

Teamwork : A Tool for Enhancing Positive Work Attitudes?

Semra F. Aşcıgil

Western Kentucky University

Fulbright Visiting Scholar

Middle East Technical University

İnönü Blv. 06531 Ankara/Turkey

Phone : 90 312 210 2014 (office)

Fax : 90 210 12 43

e-mail : sascigil@metu.edu.tr

Abstract

This paper explores the impact of job attributes, primarily teamwork participation on employee satisfaction and commitment in a manufacturing company. Autonomy and complexity are the other two job attributes studied that are expected to be enhanced through company's implementation of teamwork. The findings of regression analysis reveal that the change in commitment level is significantly explained by complexity whereas the only significant independent variable explaining change in job satisfaction was occupational related grouping. Workers' job satisfaction level is found to be significantly lower than engineers are. Teamwork participation does not make a difference in neither job satisfaction nor company commitment. (101)

Work Attitudes and Teamwork

Teamwork and Organizational Change

Employee involvement practices have been one of the techniques extensively used for improvement purposes by pioneering organizations. Among those initiatives, redesign of work combined with job enrichment are two that are used widely aiming quality increase by creating jobs that entail autonomy and feedback (Hackman & Oldham, 1980). Restructuring work around teams has been another alternative organizational change tool to contribute performance improvement through enhancing satisfaction at work place (Morley & Heraty, 1995; Rodwell *et al*, 1998). These approaches mainly focus upon changing responsibilities and relationships among employees and are founded on a number of assumptions. The assumption behind teamwork is to upgrade autonomy that is realized in terms of identifying the best way of practicing a job to achieve highest performance through continuous search of employees for alternative ways of work practices. Increased autonomy is expected to foster self-fulfillment and make jobs significant (Ross, 1999).

Teamwork is viewed as a panacea for enhancing communication, coordination and integration of diverse information at the disposal of individual members (Rodwell *et al*, 1998). In this regard, teamwork opposes the traditional Taylorist intentions to isolate employees by assigning to standard tasks sequentially designed and at the same time allowing less chances for communication. Teamwork, therefore, is viewed as a sophisticated attempt to integrate individual into the organization (Morley & Heraty, 1995) whereas employees' consent is achieved by making them feel that their interests and company interests are aligned (Hare, 1976; Isabella & Waddock, 1994). To this end, team activities have been a common approach in reestablishing trust towards management who lose trustworthiness mainly after downsizing experiences. From a strategy deployment perspective, teams are assumed to help in cascading down the new vision of doing business to operational levels and bring clarity

about the future of both work and employees thereby offsetting ambiguities associated with change.

Numerous variables are found to influence the attitudinal outcomes of team based initiatives while the literature contains contradictory findings concerning the impact of teamwork on job attitudes. Wright and Edwards (1988) have found out that teamwork leads to higher job satisfaction and labor productivity whereas no evidence was found about higher commitment. In his study on self-employed, Hundley (2001) pointed to the positive relationship between work attributes and satisfaction and argued that more autonomy, flexibility, skill utilization and greater job security led to higher levels of satisfaction. Due to continuous improvement principle, teamwork is expected to give rise to increased involvement in decision-making and greater responsibility that require a wide array of skill base leading to higher complexity and autonomy. Supporting this argument, a positive association between job satisfaction and both task autonomy and task variety has been found by Hackman and Oldham (1980).

On the other hand, Griffin (1988) based on a 3 year follow up of quality circles with matched pairs comparison group have found that attitudes and behaviors improved initially for the experimental group however dropped back to previous levels subsequently. Marks, Mirvis, Hackett and Grady (1986) suggested that quality circles programs saved employees from negative contextual factors but contributed less to enhance quality of work life. Another criticism is raised by Parker & Slaughter (1988) who argued that peer pressure may become a disadvantage for teams which may become a means for stress management. In summary, these findings point to the fact that change in work attitudes such as satisfaction and commitment need to be examined with care explaining unexpected consequences as well.

Critical Views on Teamwork as a Change Strategy

Literature provides various interpretations concerning the change or organization development strategies of management in generating desired outcomes. Any change program presupposes employee cooperation towards reaching mutual interests. In case of teamwork, the nature of cooperation that management needs from employees is supporting the schemes introduced by way of exhibiting appropriate attitudes. However, management has rarely used reliable performance measures in evaluating outcomes of change. As also argued by Golembiewski (2002), most of the OD programs were implemented rather blindly, even with no enthusiasm to measure the outcomes. At best, the implementers took temporary results of short-run nature as performance indicators whose reliability faded as time passed.

The shortsighted attitude of management as well as their consultants is mostly due to the situation-specific analysis of actors' behavior. As long as management provided the "right" rewarding system, employees are expected to exhibit "responsible" or "rational" behavior. Such assumptions have been criticized for not considering the context in which the cooperative behavior occurs. Applying Kurt Lewin's Field Theory, Kohler and Mathieu (1993) suggest that employee behavior is influenced primarily by how they react to environment as they perceive it. Therefore, explaining behavior as a discrete outcome of present relationships or a response to reward schemes will be too reductionist in perspective. The context-specific interpretations of actors need to be considered in making a healthy explanation of the conditions generating particular attitudes as a result of change initiatives employed (Mueller, 1995). Without such a focus, analysis of change remains to be mechanistic interpretations of attitudes and behavior that is dissociated from explanations focusing on more dynamic as well as historical sources of influence (Alvesson & Willmott, 2002).

The focus on creating the right individual serving managerial purposes led to use of interventions in work practices such as teamwork with a different intentions. Other examples of such interventions include introducing more work autonomy and complexity through empowerment. Main concerns of job autonomy like providing employees with more job discretion, the capacity to design one's own work processes and making key decisions have been widely employed in reconstructing employee attitudes. Job complexity explained as increased skill requirements pertaining to one's job is another strategy that is realized through job enrichment. Team activities are championed by employee involvement advocates with the claim that combination of diverse talents is enabled and an atmosphere is facilitated where the system related problems can be most effectively handled. Such claims made including employee perceptions crucial in analysis of interventions.

Along with new ways of doing work, regulation of identity with the intention of increasing commitment or satisfaction has been another target which is mostly sheltered in pioneering team activities. Any change effort requires playing with formal and objective as well as informal and subjective aspects of organization. By introducing teamwork, what is initiated is not only a new form of organizing and performing work, but repositioning employees within new forms of relationships whereas an identity reformation occurs. Eventually, teamwork is actively promoted by most to replace previously valued identities of “supervisor” or “manager” with new identities such as “team facilitator” or “team leader.”

The intervention done on individual identity is not only directed to work design but also to the meanings articulated through such design interventions. Individual identity is defined by continuous, recognizable attributes like professional or occupational affiliation, organizational position or others. Identity construction or redefinition has been a strong rationale behind team-based interventions as argued by Doorewaard and Brouns (2003). Teamwork promotes change in networks of communication, sources of motivation (from

extrinsic to intrinsic), construction of knowledge and skill base (by training) and affiliation (a sense of community and team membership) to enable identity change. Teamwork reconstructs the identity by changing titles from “worker” to “team member” or “jobs” to “skills” (Alvesson & Willmott, 2002). This mission is complete whenever human resource functions like training and promotion procedures are redesigned to reinforce the change.

Behind identity regulation or reconstruction, there lies the dynamics of changing control systems. Through identity reformation politics, teamwork shifts the frontier of control by substituting traditional forms with concertive forms of control which Barker (1999) refers as micro emancipation through subjectivity created by way of changing perceived work identity. However, as Alvesson and Willmott (2002) argue the individuals exposed to new forms of control may not be passive recipients of such mechanisms. The subjectivity created operates to exercise new forms of control and the identity regulation may not at all times be influential in increasing commitment or loyalty. Deterministic predictions as to the outcomes of teamwork, therefore, may be misleading and fall short of explaining the complex dynamics in human attitudes.

Critics of teamwork practices argued that despite of positive images like empowerment, autonomy, increased discretion and psychological involvement resulting from team based organization, such strategies need to be examined closely for such practices are used to mask the managerial intentions to control (Sewell, 1998; Ezzamel & Willmott, 1998). It is argued that the means of control management recently use are invisible and put employees into an “iron cage of bondage” (Barker, 1993). Because the pressures of profit maximization is still powerful, conflicting priorities are likely to emerge and compromises in the ideals of teamwork are made. These tendencies eventually create barriers in realizing a genuine empowered and autonomous work environment for employees. The resultant structures are shaped by underlying managerial intentions of efficiency with least capital

investment (Sinclair, 1992) giving rise to unexpected relationship between teamwork and work attitudes.

When such dilemmas are acknowledged, the implementation of teams receives numerous criticisms contrary to what is portrayed in popular management textbooks. Hackman and Wageman (1995) pointing to the existence of contradictions between ideals and actual practice, claimed that once the standards for new way of doing work is established, employees may find lesser autonomy in their jobs. Increased autonomy under teamwork tends to lose its exciting impact over time and remain as rhetoric when teams become tools for surveillance. The views on coexistence of autonomy and control is therefore challenged by claims as to the falseness of managerial assumptions that management could overcome resistance to control (Judson, 1991). According to critics of teamwork, forming teams, putting employees in such roles, redesigning relationships may not necessarily lead to integrative collaboration due to the suspicions over the underlying intentions of management in adopting teamwork as a strategy (Knights & McCabe, 1998).

It is claimed that, the experiences of employees about team-based initiatives are shaped by multiple factors. Organizational behavior research has shown that management practices give rise to particular job attitudes on the part of employees. For example, participation in decision-making that is enhanced by teamwork is argued to have a significant positive effect on job satisfaction and commitment of employees (Sarata, 1984; Boshoff & Mels, 1995). On the other hand, work pressure like increased workload and complexity of work was found out to be related to low job satisfaction (Lindstrom, 1988). Marchington *et al.* (1993) based on a longitudinal study also conclude that labor management relations are a significant factor in explaining why and how employee involvement schemes survive. Interpretations of employee response should take into account individual's capacity to recall and reflect on elements of historical context inducing counter-discourses. In addition to the

contextual factors like perceptions about how the process is implemented, work attributes enhanced and the extent to which management support and involvement is obtained, historical factors like employment strategies pursued in the past is invariably important in shaping employee perceptions.

Research have shown that organizational commitment is at the same time influenced by variables such as age, marital status, occupational status, tenure (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Cohen & Hudacek, 1993), as well as job satisfaction (Tet & Meyer, 1993) and working conditions (Brewer, 1996). These findings point to the fact that work attitudes are much more complex to study than they first appear. For example, it is found that employees show resistance whenever short and long run benefits of change strategies clash with one another (Adler, 1997). Tjosvold (1991) emphasized this aspect from a different perspective making management responsible for clarifying the rationale for the teamwork activity, also leaving room for the team to develop commitment around its own interpretation of their purpose (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993).

Similarly, Fox (1974) portrayed contradictions as to the level of commitment to organizational goals by distinguishing lateral and vertical trust prevalent in a teamwork setting. Under conditions of distrust to superiors, subordinates may turn to their peers and develop a strong solidarity which eventually influence the nature and direction of commitment. Such findings point to the importance of collecting variety of information by variety of methods in order to find out true explanations of employee attitudes.

Measures and Hypotheses

The research combines both qualitative and quantitative data to bring an explanation to the impact of job attributes on work attitudes acknowledging at the same time the historical constraints imposed by past employment relationships. Autonomy (decision autonomy of employee concerning pace, methods, tools, etc. and discretion involved), job complexity

(greater skill utilization and development opportunity), team membership (whether employee was a participant of a team) and promotion expectation (whether employee anticipates a promotion in the near future) are the specific job attributes that are considered as independent variables in this research along with team membership. A questionnaire used by Lincoln and Boothe (1993) in a survey examining the effect of unions on job attitudes is used in collecting data. Acknowledging the importance of rewards on creating positive attitudes towards work (Witt & Nye, 1992 ; Schwarzwald *et al.*, 1992), a question related with earnings was added, however, employees refrained from declaring their earning level and preferred not to declare it.

Job satisfaction and company commitment are work attitudes measured in the research as being the two dimensions of employee attitudes (See Table 1). Job satisfaction scale has been used by Quinn *et al.* (1974) and company commitment scale is a subset of Porter organizational commitment scale (Porter *et al.*, 1974). The impact of employee attributes like age, tenure in the company, education, marital status and gender are also considered as demographics. The scale reliability for 16 items was .73. The coefficient alpha for the sub-scales job satisfaction (3 items), commitment (6 items), complexity (4 items) and autonomy (3 items) were .67, .70, .65 and .61 respectively (See Table 2).

The following hypotheses are tested as a first step in the research by employing quantitative analysis:

Hypothesis 1: Teamwork participation will be positively associated with both job satisfaction and commitment

Hypothesis 2: Perceived autonomy will be positively associated with both job satisfaction and commitment

Hypothesis 3: Perceived complexity will be positively associated with job satisfaction and commitment

Hypothesis 4: Team members and non-members differ in their levels of company commitment and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 5: Occupational difference will lead to a change in the levels of commitment and satisfaction.

In addition to the circulation of the questionnaire, interviews are conducted with 39 employees in order to place and interpret the findings of quantitative analyses within a historical context. Interview summaries are also sought to clarify employees' perceptions about teamwork activities in general and the implementation process.

Research Site and Participants

The study was conducted in a manufacturing company in Turkey (the information on sector has been changed in order to make company name anonymous). The company employed approximately 710 employees, which was reduced from a thousand two years ago. In addition to downsizing, de-layering occurred in the organizational structure. Quality related initiatives were launched 6 years ago that preceded significant steps towards developing a quality culture for employee involvement. Employee involvement schemes like suggestion system, 5S and teamwork have been initiated as part of quality movement. On the other hand, practices like flexible time and gain sharing are not adopted in the company yet. The company has got ISO 9000 certification three years ago.

The target population in the research is identified as employees below middle management. 86 employees working in a different location and 19 managers holding senior and middle level positions are excluded from the population being studied. Among the remaining, 103 employees selected by convenience sampling completed the questionnaire. Employees were told that the survey was a study of employee attitudes being conducted by a researcher and confidentiality was assured. The completed questionnaires were collected by employees themselves in each unit and gathered afterwards.

Of the total sample, 10% were women and 90% were men. Their ages ranged from 22 to 51 with an average age of 34.8 (SD = 5.12). 25% were primary school, 51% high school and 22% university graduates. With respect to years worked in the firm, 31% worked less than 8 years, 33% worked between 9 and 12 years and 30% worked more than 12 years. 40% of the respondents stated that they had no teamwork experience.

The suggestion schemes had a history of about 10 years in the plant. Team activities were initiated as soon as the quality management was launched. Team activities concentrated on quality improvement and error reduction activities with some study on preventing waste and improving work environment. The company offered no financial benefits for participation in teamwork. Teams were either voluntarily formed or members were invited by management to work on problems due to their accumulated experience on the topic. The teams workers participate are formed by members working generally within the same unit whereas teams composed of engineers may engage in issues aiming at resolving interdepartmental issues.

Results

To test the hypotheses 1 to 3, the responses obtained from 103 employees are analyzed through regression analysis. Standard regression coefficients and t-values were obtained by regressing commitment and job satisfaction scores on job attributes (team membership, job complexity, work autonomy, promotion expectation, job type) and employee attributes (age, gender, marital status, education, tenure). The independent variables explain 17% of the variance in job satisfaction and 17.8% of the variance in commitment (See Tables 4 & 5). The fourth hypotheses are tested through independent sample t-tests (See Table 3).

Hypothesis 1

To test this hypothesis, regression results are used. The standardized regression coefficient for regressing commitment on independent variables listed above indicate a positive but not significant relationships between team membership and job satisfaction

($B = .125$, $t(89) = 1.136$) and between team membership and commitment ($B = .004$, $t(89) = .033$).

Hypothesis 2

The regression coefficients relevant for job satisfaction and perceived autonomy is positive but not significant ($B = .146$, $t(89) = 1.329$). Similarly, results indicate a positive but not significant relationship for commitment and perceived autonomy ($B = .153$, $t(89) = 1.396$).

Hypothesis 3

The beta coefficients for perceived complexity is in the expected direction in regressing commitment. The relationship between perceived complexity and commitment is positive and significant ($B = .273$, $t(89) = 2.497$, $p < .05$). The beta coefficient for perceived complexity and job satisfaction is negative but not significant ($B = -.047$, $t(89) = -.427$).

Hypothesis 4

The t-tests carried out indicate that team members and non-members do not differ significantly in terms of their commitment ($t(99) = -1.461$) and job satisfaction ($t(99) = -1.023$).

Hypothesis 5

A significant difference is found between workers and engineers with regard to job satisfaction levels ($t(97) = -1.907$, $p < .10$). The workers' job satisfaction level (mean = 2.06, SD = .54) is lower than what engineers felt (mean = 2.29, SD = .49).

Discussion

The quantitative analyses results mostly provide support for anticipated directions of the associations between independent and dependent variables. Autonomy and team membership induce positive changes in employee work attitudes as predicted through review

of literature. While complexity contributes positively to commitment, its coefficient is negative for job satisfaction.

At this point of analysis, it is thought that interviews will be useful to understand how employees perceive teamwork activities. The interviews with employees indicate that employees appreciate the training and learning opportunities provided, but still, they think that team related activities are not well organized leading to work overload. They state that too many programs were launched leading to confusion and extra work load. Besides, increases in the workload that occurred both due to downsizing and assignment of new quality improvement related responsibilities increased work stress. Employees also feel uncomfortable about the inequalities of work share resulting from the developments in the way work is being done. However, they feel that compared to the past they are much more skilled and appreciate management's efforts to develop the human capital and investments in training. Despite of the well-established human resource development infrastructure, they complain about the way the process is implemented and the complaints are mainly on the late responses to proposals developed within involvement schemes. The delays in getting management's response to improvement suggestions or rejections of proposals without reasonable justifications were other reasons in decreased motivation and satisfaction levels. As one machine operator have said,

... they rejected my suggestion and right after I left the unit, my suggestion was implemented. We are not allowed to trace and influence what will happen after we make a suggestion.

Similar views were voiced by another worker who said;

Our job ends once we make the suggestions. Afterwards, it is foreman's or engineer's decision whether to implement it or not. We are not given the chance to own, trace our ideas.

Effectiveness of team activities is misunderstood by middle management as "increasing the number of teams."

All middle managers do not have the same supportive attitude toward facilitating team activities.

Based on the interview findings, it was observed that satisfaction with work varied depending on perceptions of employment security. The interviews also revealed that the relatively low satisfaction level is experienced among workers as compared to engineers. Workers have developed perceptions of insecure jobs and tended to be less satisfied. Engineers rarely conveyed doubts implying vulnerability during a possible future downsizing. They think that after developing new skills, they become more demanded and even more mobile. This may be considered as a sign of failure in teamwork ideals for integration with company goals, because engineers may prefer to choose alignment with their occupational standards and goals.

The occupational difference in satisfaction levels can be explained through insecurity felt by primary school graduates that is due to a rumor concerning the possibility of termination of employment contract. There were rumors going around such as;

It is said that management is going to replace us (primary school graduates) with technical school graduates.

The number of workforce was reduced by almost 30% in the past. We are afraid that we will be faced with such a situation again!

Our wage levels are fine. However, compared to other companies, they (union representatives) signed agreement for relatively lower wages last time. The union representatives are not strong enough to defend our interests.

Although related question was not answered in the questionnaire, discontent with the wage level was a factor surfaced recurrently during interviews as a reason for low level of

satisfaction felt. Interviewees were apparently making a social comparison; what bothered them actually was the feeling that there was no comparative justice in the industry. For them, it was perceived injustice rather than the wage level itself which lead to dissatisfaction.

On the other hand, employee views about training provided by management was quite positive as reflected by changes in perceived complexity having a positive association with changes in commitment level. Training opportunities may be interpreted as a possibility of longer-term relationship with the company, which at the same time made employees feel secure. Increased confidence as to employment security has affected employee commitment positively. Identifying teamwork with quality management, a 13 year experienced worker stated that;

After quality management was launched, we took many hours of training. I feel the improvement in my capabilities that occurred in the last 5 years.

However, similar feelings are not reflected concerning work satisfaction. As evident in the responses of employees during interviews, the ambiguities and unfairness created in responsibilities and workload distribution have negatively affected the impact of complexity on satisfaction.

The two significant coefficients in regression equation for company commitment belong to complexity and educational level, whereas job status and gender initiate significant changes in dependent variable in the regression equation for job satisfaction. The findings suggest that teamwork participation, the main focus of this study, does not alone lead to a significant difference in job attitudes between participants and non-participants as shown by the t-tests. The other independent variable - age is found to be positively associated with job satisfaction. The interpretation for this can be that increased satisfaction among elderly is stemming from complacency. On the other hand, the inverse relationship of age and commitment need to be explained further. The adverse relationship may be an indicator of a

preference for retirement particularly in a change demanding work environment where aged people find it hard to adopt to the requirements of new schemes introduced. On the other hand, experience has a positive association with both of the dependent variables. This shows that number of years worked in the company but not age is the reliable source for enhancing both job satisfaction and commitment to the company.

Whenever the interpretations of quantitative data is combined with qualitative data the picture changes revealing the concealed dynamics. The findings suggest that in addition to the individual and work related attributes, factors like employment policy pursued in the past, how change is managed are equally critical aspects as perceived by respondents. Teamwork, which was the primary focus in this study, may not be a reliable source of managerially desired attitudes given a downsizing experience in the past. The perceptions and the meanings attributed to management policies embody identity formation. The outcome may be securing traditional identities of “worker” and “engineer” rather than “team member” in generating attitudes toward organizational practices. As a result, it can be suggested that socialization within teams may not necessarily offset the anxieties arising from poor relations in the past. Team activities may not at the same time eliminate the suspicions over justice in pay levels or work share. The absolute amount of economic incentives provided, whether employees are fairly paid in return to the responsibilities assigned, might not all the time constitute reliable reason for job satisfaction. Employee’s sensitivity to social comparisons i.e. fairness in relation to earnings of referent others is equally important. This attitude is supported with the literature on psychological contract. Rousseau (1989) suggested that overtime employees develop feelings of entitlement i.e. perceived obligations that their employers have toward them that involves fair treatment.

There appear to exist possibility for improving work attitudes through teamwork as demonstrated by the direction of the association; however, this is conditional on providing a

flawless employment relationship inherited from the past as well as justice in payment policies. Otherwise, it will be difficult to reconcile suspicions about a possible downsizing decision with participation islands, i.e. teams. Employee involvement schemes most of the time can not remove the tension created by a high degree of uncertainty over the future of employment contract. What is lacking is the trust created by just policies and actions to enhance the value of identification with teams.

It appears that there is more potential for enhancing commitment through increasing opportunities for learning new skills. Investment in people, facilitating a work environment where they acquire new skills and update their knowledge base is more likely to create long-term engagement and commitment to company goals. Therefore, development of knowledge and skills is a key resource for regulation of identity. The interviews support the idea that training provided may be perceived as a means for higher potential for mobility by more educated staff, just as it implies greater possibility for self-employment after retirement for workers. The trust necessary to create alignment with company goals can be established through making people feel that company is helping employees to upgrade their skill levels and create a learning environment whereas the knowledge formation will not be restricted to occupational formation gained through one's education. However, it should be acknowledged that group-based processes with some reservations drive attitudes. Commitment presupposes development of a long-term perspective that can be easily endangered with rumors of layoffs. Also, increased job complexity may stimulate keener questioning of policies and established hierarchical relations and thereof can create dissatisfaction and also pressure for removal of any constraint upon exercise of more initiative.

Limitations of the Study and Suggestions for Future Research

Lacking earnings related data among job attributes is one shortcoming of this research. This also partly explains why explanatory power of regression model was less than expected.

Sampling based on convenience is another limitation that needs to be underlined. A longitudinal study might explain the changes in work attitudes in different phases of teamwork implementation better than a study conducted at a given time. Intra-team and inter-team relations that are not considered in this research may also help to enrich our understanding of work attitudes.

The findings also show that considering differences in identities will be promising in enriching the research on work attitudes. Another implication is that, it will be hard to bring a mutually exhaustive explanation about employee reactions towards involvement schemes without acknowledging political dynamics that exist during change. The responses of different employee groups might be traced separately, which will enable identifying uneven developments within overall trends. The future research may also focus upon the effect of trust in company policies and management on work attitudes.

References

- Adler, N. J. (1997). *International dimensions of organizational behavior* (3rd Ed.) Cincinnati, OH: South-Western College Publishing.
- Alvesson, M. & Willmott, H. (2002). Identity regulation as organizational control: Producing the appropriate individual, *Journal of Management Studies*, 39(5), 619-644.
- Barker, J.R. (1993). Tightening the iron cage : concertive control in self-managing teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38, 408-437.
- Barker, J.R.(1999). *The discipline of teamwork*. Sage : London.
- Brewer, A. M. (1996). Developing commitment between managers and employees. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 11, 24-34.
- Boshoff, C. & Mels, G. (1995). A causal model to evaluate the relationship among supervision, role stress, organizational commitment and internal service quality. *European Journal of Marketing*, 29, 23-42.
- Brockner, J. (1988). The effects of work layoffs on survivors: Research, theory, and practice. In B.M. Staw and L.L. Cummins (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 10). Greenwich, CT.: JAI Press, 213-255.
- Cameron, K. S., Freeman, S. J., & Mishra, A. K. (1998). Downsizing and redesigning organizations. In Huber, G. And Glick, W. (Eds.) *Organizational change and redesign*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Clegg, S. R. (1981). Organization and control. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26, 545-562.
- Doorewaard, H. & Brouns, B. (2003). Hegemonic power processes in team-based work. *Applied Psychology : An International Review*, 52(1), 106-119.
- Ezzamel, M., & Willmot, H. (1998). Accounting for teamwork : A critical study of group-based systems of organizational control. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43, 358-396.

- Fox, A. (1974). *Beyond contract : Work, power and trust relations*. London : Faber and Faber.
- Golembiewski, R.T. (2002). *Ironies in organizational development* (2nd ed.). New York: Marcel Dekker.
- Griffin, R. W. (1988). Consequences of quality circles in an industrial setting : A longitudinal assessment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 31 (2), 338-358.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). *Work redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison – Wesley.
- Hackman, J. R., & Wageman, R. (1995). Total quality management : Empirical, conceptual, and practical issues. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, 309-342.
- Hare, A. P.(1976). *Handbook of small group research*.(2nd ed.) New York : Free Press.
- Henkoff, R. (1990). Cost cutting : How to do it right. *Fortune*, 121(8), 40-49.
- Hundley, G. (2001). Why and when are the self-employed more satisfied with their work? *Industrial Relations*, 40 (2), 293-316.
- Isabella, L.A., & Waddock, S.A.(1994). Top management team certainty : Environmental assessments, teamwork, and performance implications. *Journal of Management*, 20(4), 835-859.
- Judson, A.S. (1991). *Changing behavior in organizations: Minimizing resistance to change*. Cambridge, MA : Basil Blackwell.
- Katzenbach, J. R., & Smith, D. K. (1993). *The wisdom of teams : Creating the high performance organization*. Boston : Harvard Business School Press.
- Knights, D., & McCabe, D. (1998). When “Life is but a dream”: Obliterating politics through business process reengineering? *Human Relations*, 51 (6), 761-798.
- Kohler, S.S., & Mathieu, J.E.(1993). Individual characteristics, work perceptions, and affective reactions influences on differentiated absence criteria. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14, 515-530.

- Lincoln, J. R., & Boothe, J. N. (1993). Unions and work attitudes in the United States and Japan. *Industrial Relations*, 32 (2), 159-187.
- Lindstrom, K. (1988). Age related differences in job characteristics and in their relation to job satisfaction. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment and Health*, 14: 24-26.
- Marchington, M., Wilkingson, A., Ackers, P., & Goodman, J. (1993). The influence of managerial relations on waves of employee involvement. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 31(4), 553-576.
- Marks, M. L., Mirvis, P. H., Hackett, E. J., & Grady, J. F. (1986). Employee participation in a quality circle program : Impact on quality of work life, productivity, and absenteeism. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 61-69.
- Mathieu, J., & Zajac, E. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 171-194.
- Morley, M., & Heraty, N.(1995). The high performance organization : Developing teamwork where it counts. *Management Decision*, 33(2), 56-64.
- Mueller, F. (1994). Teams between hierarchy and commitment : Change strategies and the internal environment. *Journal of Management Studies*, 31 (3), 383-403.
- Parker, M., & Slaughter, J. (1988). Management by Stress. *Technology Review*, 37-42.
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 603-609.
- Rodwell, J.J., Kienzie, R., & Shadur, M.A.(1998). The relationship among work-related perceptions, employee attitudes, and employee performance: The integral role of communication. *Human Resource Management*, 37(3&4), 277-293.
- Rousseau, D.M. (1989). Psychological and implied contracts in organizations. *Employee Rights and Responsibilities Journal*, 2, 121-139.

- Quinn, R. P., Staines, K., & McCullough, M. R. (1974). *Job satisfaction : Is there a trend?* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor.
- Ross, J. E. (1999). *Total quality management: Text, cases and readings*. 3rd ed. St. Lucie Press.
- Sarata, B. P. (1984). Changes in staff satisfaction after increases in pay, autonomy, and participation. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 12: 431-444.
- Schwarzwald, J. Koslowsky, M., & Shalit, B. (1992). A field study of employees' attitudes and behaviors after promotion decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 511-514.
- Sewell, G. (1998). The discipline of teams : The control of team-based industrial work through electronic and peer surveillance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43, 397-428.
- Shaw, J. B. & Barrett-Power, E. (1997). A conceptual framework for assessing organization, work group, and individual effectiveness during and after downsizing. *Human Relations*, 50(2), 109-127.
- Sinclair, A. (1992). The tyranny of team ideology. *Organization Studies*, 13, 611-626.
- Tett, R. P., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention and turnover : Path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology*, 46, 259-293.
- Tjosvold, D. (1991). *Team organization : An enduring competitive advantage*. London : Wiley.
- Tomer, J. (1998). Organizational capital and joining-up : Linking the individual to the organization and the society. *Human Relations*, 51(6), 825-846.
- Witt, L. A., & Nye, L. G. (1992). Gender and the relationship between perceived fairness of pay or promotion and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 910-917.
- Wood, S., & Albenese, M. T. (1995). Can we speak of a high commitment management on the shop floor? *Journal of Management Studies*, 32, 215-247.

Wright, M., & Edwards, P. (1998). Does team working work and if so, why? *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 19 (1), 59-90.

Tables

Table 1
Scale Items and Descriptive Statistics

Items	Mean	S.D.
<i>Company Commitment</i>		
I am willing to work harder than I have to in order to help this company Succeed (1= strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree)	3.54	1.56
I would take any job in order to continue working for this company (same)	2.47	1.58
My values and the values of this company are quite similar (same)	3.11	1.44
I am proud to work for this company (same)	3.78	1.45
I would turn down another job for more pay in order to stay with this Company (same)	2.34	1.36
I feel very little loyalty to this company (1=str. agree, 5= str. disagree)	3.71	1.58
<i>Job satisfaction</i>		
If a good friend of yours told you that he or she was interested in working at a job like yours at this company, what would you say? (1=would advise against it, 2= would have second thoughts, 3= would recommend it)	2.23	.58
Knowing what you know now, if you had to decide all over again whether to take the job you now have, what would you decide? (1=would not take, 5= would take job again)	2.29	.73
How much does your job measure up to the kind of job you wanted when you first took it? (1=not what I wanted, 5= what I wanted)	1.95	.71
<i>Job Complexity</i>		
How long would it take to train someone to do your work? 1= few hours, 5= more than a year	4.67	.70
My job requires a high level of skill (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree)	3.76	1.46
My jobs keeps me learning new things (1=str. disagree, 5= str. agree)	4.09	1.35
There is a lot of variety in the kinds of things that I do in my job (1=str. Disagree, 5= str. agree)	4.10	1.39
<i>Work Autonomy</i>		
My job gives me freedom as to how I do my work (1= str. disagree, 5= str. agree)	3.08	1.70
My job lets me decide the speed that I work (same)	3.20	1.72
The degree to which "my judgement" was cited (1=least effect, 5= most effect) in response to : "What has the most effect on what you actually do on your job?"	3.34	1.53

Table 2
Means, Standard Deviations, and Inter-correlation for Variables

Variable	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Commit.	3.11	.94	(.70)							
2. Satisfact.	2.13	.54	.419*	(.67)						
3. Complex	4.07	.94	.271*	.054	(.65)					
4. Autonomy	3.15	1.24	.234*	.152	.187	(.61)				
5. Team membership	-	-	.145	.102	.179	.082	-			
6. Promotion	-	-	.016	-.065	-.113	.117	.041	-		
7. Education	-	-	-.002	.023	.217*	.180	.083	-.180	-	
8. Job category	-	-	.198*	.235*	.120	.160	.120	.009	.446*	-

Cronbach Alphas for the subscales (in parentheses) are in the diagonal.

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

Table 3
t-test for Equality in Work Attitudes Between Subgroups

Variable	Subgroup	N	Means	SD	t
Commitment	1 team memb.	60	2.99	1.02	-1.46
	2 nonmember	41	3.28	.82	
Satisfaction	1 team memb.	60	2.08	.59	-1.02
	2 nonmember	41	2.19	.45	
Commitment	1 promotion	14	3.05	.94	-.16
	2 no promot.	83	3.09	.95	
Satisfaction	1 promotion	14	2.21	.62	.63
	2 no promot.	83	2.11	.54	
Commitment	1 worker	75	3.02	.98	-1.36
	2 engineer	25	3.31	.79	
Satisfaction	1 worker	74	2.06	.54	-1.91*
	2 engineer	25	2.29	.49	
Commitment	1 female	9	3.46	.69	1.17
	2 male	93	3.08	.96	
Satisfaction	1 female	9	2.41	.32	1.64
	2 male	93	2.10	.55	

* $p < .10$

Table 4
Result of Regression Analysis for Company Commitment

Independent Variables	Standardized Beta	t
Job Attributes		
Team membership (1=Y)	.004	.033
Job Complexity	.273	2.497*
Work Autonomy	.153	1.396
Promotion expectation (1=Y)	.033	.307
Job type (1=worker, 2=engineer)	.195	.681
Employee Attributes		
Age (in years)	-.071	-.446
Gender (1=f, 2=m)	-.090	-.789
Education (1=primary school., 4=university)	-.262	-1.861**
Tenure (in years)	.121	.681
R Square	.178	
Adj. R Square	.073	
Durbin Watson	1.479	

Note: N=103 *p<.05 **p<.10

Table 5
Result of Regression Analysis for Job Satisfaction

Independent Variables	Standardized Beta	t
Job Attributes		
Team membership (1=Y)	.125	1.136
Job Complexity	-.047	-.427
Work Autonomy	.146	1.329
Promotion expectation (1=Y)	-.132	-1.216
Job type (1=worker, 2=engineer)	.260	1.763**
Employee Attributes		
Age (in years)	.086	.535
Gender (1=f, 2=m)	-.244	-2.123*
Education (1=primary school., 4=university)	-.082	-.581
Tenure (in years)	.102	.568
R Square	.170	
Adj. R Square	.063	
Durbin Watson	1.561	

Note: N=103 *p<.05 **p<.10