good organizational climate facilitates effective change.
- **Surprises:** Because people's reflex is to resist when they must deal with a sudden, radical change or peer pressure. If people are taken unawares, they are bound to resist the change initiative because they are not

properly communicated about the change. Change should be planned and workers must be integrated into the change program.

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

- **Narrow Focus of Change:** Any effort to force change in the tasks of individuals or groups must take into account the interdependencies among organizational elements such as people, structure, tasks, and the information system. For example, some attempts at redesigning jobs are unsuccessful because the organizational structure within which jobs must function is inappropriate for the redesigned jobs.
- **Group Inertia:** When an employee attempts to change his or her work behaviour, the group may resist by refusing to change other behaviors that are necessary complements to the individual's changed behaviour. In other words, group norms may act as a brake on individual attempts at behavioural change.
- **Over-determination or Structural Inertia:** Organizations have several systems designed to maintain stability. For example, consider how organizations control employee's performance. In other words the structure of the organization provides resistance to change because it was designed to maintain stability and equilibrium.
- **Threatened Expertise:** A change in the organization may threaten the specialized expertise individuals or groups have developed over the years. A job redesign or a structural change may transfer the responsibility for a specialized task from the current expert to someone else, thus threatening the specialist's expertise and building his or her resistance to the change.
- **Threatened Power:** Any redistribution of decision-making authority may threaten an individual's power relationships with others. If an organization is decentralizing its decision-making powers in return for special favours from others, they may resist the change because they do not want to lose their power base.
- **Resource Allocation:** Groups that are satisfied with current resource allocation methods may resist any change that they believe will threaten their future allocations. Resources in this context can mean anything from monetary rewards and equipment, to additional seasonal help, to more computer time, production priority and concession.
- **Organizational culture:** The culture of an organization develops over time and may not be easy to change. The pervasive nature of culture in terms of "how things are done around here" also has a significant effect on organizational processes and the behavior of staff. An ineffective culture may result in a lack of flexibility for an acceptance of change.
- **Low Risk Environment:** In an organization that does not promote change and tends to punish mistakes, individuals develop a resistance to change, preferring instead to continue in safe, low risk behaviours than embracing strange new and strategic changes.

3.3 Overcoming Barriers to Resistance to Change

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

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

- **Education and Communication:** Communication can reduce resistance on two levels. First, it fights the effect of misinformation and poor communication; secondly, communication can be helpful in "selling the need for change". The way and manner the need for change is sold matters – change is more likely when the necessity for change is properly packaged. (Dutton, Ashford, O'Neill and Lawrence (2001).
- **Participation:** It is difficult for individuals to resist a change decision in which they participated in. Prior to making a change, those opposed to change can be brought into the decision making process so

that they can be part of its design and implementation phases.

- **Building Support and Commitment:** Change agents can offer a range of supportive efforts to reduce resistance. When employee's fear and anxieties are high, employee counseling and therapy, new-skills training, or a short paid leave of absence may facilitate adjustment. Adequate rest will re-invigorate their sense of commitment which is capable of increasing their innovative tendencies.
- **Negotiation:** Another way for the change agent to deal with potential resistance to change is to exchange something of value for a lessening of the resistance. Negotiation as a tactics may be necessary when resistance comes from a powerful source. It might be costly and risky due to black mail possibilities. It should be the last option because of their integrity consequences.
- **Manipulation and Cooptation:** Manipulation refers to covert influence attempts. Twisting and distorting facts to make them appear more attractive, withholding undesirable information, and creating false rumors to get employees to accept a change. While cooptation is a form of both manipulation and participation. It seeks to "buy off" the leaders of a resistant group by giving them a key role in the change decision. Both are relatively inexpensive and easy ways to gain the support of adversaries for effective and efficient participation.
- **Selecting People who Accept Change:** The ability to easily accept and adapt to change is related to personality. One study of managers in the United States, Europe, and Asia found out that those with a positive self-concept and high risk to tolerance coped better with organizational change. Selecting people based on resistance-to-change scale worked well in winnowing out those who tended to react emotionally to change or rigid elements (Oreg, 2003).
- **Coercion:** Is the application of direct threats or force on the resisters. For example, threats of transfer, loss of promotions, negative performance evaluations, and a poor letter of recommendation. The advantages and drawbacks of coercion are just the same as those in manipulation and cooptation.

3.4 Concept of Challenges in the implementation of Teamwork in an Organisation.

According to Nguyen (2010), there are eight common problems that teams encounter, they include;

1. **Absence of team identity.** Members may not feel mutually accountable to one another for the team's objectives. There may be a lack of commitment and effort, conflict between team goals and members' personal goals, or poor collaboration.
2. **Difficulty making decisions.** Team members may be rigidly adhering to their positions during decision making or making repeated arguments rather than introducing new information.
3. **Poor communication.** Team members may interrupt or talk over one another. There may be consistent silence from some members during meetings, allusions to problems but failure to formally address them, or false consensus (everyone nods in agreement without truly agreeing).
4. **Inability to resolve conflicts.** Conflicts cannot be resolved when there are heightened tensions and team members make personal attacks or aggressive gestures.
5. **Lack of participation.** Team members fail to complete assignments. There may be poor attendance at team meetings or very indifferent attitude to suggestions during meetings.
6. **Lack of creativity.** The team is unable to generate fresh ideas and perspectives and doesn't turn unexpected events into opportunities.
7. **Groupthink.** The team is unwilling or unable to consider alternative ideas or approaches. There is a lack of critical thinking and debate over ideas. This often happens when the team overemphasizes team agreement and unity.
8. **Ineffective leadership.** Leaders can fail teams by not defining a compelling vision for the team, not delegating, or not representing multiple constituencies. Coherent leadership motivates performance and team management successes.

3.5 Theoretical Framework

The Resource-Based View: Financial resources include the firm's monetary sources and abilities to fund its operations. Physical resources involve the company's property, plants, and equipment, as well as its ability to obtain raw materials. Human resources consist of the experience, backgrounds, and capabilities of the firm's personnel. Intellectual resources are comprised of the firm's knowledge and learning abilities that allow it to stay innovative and competitive. Finally, the general resources of the firm vary between business and industries, but some examples include the company's culture, internal processes, management techniques, relations with suppliers, and organizational structure (Gregory, 2015).

The resource-based view attempts to help companies identify the resources it controls that can lead to the creation of a sustainable competitive advantage. However, these resources must contain some intrinsic value. A resource is considered valuable if it is unique, difficult to imitate, and difficult to substitute. If a single firm or only a limited number of firms possess a resource that is impossible or costly to imitate, competitors find

themselves at a disadvantage. Firms need to focus on this resource and fully exploit it. If done correctly, the resource should lead to a sustainable competitive advantage that offers the firm above-average performance for an extended period of time.

The Stakeholder View: The stakeholder view of a firm takes into account all internal and external groups that have an interest in a firm's operations. These stakeholders are directly impacted by the decisions and actions of the company. Common stakeholders include the organization's shareholders, management, employees, suppliers, customers, special interest groups, local communities and local governments. With this perspective, organizations need to participate in two activities, stakeholder analysis and stakeholder management. Stakeholder analysis involves identifying the particular company's stakeholders, evaluating their wants, needs, and ideas, and assimilating their contributions into the firm's strategic management processes. The stakeholder view intends for firms to evaluate the impacts of their actions on stakeholders and recognize the potential consequences from their strategic decisions.

However, an important aspect of this analysis requires the firm to prioritize certain stakeholders over others. For instance, management needs to pay more attention to the needs of the firm's shareholders than a special interest group trying to further their ideals. This can often be a difficult task given the large numbers of stakeholders many companies have; however, organizations need to recognize the stakeholders who are most important to the firm's success, and prioritize them accordingly.

The stakeholder view also requires firms to engage in stakeholder management. This process involves managing the firm's relations with stakeholders through communication, negotiation, and contracting. Moreover, motivating different groups of stakeholders to act in ways that benefit the firm, as well as its other stakeholders, is an important aspect of stakeholder management. Maintaining good working relations with internal and external stakeholders has resulted in increased performance and decreased risk for many organizations. Therefore, participating in this process increases the likelihood of a firm creating a sustainable competitive advantage.

The resource-based and stakeholder views are not competing perspectives, rather they are simply processes for organizations to identify or create competitive advantages. Companies depend on their stakeholders to obtain and develop their resources. Being in good standing with these stakeholders increases the probability for the company to receive more beneficial terms from arrangements. The research will be anchored on both theories as organizational resources consist of its human resources that equally form part of the stakeholders in actualizing team work.

3.6 Empirical Review

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

Challenges of Teamwork Approach to Change Management

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

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

Furthermore, another major problem of teamwork is the Risky-Shift phenomenon, this suggests that instead of the team taking fewer risks and making safer or more conservative decisions, the reverse is often the case. Studies suggest that people working in groups generally advocate more risky alternative than if they were making an individual decision on the same problem (Kogan and Wallach, 1967) in Mullins (2010). Presumably,

this is because members do not feel the same sense of responsibility for team decision or their outcomes because a decision which is everyone's is the responsibility of no one

Other problems faced by teamwork are due to interpersonal clashes and ignorant of conflict resolution skills, unwillingness to speak up when things are going wrong, a poor mix of team members that result in insufficient skills, conflicting priorities and personalities. Insufficient clarity as to who does what can adversely affect the performance of team members, also insufficient and unclear communication between team members can adversely affect team progress. A disconnection between what is expected of the team and what the team wants to/can accomplish (Somech et al, 2009). Social loafing occurs when one or more group members rely on the efforts of other group members and fail to contribute their own time, effort, thoughts, or other resources to a group (Price, 1993). Social Loafing is defined by Mullins (2010) as the tendency for individuals to expend less effort when working as a member of a group than as an individual. This may create a real drag on the group's efforts and achievements. Some scholars argue that, from the individual's standpoint, social loafing, or free riding, is rational behavior in response to an experience of inequality or when individual efforts are hard to observe. However, it shortchanges the group which losses potentially valuable resources possessed by individual members (Albanese and Van Fleet, 1985).

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

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

4. Research Methodology

The paper adopted the survey research design, in which ten (10) manufacturing companies in the South-Eastern Nigeria were studied. The population of the study was 13,623 and the sample size was calculated to be 598 using the Taro Yamane's formula. The sampling selection was the stratified sampling method. A self-developed structured questionnaire and oral interview guide were the research instruments used for the study. The sample size was distributed among the ten manufacturing organizations in the Southeast under study by the proportionality formula to get 619. Out of the six hundred and nineteen (619) copies of questionnaire that were administered, five hundred and thirty-three copies (533) were correctly filled and returned, giving 86.1% success rate while eighty six (86) copies were incorrectly filled or not returned, giving 13.9% failure rate. Data collected were presented descriptively using charts, simple frequency and percentage distribution, mean and standard deviation. The hypotheses were tested using the Z test statistic.

Hindrances of Organizational Change Management by Inability to cope with the Challenges of Teamwork approach

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

Table 4.1: Hindrances posed by inability to cope with the challenges of teamwork approach on organisational change management

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

Source: Field Survey, 2018

As presented in Table 4.1, the challenges that teamwork approach might pose to change management that might hinder organisational survival are they are costly (50.7% strongly agreeing, 15% agreeing, mean = 3.89 ± 1.36), compromise (56.8% strongly agreeing, 34.7% agreeing, mean = 4.48 ± 0.65), risky-shift (45.6% strongly agreeing, 44.1% agreeing, mean = 4.32 ± 0.75), group thinking (23.1% strongly agreeing, 35.8% agreeing, mean = 3.16 ± 1.60) and social loafing (36.6% strongly agreeing, 37% agreeing, mean = 3.97 ± 1.03). As indicated from the responses of 351 (65.9%) respondents who strongly agreed, 127 (23.8%) respondents who agreed, 50 (9.4%) respondents who were undecided and 5 (0.9%) respondents who disagreed as well as the mean response of 4.55 ± 0.70 , the respondents agree that management of organizational change hindered by inability to cope with the challenges of teamwork approach in Nigerian manufacturing organizations. The respondents agree that teamwork approach to change management increases competitiveness in the management of the organisation by improving productivity (mean = 4.31 ± 0.98 , 59.5% strongly agreeing, 20.5% agreeing), improving employee motivation (65.1% strongly agreeing, 29.3% agreeing, mean = 4.58 ± 0.67), improving quality (68.9% strongly agreeing, 22.7% agreeing, mean = 4.53 ± 0.86) encouraging innovation (21.6% strongly agreeing, 61.5% agreeing, mean = 3.83 ± 1.08) and being proactive rather than reactive (26.8% strongly agreeing, 56.3% agreeing, mean = 4.06 ± 0.75). The reasons the respondents agree are responsible for resisting change in manufacturing organisations are selective perception (mean = 4.59 ± 0.63), insecurity (mean = 4.49 ± 0.65), habit (mean = 4.18 ± 0.93), economic implication (mean = 3.79 ± 1.09), inconvenience or loss of freedom (mean = 4.16 ± 0.86) and fear of the unknown (mean = 4.16 ± 0.93). From the respondents' responses, resistance to change in manufacturing organisations can be best managed by education and communication (80.3% strongly agreeing, 15.9% agreeing, mean = 4.77 ± 0.51), facilitation and support (74.7% strongly agreeing, 21.6% agreeing, mean =

4.71 ± 0.53), and negotiation and agreement (50.8% strongly agreeing, 40.7% agreeing, mean = 4.42 ± 0.64). Having 189 (35.5%) respondents strongly agreeing, 299 (56.1%) respondents agreeing and 45 (8.4%) respondents being undecided as well as mean response of 4.27 ± 0.61, the respondents agree that organisational change is communicated to the employees to a large extent.

4.2 Test of Hypothesis

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

In testing this hypothesis, the data presented in Table 4.1 were tested using Z-test.

Table 4.2 -Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov (Z) Test Result for Hypothesis Five

| | | mean response on challenges |
|----------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|
| N | | 533 |
| Normal Parameters ^{a,b} | Mean | 4.0260 |
| | Std. Deviation | .35679 |
| Most Extreme Differences | Absolute | .127 |
| | Positive | .079 |
| | Negative | -.127 |
| Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z | | 4.553 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | | .000 |

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

Decision Rule

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

Result/Decision

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

4.3 Findings and Discussion

Despite the laudable benefits and effects of teamwork approach to change management, the teamwork approach is not without challenges. These challenges include cost-implication, compromise, risky-shift, group thinking, and social loafing. When these challenges are not handled properly or when the organisation cannot cope with these challenges, they negatively impact on the ability of teamwork approach in change management. Also, other challenges facing teamwork approach, which has to be tackled adequately, are selective perception, insecurity, habit, economic implication, inconvenience or loss of freedom, and fear of the unknown. These challenges can be effectively mitigated through the process of education and communication, facilitation and support, negotiation and agreement, and participation and involvement.

The finding is in accordance with the finding of the study carried out by Weihrich and Koontz (2005) and Ezigbo (2006) who revealed that teams inevitably face obstacles which if not overcome, can waste the organization's resources, hamper morale and ultimately lead to the organization's demise. Teamwork is costly to implement, may result in compromises, may lead to indecision, can split responsibilities and they may lead to a situation in which a few persons impose their will on the majority, not allowing participation of other members

5.1 Conclusions

In conclusion, the work investigated the challenges encountered in the course of implementing teamwork in an organization. These challenges ranges from social loafing, risky shift, deindividuation, difficulty in making decisions, poor communication, inability to resolve conflict, groupthink, ineffective leadership and so many other problems of teamwork. Understanding and anticipating these challenges help us to develop effective and functioning teams. Team members should believe without question that if they stand by the established plan or process and some interdepartmental conflict occurs, their leader will have their back and will stand by them. A culture of cooperation for mutual benefit is a lot easier to manage and maintain than series of small, self-important behaviours. Also, other challenges facing teamwork approach, which has to be tackled adequately, are selective perception, insecurity, habit, economic implication, inconvenience or loss of freedom, and fear of the unknown. These challenges can be effectively mitigated through the process of proper education and communication, facilitation and support, negotiation and agreement, and participation and involvement. Personal

or professional brilliance, experience, expertise, and dedication helps the leader to bring all of these to bear, these virtuous will offer team the confidence to move forward. By confronting these challenges, and therefore improving teams' outcomes, team leaders can boost their own career, while working better together benefits everyone on the team and manufacturing organizations in South Eastern Nigeria.

5.2 Recommendations

- An effective team should be built by applying practical skills/strategies to maximize team performance and development. These skills/strategies should include, but not limited to, getting to know the team, defining the team purpose, establishing norms, encouraging questions, celebrating accomplishments and being participatory and assessing team effectiveness.
- Manufacturing organizations leaders should encourage their organizations to anticipate change, to understand the nature of change and to manage change very well.
- People affected by change should be incorporated into the change programme; this involves the change agents empowering their subordinates to action by removing obstacles, enabling constructive feedback and rewarding and recognizing progress and achievements.
- Team leaders should be able to protect their team members through using proper means of communication to enlighten them about the changes in the organization, encourage them to think critically and ask questions as a part of the process. Let them know why the change is important and why they should trust the managers' judgment.
- Members with requisite skill should be selected as members of the team; this will reduce the incidence of social loafing.
- Team leaders should keep their eyes forward. They should be the ones to see the iceberg before the rest of the team, and they should encourage confidence in their team members. Spotting trouble before it can happen, or at least having a solution prepared in advance, will go a long way towards providing change management in the organization.
- Team leaders should be transparent, without transparency, trust will suffer, both within the team and with the clients. Transparency is becoming the presumed norm in teams and programme management and expectations are growing. It starts at the top: the more executive your position is, the more responsibility you have to be a role model for other team members. Employees will tag along the leader's behaviour, good or bad. When this is done well it can have a positive cascading effect throughout the organizations.

References

- Albanese, R. and Van Fleet, D. D. (1985) "Rational Behavior in Groups: The Free Riding Tendency," *Academy of Management Review*. 10, 244 – 255.
- Armstrong, M. (2006) *A Handbook of Human Resources Management Practice* (10th Edition) London, Cogan Page.
- Beer, M., Eienstat, R. and Spector, B. (1990) "Why Change Programs Don't Produce Change", *Harvard Business Review* Nov-Dec; 68(6):158-66.
- Chukwu, O. C. (2007), *Management and Organization* Enugu: Choby Press Enterprise.
- Derek, T. Hall, L. and Taylor, S. (2008) *Human Resources Management* (seventh Edition). Italy Pearson Education Ltd
- Dextrer, A.B. and Forrester, R, (1998) "Teamwork Not Necessarily the Answer," *HR Magazine* January, 55 - 58.
- Diener, E.(1979) "Deindividuation, Self- Awareness, and Disinhibition," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 37, 1160 - 1171.
- Dutton, J. E, Ashford, S. J, O'neill, M.O and Lawrence, K. A (2001) "Moves that matter, Issue selling and Organizational Change" *Academy of Management Journal*, August; 44(4):716-736
- Eden, C. and Huxham, C. (1996) "Action Research for the study of organizations" in S.R. Clegg, C. Hardy, and W.R. Nord (eds), *Handbook of organization studies* London Sage.
- Efi, A.E. (2010) "Teamwork, And Organizational Performance in Champion Breweries Plc, Uyo": *Nigerian Journal of Management Research* 5(1).
- Ezigo, C. A. (2006) "Understanding and Applying Innovation Strategies in Public Sector Organizations", *Journal of Management Research*.
- Ezigo, C.A. (2011) *Advanced Management Theory and Application* (3rd Edition) Enugu: Immaculate Publication Ltd.
- Flint, M. and Vinberg Hearn, E. (2016) *Leading Teams – 10 Challenges: 10 Solutions*, published by Financial Times, [Project Journal](#)
- Gregory, S. (2015) *Strategic Management Models*, Missouri: Gaebler Ventures

- Hall, P. (2001) "Team Solutions Need Not Be the Organizational Norm", *Professional Manager*.
- Hambrick, D. (2001) *Putting the Team into Top Management* in Pickford, J. (Ed) Financial Times Mastering Management 2.0. Financial Times Prentice Hall
- Hooper, A. and Potter, J. (2003) *High Performance Team Development*, Available in <http://www.kms.org/ca/www/wncyclopedia102/>
- Janis, J.L. (1972) *Victims of Groupthink*. Boston, Houghton Mifflin.
- Janis, J.L. (1982) *Groupthink* (Second Edition) Boston, Houghton Mifflin.
- Kelvin-Iloafu, L. E. (2016b) "Strategies for Building a High Performance Work Teams in Public Sector Organizations in Nigeria" *European Journal of Business and Management*. 8(35) 146-153.
- Kelvin-Iloafu, L. E. (2016a) "Team Work Approach to Strategies of Change Management in Selected Nigerian Manufacturing Firms". *GOUni Journal of Management and Social Science*, 4(1) 89-106.
- Kelvin-Iloafu, L. E. (2017) "Prospects for Sustainability and Viability of Nigerian Manufacturing Organizations through Team Work Approach" *African Journal of Business Management* 11(11) 250-260.
- Khan, A. (2007) *Understanding Work Teams*, Goshen Marke Inc.
- Kogan, N. and Wallach, M. A. (1967) "Risk taking as a Function of the situation, the Person and the group." In Newcomb, T. M (ed) *New Directions in Psychology III* Rinehart and Winster.
- Lewin K. (1951) *Field Theory in Social Science*. Harper and Row, New York.
- MAN Newsletter (2010) A Quarterly Newsletter of the Manufacturers Association of Nigeria, April – July Edition.
- Marks, M.A, Mathieu, J.E. and Zaccaro, S.J (2001) "A Temporally Based Framework and Taxonomy of Team Processes". *Academy of Management Review* 26 (3)356 - 376.
- Meshane, S. L. and Glinow, V. (2000:482), *Organizational Behavior*, USA: McGraw-Hill.
- Moorhead, G and Griffin, R.U (1995) *Organizational Behaviour* (4th Edition), Boston Houghton Mifflin Publishers, 484 – 487.
- Mullins, L.J. (2010) *Management and Organizational Behavior* (9th Edition) England, Prentice Hall.
- Naquin, C.E. and Tynan, R.O. (2003) "The Team Halo Effect: Why Teams Are Not Blamed for Their Failures", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, April.
- Nelson, D. L. and Quick, J.C. (2005) *Understanding Organizational Behaviour* (2nd Edition) Ohio, South-Western: Globus Printing – Inc.
- Nguyen, S. (2010), "Eight Common Problem Teams Encounter" *Harvard Business Review*
- Oreg, S (2003) "Resistance to Change: Developing on Individual Differences Measures" *Journal of Applied Psychology*, August 680 - 693
- Pearce, C. L. and Sims, H. P. Jr, (2002) "Vertical versus shared leadership as predictors of the effectiveness of change management teams: An examination of aversive, directive, transactional, transformational, and empowering leader behaviors". *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 6(2)172-197.
- Peterson, R. S. and Behfar, K.J. (2003) "The Dynamic Relationship between Performance Feedback, Trust, and conflict in Groups: A longitudinal study", *Organization Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, Sept – Nov, 102 - 112.
- Prentice-Dunn, S. and Rogers, R. W. (1989) "Deindividuation and Self-Regulation of Behavior," in P. Paulus, (edition), *Psychology of Group Influence* (Hillsdale, N. J. Erlbaum).
- Price, K. H. (1993) "Working Hard to Get People to Loaf" *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*.
- Robbins, S.P. and Judge, T.A. (2007) *Organizational Behavior* (12th Edition) New Delhi, Prentice-Hall 14.
- Somech, A, Desivilya, H., and Lidogoster, A. (2009) "Team Conflict Management and Team Effectiveness the Effects of Task Interdependence and Learning Identification": *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*. 6(8).
- Weighrich, H. and Koontz, H. (2005) *Management: A Global Perspective*, New Delhi, Tata McGraw-Hill.
- Woodcock, M. and Francis, D. (1993), *Team Building Strategy, Gower hand Book of Training and Development*, (2nd Edition) New York, John Prior MBE Edition

Brief Biography of Dr Lovlyn Nnenna Ekeowa Kelvin-Iloafu

Lovlyn Nnenna Ekeowa Kelvin-Iloafu is a lecturer in the Department of Management, Faculty of Business Administration, University of Nigeria, Enugu Campus. She is a member of the Nigerian Institute of Management (Chartered), and also a member of Nigerian Environmental Society. She has published papers in learned journals. She has presented papers in seminars; she has supervised a number of graduating students and post graduates' projects in the Department of Management, Faculty of Business Administration. She has served in many committees in the faculty of Business Administration and for the University of Nigeria. She lectures at the University of Nigeria Business School and also does part-time lecturing and supervision with few other near-by Universities.

She holds a B.Sc. degree in Microbiology, Post Graduate Diploma in Business Administration, Masters in

Business Administration and a Ph.D in Management.

Brief Biography of Dr. Anthony Obiora Ude

Anthony Obiora Ude is a lecturer in the Department of Management, Faculty of Business Administration, University of Nigeria Enugu Campus. He is an Associate member of the Nigerian Institute of Management member of the Computer Professionals Registration Council of Nigeria. He is a certified FIATA trainer in Freight Forwarding and Supply Chain Management and has publications in some reputable National and International journals.

He holds a Higher National Diploma in Computer Science, Post Graduate Diploma in Computer Science, Post Graduate Diploma in Management, Masters in Business Administration and a Doctor of Philosophy in Management. He equally lectures at the University of Nigeria Business School and the ESUT Business School, Enugu. He has several career honours and awards which include the Best Candidate in the CRFFN-FIATA training of trainers in Freight Forwarding and Supply Chain Management in July 2018.