



ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to propose a conceptual framework on the key determinant of employee productivity. This paper is designed to study the three determinants that impact on employee productivity. Three key determinants were used as independent variables which are work environment, team and co-worker relationship, and organization well being. Employee productivity acts as a dependant variable. This is a causal study that has used qualitative exploratory methodology to draw conclusion about

TEAM WORK AND COWORKERS RELATIONSHIP AS A KEY DETERMINANT TO ORGANIZATIONAL SUCCESS AND EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY IN SELECTED COMMERCIAL BANKS IN MUBI, ADAMAWA STATE, NIGERIA

ABDULKARIM HARUNA (PhD)

Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Administration and Management, Adamawa State University, Mubi, Nigeria.

abdulkarimharuna@gmail.com

Introduction

In the current era, the subject of employee productivity has gained widespread attention. It has emerged as a significant and captivating topic of discussion, both within consulting firms and across various media outlets. This heightened interest is primarily attributed to the growing body of research that seeks to expand our understanding of employee productivity in the context of work, job roles, and organizational engagement (Welch, 2011). Moreover, it has been shown to exert a positive influence on a range of work-related outcomes, as evidenced by studies conducted by Vincent-Höper et al. (2012), Karatepe (2017), and Harter et al. (2016).

Kahn (1990) is credited with being the pioneer in defining work engagement as the "harnessing of organizational members' full selves to their roles." He emphasizes that engagement must originate from the individuals being employed, who can express it through their physical, cognitive, and emotional commitment to perform their duties, whether they are obligatory or voluntary. In line with this perspective, Shuck and Wollard (2020) have more recently articulated the concept of employee productivity as "an individual employee's cognitive, emotional, and behavioral disposition aimed at achieving desired organizational outcomes."

Employee productivity stands as a pivotal factor driving elevated levels of employee performance, a fact substantiated by numerous studies (Macey et al., 2019; Mone & London, 2020; Gorgievski et al., 2020; Christian et al., 2011; Chughtai & Buckley, 2011). In the quest for



employee productivity. The finding of the study shows relationship between work environment, team and co-worker relationship and organization well-being on employee productivity. A deep focus should be given to the factors that can enhance work environment, team and co-worker relationship as well as providing supportive organizational well-being to ensure the employees in their organization is fully engaged. The determinant of employee productivity will promote a healthy and positive working environment that can contribute to positive and healthy life in social community that impact productivity in business setting.

Keywords: Team Work, Coworkers Relationship, Organizational Wellbeing, Employees Productivity, Work Environment.

business success and competitiveness, organizations must assign greater significance to issues pertaining to employee productivity. It has been documented that highly engaged employees consistently deliver strong business results, even amid the volatility of the economic landscape (Kular et al., 2018; Harter et al., 2016; Shuck & Wollard, 2020). Organizations confronting production downturns resulting from global economic turbulence can endure and thrive, vow to engaged employees who remain steadfast in their roles. Their unwavering commitment to their work contributes to the organization's ability to sustain and perpetuate its operations. This underscores the critical importance of employee engagement, especially in times of economic instability.

While there has been a growing body of research on employee productivity, researchers have recognized a gap between academic investigations and practical applications (Macey & Schneider, 2018; Robinson et al., 2018). Given that an understanding of employee productivity is a cornerstone of organizational performance, it is imperative to explore the antecedent variables that directly impact employee productivity.

Problem Statement

Comprehending the genuine influence on employee productivity stands as a cornerstone in evaluating an employee's overall performance. As noted by prominent Australian researcher Hooper (2017), the Australian economy suffers an annual loss of approximately \$31 billion due to issues stemming from employee disengagement and resignations. Furthermore, the North Shore Health System allocates a substantial yearly investment of \$10 million towards employee training and development, with the aim of fostering and educating their workforce. This significant initiative is driven by the hope that it will elevate employee engagement levels within the organization (States, 2018). Consequently, this endeavor has yielded positive results, including a remarkable 96% reduction in annual retention rates, heightened customer satisfaction, and increased profitability (State, 2018).

Schaufeli and Bakker (2018) have discovered that organizations capable of fostering engagement among their employees tend to establish stronger bonds between the workforce and the



company. As a result, engaged employees exhibit a diminished intention to resign compared to their disengaged counterparts. Employee productivity not only shapes individual job performance but also exerts a substantial impact on employee turnover.

Since the year 2000, there has been a substantial influx of research papers addressing the topic of employee productivity. While the majority of these publications have primarily concentrated on various definitions of employee productivity, there is still element of insufficient in empirical studies aimed at identifying factors that can predict employee productivity. Furthermore, despite the acknowledged significance of engagement, as indicated by studies such as Kamet al. (2012), Macey et al. (2019), and Shuck and Wollard (2020), there seems to be a lack of consensus regarding the precursors and consequences of this construct, as noted by Sowath Rana et al. (2014).

Consequently, to bridge the existing knowledge gap concerning the determinants of employee productivity, this study appears to be both pertinent and capable of addressing the issue of employee attrition, potentially reducing the company's recruitment costs.

Literature Review

Teamwork

Teamwork is a group of employees, which is coordinated by a team leader or a manager, who has duty to do coaching to all members to show maximum performance by giving guidance, direction, motivation and inspiration, so that any delegated tasks can be performed well (Sinambela, 2016). According to McShane and Von Glinow (2012), to work effectively in a team, employees must have more than technical skills to perform their own work.

According to Cohen and Bailey (2009), an employee team is a collection of individuals who are interdependent in the tasks and who share responsibility for the outcomes. Team's enables people to cooperate, enhance individual skills and provide constructive feedback with out any conflict between individuals (Jones, 2007). Teamwork is an important factor for smooth functioning of an organization. Most of the organizational activities become complex due to advancement in technology therefore teamwork is a major focus of many organizations. One research study concluded that teamwork is necessary for all types of organization including non-profit organizations (Pfaff & Huddleston, 2003). Team members enhance the skills, knowledge and abilities while working in teams (Froebel & Marchington, 2005).

According to Ingram (2019), teamwork is a strategy that has a potential to improve the performance of individuals and organizations, but it needs to be nurtured over time. Organizations need to look at strategies for improving performance in the light of increasingly competitive environments. Top managers need to have the vision to introduce teamwork activities within the organizations, the sensitivity to nourish it and the courage to permit teams to play an important part in decision making.

Employee Productivity

To this day, there remains a lack of a universally agreed-upon definition for the term "employee productivity" (Markoz & Sridevi, 2020). Nevertheless, previous research has converged on a fundamental concept, as articulated by Kahn (1990), defining employee productivity as an individual employee's cognitive, emotional, and behavioral state directed toward desired



organizational outcomes (Shuck & Wollard, 2020). Employees exhibit a profound emotional and psychological connection to their work environment (Wagner & Harter, 2017; Kahn, 1990). Productivity also serves as a catalyst for heightened internal motivation, mindfulness, individual creativity, and ethical behavior, encouraging employees to go above and beyond their prescribed duties. Consequently, they become more productive and experience greater job satisfaction, operating within a conducive work environment (Robertson-Smith & Markwick, 2019). Organizations can gauge the effectiveness of their engagement initiatives by assessing improvements in customer loyalty, reductions in employee turnover, heightened employee productivity, and overall financial success (Robertson-Smith & Markwick, 2019). This assertion aligns with the discoveries of Harter et al. (2016) in their comprehensive meta-analysis encompassing 7,400 business units. They observed a discernible relationship between employee productivity and a variety of outcomes, including customer satisfaction, overall productivity, profitability, and employee retention, all of which collectively influence the overall success of a business.

Supportive Work Environment

The impact of the work environment on employee productivity is widely recognized as a crucial factor within organizations. Numerous prior studies, including those conducted by Miles (2020), Harter et al. (2016), Holbeche and Springett (2016), May et al. (2018), and Rich et al. (2020), have illuminated how various aspects of the work environment can significantly influence employee productivity outcomes. Deci and Ryan (1987) have illustrated that management functions that foster a supportive work environment demonstrate care and concern for employees' needs and emotions. They do so by providing positive feedback and encouraging employees to voice their needs, thereby enhancing their problem-solving abilities. Consequently, a harmonious and adaptable work environment that facilitates employees' focus on their tasks and personal development is strongly associated with positive outcomes (Anitha, 2017).

A supportive work environment serves as a comprehensive factor that can elevate employee productivity levels. Gallup's research data suggests that there is no metric that more profoundly influences human behavior diversity than the work environment itself. Additionally, the work environment encompasses all elements that shape our perception of life and our experiences (Rath & Harter, 2020). Consequently, the work environment emerges as a critical indicator of an organization's impact on its employees.

A nurturing atmosphere conducive to fostering and sustaining essential elements is cultivated through the principles of camaraderie, collaboration, assistance, and confidence, as highlighted by Kahn in 1990. To assess the current state of a supportive workplace, employees will be queried regarding their experiences with camaraderie, collaboration, assistance, and trust. It is worth noting that employees who do not encounter these criteria in their professional relationships often experience feelings of isolation, disconnection from their peers, and heightened stress levels. Such relationships are typically absent in hostile work environments or when employees perceive threats, compelling them to adopt a facade instead of being authentic (Kahn, 1990). Establishing a sense of connection to their work significantly enhances employees' overall work experience and subsequently boosts their engagement levels.



Team and Coworker Relationship

The interplay between team dynamics and coworker relationships represents another crucial factor influencing employee productivity. As suggested by Kahn (1990), fostering supportive and trust-based connections among colleagues can significantly elevate employee productivity, underpinned by the bedrock of harmonious and tangible relational qualities. In practical terms, a team characterized by supportive members contributes to each member's capacity to explore new avenues and extends unwavering assistance during challenging circumstances and adversities (Kahn, 1990). This assertion is further corroborated by May et al. (2018), who established that workplace relationships wield a substantial influence on the development of a sense of meaning, a vital component of overall engagement. Echoing this sentiment, Locke and Taylor (1990) argue that employees who cultivate positive interpersonal interactions within the workplace not only derive a greater sense of purpose from their tasks but also evolve into more engaged team contributors. In summation, when employees cultivate robust relationships within their organization, their level of work engagement tends to soar, as affirmed by Anitha (2017).

Organisation Well-being

Measuring the well-being of an organization is a crucial determinant of employee productivity, as highlighted by Anitha in 2017. According to Gallup's data, there is no other metric that better reflects the variability in human behavior than well-being. Rath and Harter, in 2020, defined well-being as encompassing all the factors that significantly influence how individuals perceive and experience their lives. In essence, well-being stands as the paramount measure to gauge the organization's impact on its employees, as noted by Anitha in 2017.

Additionally, the Towers Perrin Talent Report from 2016 also emphasized the significance of well-being, which has been extensively explored by scholars. It is considered the foremost determinant of engagement, prompting senior management to take a keen interest in their employees' well-being.

Empirical Review

Ooko (2020) did a study on impact of teamwork on the achievement of targets in organizations in Kenya, using SOS children's village, Eldoret was the study area. The study adopted descriptive research design. The study found that job satisfaction was to be achieved through recognition of achievement, promotions, good working environments and fair rewards and remunerations. This was to impact team performance if it was done correctly. It was concluded that there was no effective teamwork at SOS despite employees being aware of how much they can achieve by working together in teams.

Shastri (2019) examined the relationship between charismatic leadership and team commitment in Indian organization with a sample of 147 employees from Eastern and Northern India and found that the two major antecedents (Charismatic leadership and job satisfaction) exert strong effect on team commitment of the employees of Indian organization in the study sample. This finding indicates that people tend to be more satisfied if their leader displays charismatic behaviour which makes them to be more committed to their organization. Since it was found that leader's sensitivity to member's needs is related to team commitment, then managers need to be clear



about the goals and values of the organization so as to align them with the needs of the workers. This will help to reduce the high turnover rates being experienced in today's Industrial World.

The study of Shekari, Naieh & Nouri (2019) investigated relationship between team delegation authority process and rate of effectiveness: case study municipality regions of Mashhad. Team delegation of authority was measured by preparation, appreciation stage and effectiveness. Correlation analysis was employed as method of data analysis. Findings of their study showed that there is a significant relationship between team delegation authority process, and rate of effectiveness. And appreciation and preparation stage have greater effect on rate of effectiveness.

According to Kibe (2019) investigated the effects of communication strategies on organizational performance. A descriptive research design was used in this study. 132 questionnaires were distributed employees. The findings of this research showed the importance of both the theoretical level and practical level. It concluded that for any organizational performance to be effective, an open communication environment should be encouraged. Once members of the organization feel free to share feedback, ideas and even criticism at every level it increases performance.

Underpinning Theory

In the realm of theoretical foundations and their alignment with Kahn's (1990) engagement concept, Abraham Maslow's (1970) motivational theories bear a striking resemblance to Kahn's concept. Maslow's hierarchy of needs is well-recognized for providing a comprehensive and enhanced understanding of a conceptual framework. According to Maslow, it is imperative to address fundamental human needs while also establishing a context for comprehending employee productivity. Nonetheless, this research employed Social Exchange Theory (SET) and the theories of Leader-Member Exchange and Team-Member Exchange (LMX-TMX). These theories have been selected due to their comprehensive ability to elucidate the relationships among all variables under examination in this study.

The Social Exchange Theory

The Social Exchange Theory (SET), also known as SET, has gained widespread acceptance as the predominant theory in contemporary research and studies on employee productivity. Saks (2017) asserted that SET provides robust and comprehensive theoretical support for understanding employee productivity. At the core of SET is the concept that individuals make social decisions based on their perceived costs and benefits (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Human beings assess social relationships by evaluating the advantages and benefits they expect to gain from these relationships (Ethugala, 2011). Saks (2017) further highlighted that the most effective way for employees to reciprocate their organization's kindness is by demonstrating a high level of engagement.

In essence, SET offers a coherent theoretical framework that explains why employees choose to be more or less engaged in their work and within the organization. The conditions for engagement, as outlined by Kahn (1990), encompass both economic and socio-emotional exchange resources. This underscores the importance of organizations providing these resources to their employees,



as when employees have access to these resources, they are more inclined to reciprocate by displaying elevated levels of engagement.

Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory

Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) theory finds its application at the individual level, particularly in the context of workplace relationships among employees. Furthermore, there exists a positive correlation between workplace relationships and Team-Member Exchange (TMX), thereby establishing a meaningful connection between LMX and TMX theories. Seers (1989) has defined LMX as the quality of relationships between an individual and their fellow team members.

Over the past 25 years, numerous studies have been conducted to explore the practical implications of Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) theory (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). In the realm of LMX theory, scholars have predominantly focused on discerning the exchange dynamics within relationships as leaders strive to cultivate and sustain relationships with their subordinates through collaborative teamwork (Dansereau et al., 1975). Sparrowe and Liden (1997) have additionally emphasized the interconnectedness of interpersonal relationships among leaders, subordinates, and coworkers, forming a broader social system that operates as a cohesive team and organization. Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) have advocated for a systemic perspective, calling for further research to enhance our comprehension of how LMX dyadic relationships can influence the work attitudes and behaviors of employees within larger organizational teams.

This is because Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) not only influences the dyadic relationships between leaders and team members but can also extend its impact to other exchange relationships within a larger organization. Specifically, LMX can affect Team Member Exchange (TMX). Additionally, a high-quality LMX relationship fosters a comfortable working environment, facilitating effective communication through shared identity and common values. This serves as a foundation for employees to bridge the gap between them, fostering strong emotional bonds in the workplace and promoting the formation of friendships among colleagues (Ellemers et al., 2018).

Methodology

This study employed qualitative research approach with a hypothetical deductive framework to generate knowledge and establish the connection between independent and dependent variables related to employee productivity. The research adopts a cross-sectional survey design due to its short timeframe. To select participants, a simple random sampling method is utilized among middle and lower managerial levels across four banks in Mubi. The research population comprises employees in the Banking sector within the Mubi, Adamawa State. Specifically, the sample is drawn from two employee levels: the middle managerial level, which encompasses all unit and department assistant managers as well as bank officers, and the lower managerial level, focusing on front-line employees at the clerical level in the four chosen banks. Viz United Bank for Africa (UBA), Union Bank Plc, First Bank Plc and Zenith Bank Plc. Where verbal interactions (Oral interview) were conducted in supporting the content analyzed in the review.

Implication and Recommendation for Future Research

This paper underscores the pivotal factors influencing employee productivity, emphasizing their potential to cultivate a positive work environment that significantly shapes the employer's social



image. The key determinants discussed herein can garner substantial attention from employees, enabling managers to bolster their confidence when interacting with their subordinates and involving them in organizational development initiatives. It is essential to allocate ample time for setting clear objectives and ensuring that every employee comprehends the firm's expectations for their performance. Engaging employees in this manner fosters optimism and productivity, ultimately enhancing overall organizational performance.

This research seeks to further emphasize the significance of all three determinants in enhancing employee engagement. Additionally, it encourages future studies to explore the impact of these variables on both employee productivity and performance across diverse organizations, aiming to deepen our understanding of these crucial aspects of employee productivity.

Conclusion

The realm of employee productivity has witnessed a growing body of research, predominantly spearheaded by practitioners rather than academic scholars. This trend is largely attributable to the substantial influence of practitioner literature and consulting firms in shaping the discourse on employee productivity, leading to a surprising scarcity of academic inquiry in this domain (Robinson et al., 2018). Consequently, there arises an urgent imperative for future research endeavors to delve deeper into the subject of employee productivity.

As aforementioned, numerous prior studies have underscored the pivotal role of employee productivity in determining an organization's success. In this study, we have selected three independent variables—namely, work environment, team and coworker relationships, and organizational well-being—based on Kahn's (1990) emotional state framework for employee productivity. This selection aligns with previous research, such as that conducted by Saks (2017), which, despite the dearth of empirical studies on predictors of employee productivity, identifies potential antecedents from Kahn's (1990) and Maslach et al.'s (2020) model. Shuck and Wollard (2020) also affirm that employee productivity can be defined as an emergent and functional state characterized by positive cognitive, emotional, and behavioral engagement directed toward organizational outcomes.

Furthermore, the issue of engagement is consistently discussed within the context of behavioral aspects, rather than considering the cognitive and emotional dimensions of engagement (Shuck & Wollard, 2020). Consequently, this research aims to investigate the emotional facets of engagement and their relationship with three variables that influence employee productivity. By examining these crucial factors that precede employee productivity, this study may offer valuable insights and information to organizations. It can aid in creating a more conducive work environment, fostering a harmonious and friendly team atmosphere, nurturing strong coworker relationships, and ultimately prioritizing organizational well-being as an essential element for enhancing employee productivity. To foster employee engagement, these initiatives can be implemented within the organization, going beyond mere monetary incentives such as rewards, recognition, bonuses, and salary increments.

References

- Anitha, J. (2017). *Determinants of employee productivity and their impact on employee performance*. International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 63(3), 308-323.



- Cohen, S. G. & Bailey, D. E. (2009). *What makes teams work: group effectiveness research from the shop floor to the executive suite*. Journal of Management, 23(3), 239-90.
- Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R. M. (1987). *The support of autonomy and the control of behavior*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53(6), 1024-1037.
- Froebel, P. & Marchington, M. (2005). *Teamwork structures and worker perception: a cross national study in pharmaceuticals*, International Journal of Human Resource Management, 16(2), 256-276.
- Gallup, H. (2016). *The high cost of disengaged employees*. Gallup Business Journal, 15, available at: <http://businessjournal.gallup.com/content/247/thehigh-cost-of-disengaged-employees>.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F.L. & Keyes, C. L. (2016). *Well-being in the workplace and its relationship to business outcomes: A review of the Gallup studies. The Positive Person and the Good Life*, American Psychological Association, Washington: Flourishing Press.
- Hewitt Associates L. L. C. (2018). *Research brief: Employee productivity higher at double-digit growth companies*. Available at: www.hewitt.com (accessed 21 August 2014).
- Holbeche, L. & Springett, N. (2016). *In search of meaning in the workplace*. Horsham, Roffey Park Institute, ISBN: 0 907416527.
- Hooper, P. (2017). *Public green spaces and positive mental health - investigating the relationship between access, quantity and types of parks and mental wellbeing*. Journal of health place. 4(8), 63-71.
- Ingram, H. (2019). *Linking teamwork with performance*. Journal of Team Performance Management, 2(4), 5-10.
- Jones, A., Richard, B., Paul, D., Sloane K. & Peter, F. (2007). *Effectiveness of teambuilding in organization*. Journal of Management, 5(3), 35-37.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). *Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work*. Academy of Management Journal, 33(4), 692-724.
- Kibe, C. W. (2019). *Effects of Communication Strategies on Organizational Performance: A Case Study of Kenya Ports Authority*. European Journal of Business and Management 6(11) 6-10.
- Kular, S., Gatenby, M., Rees, C., Soane, E. and Truss, K. (2018). "Employee productivity: a literature review.
- Macey, W. H. & Schneider, B. (2018). *The meaning of employee productivity*. Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 1(1), 3-30.
- Macey, W.H., Schneider, B., Barbera, K.M., & Young, S. A. (2019). *Employee productivity: Tools for analysis, practice, and competitive advantage*. Malden, WA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B. & Leiter, M. P. (2020). *Job burnout*. Annual Review of Psychology, 52(1), 397-422.
- May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. M. (2018). *The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work*. Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology, 77(1), 11-37.
- McShane, S. L. & Glinow, M. V. (2012). *Organizational Behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Miles, R. H. (2020). *Beyond the age of Dilbert: Accelerating corporate transformations by rapidly engaging all employees*. Organisational Dynamics, 29(4), 313-321.
- Mone, E.M., & London, M. (2020). *Employee productivity through effective performance management: A practical guide for managers*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ooko, A. P. (2020). *Impact of teamwork on the achievement of targets in organizations in Kenya. A study of SOS Children villages, Eldoret*. A Masters Degree Thesis Submitted to the University of Nairobi.
- Pfaff, E. & Huddleston, P. (2003). *Does it matter if I hate teamwork? What impacts student attitudes toward teamwork*. Journal of Marketing Education 25:37-45.
- Rath, T., & Harter, J. K. (2020). *Wellbeing: The five essential elements*. New York, NY: Gallup Press.
- Rhoades, L. and Eisenberger, R. (2016). "Perceived organizational support: a review of the literature", Journal of Applied Psychology, 8(7), 698-714
- Rich, B.L., Lepine, J.A., & Crawford, E. R. (2020). *Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance*. Academy of Management Journal, 53(3), 617-635.
- Robinson D., Perryman S., and Hayday S. (2018). *The Drivers of Employee productivity Report 408*, Institute for Employment Studies, UK.
- Saks, A. M., & Rotman, J. L. (2017). *Antecedents and consequences of employee productivity*. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21(7), 600-619.
- Schaufeli, W. B. & Bakker, A. B. (2018) *The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: a cross-national study*. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 6(6), 701-716.
- Shekari, G., Naieh, M. & Nouri, R. (2019). *Relationship between team delegation authority process and rate of effectiveness (case study municipality regions of Mashhad)*. Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business, 4(5), 870-889.
- Shuck, B., & Wollard, K. (2020). *Employee productivity & HRD: A seminal review of the foundations*. Human Resource Development Review, 9(1), 89-110.
- Sinambela, L. P. (2016). *Human Resource Management: Built solid teamwork to increase performance*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Towers Perrin Talent Report. (2016). *Working today: Understanding what drives employee productivity*.
- Van Veldhoven, M., De Jonge, J., Broersen, J. P. J., Kompier, M., & Meijman, T. (2016). *Specific relations between psychosocial job conditions and job-related stress: A three-level analytic approach*. Work and Stress, 16, 207-228



**MAY, 2024 EDITIONS. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF:
FINANCIAL RESEARCH & MGT. SCIENCE VOL. 4**

Wagner, R. & Harter, J. K. (2017). *The Great Elements of Managing*, The Gallup Organization, Washington, DC.
Welch, M. (2011). The evolution of the employee productivity concept: Communication implications. *Corporate Communications. An International Journal*, 16(4), 328-346.