

# Journal of Human Resource and Leadership (JHRL)



## **AN ASSESSMENT OF THE QUALITIES OF HIGH PERFORMANCE TEAMS \_ A CASE STUDY OF WORLD VISION KENYA**

**Linda Mukolwe Muyoti and Dr. Percy Opio**

## AN ASSESSMENT OF THE QUALITIES OF HIGH PERFORMANCE TEAMS – A CASE STUDY OF WORLD VISION KENYA

<sup>1\*</sup> Linda Mukolwe Muyoti

Post Graduate Diploma Student, Pan Africa Christian University \*Corresponding  
Author's E-mail: [lindamuyoti@gmail.com](mailto:lindamuyoti@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Percy Opio

Lecturer, Pan Africa Christian University

### Abstract

**Purpose:** To assess the qualities of high performance teams in World Vision Kenya.

**Methodology:** The study adopted a survey research design.

**Findings:** Descriptive results revealed that both the team members and the team leaders agreed with the statements on shared leadership, trust and conflict management style. The inferential statistics revealed that shared leadership, trust and conflict management style had a positive and significant relationship with team performance.

**Unique contribution to theory, practice and policy:** The study will help reveal strengths in teams as well as disclose weaknesses that need to be addressed in order to get teams performing at the highest level. World Vision Kenya leadership will benefit from the findings of this study which will enable them make informed decisions regarding appropriate support and investment required for team empowerment. Teams that are not performing at their best level stand to gain from learning from HPTs. This study further intends to contribute to knowledge on characteristics of high performance teams.

**Keywords:** *Shared Leadership, Trust, Conflict Management Style, Team Performance*

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **Background**

Organizations are increasingly depending on teams to succeed hence the demand for outstanding teams. High team performance does not come as a guarantee despite the efforts put in hiring the right person, assigning them the right job and putting them in the right team. Studies have shown that influences from internal and external environment continue to impact team performance. As organizations strive to strengthen their teams, West (2012) cautions against one size fits all prescriptions for effective teamwork due to their uniqueness. He identified the following five key components for team effectiveness:-

- a) The extent to which the team is successful in achieving task related objectives
- b) Team member wellbeing which includes mental health, growth and development
- c) Team viability which relates to the team's ability to continuously work together and function effectively
- d) Team innovation characterized by the extent to which the team develops and implements new and improved processes, products and procedures
- e) Inter team cooperation which is the effectiveness of the team in working with other teams in the organization with which it has to work with in order to deliver products or services Mankins and Steele (2005) state that an average team achieves only 63% of their strategic plans. This was based on a research they conducted which went on to identify key issues that impact success of teams to include; communication, alignment to top priorities, trust, short and long term plans and accountability. Mankins and Steele's research identified five common features of companies that were found to have performance gaps. These companies failed to track performance against top annual priorities. Their multi-year results rarely meet projections. There was evidence of poor communication and lack of follow through. Top management were found reluctant to address bottlenecks and tolerant of underperformance.

Effective teams come with a number of benefits to the organization. According to Mattson (2015) they foster creativity, healthy risk taking and learning which generates into new ideas, innovation and solutions catapulting the organization at higher levels. Productivity and profits are increased through the complementary strengths from the team. Customers are able to receive affordable products or services because teams are working together in an efficient way to surpass targets. Warrick (2016) adds that teamwork can significantly improve morale, job satisfaction, unity of purpose, communication, quality, speed in getting things done and loyalty to an organization.

There are many examples of organizations that have succeeded through HPTs. Thiel (2009) commends Procter & Gamble and General Electric for deploying a team-based strategy to achieve high results. They turned team development into a part of their corporate strategy, making them enterprise-wide initiatives. The resultant effect was increased productivity, quality, reduction in costs and faster time to market. Motorola also relied heavily on HPTs to surpass its Japanese competition in producing the lightest, smallest, and highest-quality cellular phones. Kodak's Zebra Team proved the worth of black-and-white film manufacturing in a world where color was king.

De Silva (2012) cites Apple, Toyota and General Electric as global giants, among the best high performance organizations. The distinct feature of these organizations is that they manage and empower their people differently. He notes that Toyota is known for building people before building cars. The center of TPS is people. Employees see themselves as equal participants in the success of the organization. Teamwork is the most significant characteristic in Toyota's organizational culture (De Silva, 2012).

There are also examples of organizations that have lost miserably because of poor team performance. An example is Microsoft, once a force to reckon with but now Apple, Google and Facebook have dominated the technology industry. Eichenwald (2012) revealed several issues that contributed to its downfall. Among them is the infamous management system called stack ranking also referred to as performance model. This system put a demand on every functional team to declare a certain percentage of top, good, average and poor performers. The result was unhealthy competition among team members. Some of the former and current employees who were interviewed confessed to having withheld information from others so that they would not get ahead of them.

Several authors have identified numerous characteristics of HPTs (Katzenbach & Smith 1993; Mackin, 2007; Hakanen & Soudunsaari, 2012 and Ricci & Wiese, 2012). This study will only focus on three qualities namely shared leadership, trust and conflict management styles. Literature review on shared leadership, trust and conflict management styles provided the linkage between the above three variables and team performance (Carson, Tesluk & Marrone, 2007; Tjosvold, Hui, Ding & Hu, 2003; Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 2000 & Lencioni, 2000).

### **Statement of the Problem**

In WVK team performance is measured and monitored against defined criteria that have been standardized across the partnership. The measures in place focus more on the team results at the expense of team characteristics which impact performance. It is important to note that WVK on various forums has taken to recognizing and rewarding teams with commendable performance. However, there is a glaring gap with regard to learning from top teams. There is also limited effort towards empowering teams to be high performing and maintain at high performance levels. Research has revealed that very few teams reach the level of high performance (Scholtes, Joiner & Streibel, 2003). WV's effort to reward and recognize top performing teams has not also worked as a strong motivator to other teams. For WVK to gain maximum returns from its teams it has to begin from the point of understanding the uniqueness of its top performing teams so that these lessons can be applied to other teams.

### **Objectives of the Study**

- To identify the influence of shared leadership on team performance.
- To establish the influence of trust on team performance.
- To identify the influence of conflict management style on team performance.

## **THEORETICAL REVIEW**

### **Stages of Group Development**

The selection of Tuckman's stages of group development is based on the fact that it brings out the aspect of group development explaining the process of a team maturing into an effective functioning unit (Wheelan, 2005). Stages of group development model by Bruce Wayne Tuckman was published in 1965 and later refined in 1977 (Chapman, 2013). The model recognizes that groups go through progressive stages of growth up to the level where they become high performing (Tuckman, 1965). Tuckman's studies initially identifies four phases namely; forming, storming, norming and performing. Tuckman's subsequent studies along with Mary Ann Jensen's contribution added the fifth stage of adjourning (Scholtes, Joiner & Streibel, 2003).

According to Tuckman (1965) teams begin at the forming stage. In this stage, individual roles and responsibilities are not clear, team members focus on themselves and depend on the leader to be directed (Chapman, 2013). Mathieu, Kuenberger and Innocenzo (2014), propose that there is also a shift in testing boundaries, overcoming individual boundaries and legitimizing leadership. This ushers the storming stage characterized by a time of conflict, unrest and disagreement.

Caple (1978) suggested that conflicts arise when members become acquainted with each other's strengths and weaknesses as well as tasks versus people orientation. Members are judgmental and critical of other members, they voice their opinions, resist and challenge authority (Raynolds, Lodato, Gordon, Blair-Smith, Welsh, & GerZon, 2007), whereas others fight to maintain their identity (Tuckman, 1965). Hartzell (2016) observes that it is at this stage that dominant personalities emerge while the non-confrontational ones suppress their feelings. Tuckman (1965), argued that some teams that are unable to resolve conflict never move out of the storming stage. Hartzell (2016) suggests that questions around leadership, rules, responsibilities, structure, evaluation and performance need to be addressed before the team transitions to the next stage. Tuckman (1965) proposed that it is in the storming stage that teams define the mission, determine how to perform independent and interdependent tasks and define leadership model.

Raynolds et al. (2007) argued that once conflicts are resolved the team members are seen to become more intimate and cooperative. Norming stage is one of group identity and cohesion in which there is mutual goal alignment and agreed upon processes (Mathieu, 2014). Members are more accepting of one another thus unified (Nestor, 2013). Kormanski and Mozenter (1987) referred to this stage as cooperation in which team members agree on major decisions through consultation and some aspects of leadership are shared. The norming phase represents a period of cohesiveness and in-group feeling, where focus shifts to assigned task (Tuckman, 1965).

Teams in performing stage perform at the highest level, unfortunately not all of them reach this level (Scholtes, Joiner & Streibel, 2003). In performing stage the group actively produces and performs tasks (Tuckman & Jensen, 1977). There is flexibility and dynamism (Tuckman 1965; Braaten, 1975). Team members mutually explore and resolve problems (Mathieu et al., 2014). There is a high degree of autonomy, team members are genuinely concerned for one another and they can freely seek support from their leader (Vliet, 2014). This stage represents achievement (Caple, 1978). Scholtes, Joiner and Streibel (2003) caution that although a team may reach this

stage it can easily revert back to former stages for instance if a new member joins the team it will revert back to the forming stage or if change occurs they may revert back to the storming stage. Subsequent studies of Tuckman included the adjourning stage which represents the break-up of the team (Scholtes, Joiner & Streibel, 2003). In WVK context project teams are guaranteed of going through this stage since they are constituted to address a specific assignment within a restricted period of time. According to Swarhout (2016), organizational development such as restructuring can land teams into the adjourning phase. Adjourning stage is characterized by feelings of insecurity or threat due to separation. Scholtes, Joiner and Streibel (2003) point out the importance of celebrating success and documenting best practices.

Tuckman (1965) summarized three issues that determine team's performance, content, process and feeling. Content is about what the team does, process is how the team works towards its objectives and feeling encompasses how the team members relate to one another. Tuckman's research suggests that most teams concentrate on content at the expense of process and feeling (Nestor, 2013).

### **Strengths and Weaknesses of Tuckman's Team Stages Model**

Tuckman's model application was intensified in the beginning of the twenty-first century where it was applied in various work settings, project teams (Erickson & Dyer, 2004), leadership teams (Wheelan, 2003), virtual teams (Maruping & Agarwal, 2004), public health partnerships (McMorris, Gottlieb & Sneden, 2005) and in education (Cassidy, 2007). Scholtes (1988) supports the predictability of team stages model and how members gradually learn to cope with the emotional and group pressures they face. Tuckman's model is easy to use due to its practical perspective and commonsense approach (McMorris, Gottlieb & Sneden, 2005).

Tuckman (1965) stated several limitations in his original work. These included non representative literature review and over representation of therapy group setting. Gersick (1988) stated that Tuckman's model assumed groups to be closed systems thereby downplaying the role of external influences on group development. Cassidy (2007) proposed a shift from looking at conflict as a stage and exploring concerns that drive the conflict. Cassidy also stated concern over application of storming stage outside of therapeutic groups – thus limiting the applicability of Tuckman's model in experiential education. Rickards and Moger (2000) proposed several limitations about the model. Its failure to explain how groups change over time, its limitations regarding effects of team development on creativity in problem solving and inadequacy in discussing management of poor and outstanding performances. Several developmental models including Tuckman's fall short of assuming group development processes are linear (Richards & Moger, 2000; Miller, 2003). Vliet (2014), suggested that the model was designed to describe development stages in small groups it is not clear how this plays out in large teams. Vliet was also concerned about the time a team is required to take in each stage or even when to progress to the next stage.

Morgan, Salas and Glickman (1993) took aspects of Tuckman's and Garsick's model (1988) and proposed a hybrid team evolution and maturation (TEAM) development model. This model has nine stages, five from Tuckman's model. The additional include reforming, performing II, conforming and deforming. Morgan et al. (1993) did not expect teams to develop in a linear fashion

and suggested that groups could recycle through phases in order to resolve conflict or correct misconceptions. Mathieu et al. (2014) argued that spending time to work things out in the initial stages of team development can benefit team performance over time. This was supported by several researchers on development model who proposed that the success of later stages was dependent on the success in the earlier. In conclusion Tuckman's model along other development models can be used to identify which stages teams are at so that informed decisions can be made on timely interventions to facilitate team development (Mathieu, 2014).

## **METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY**

This research used a survey design. The target population included all functional teams that met the criteria of HPTs. Purposive sampling was employed to determine respondents from HPTs while stratified cluster random sampling was employed to select respondents from the operations teams. The sample size of this study was therefore 38 respondents. The study used both primary and secondary data. The study used questionnaires which were self-administered through an online survey platform to obtain primary data. The survey undertook secondary data review to triangulate primary data. Key documents were reviewed including survey reports, MMR, scorecards, KPIs and annual reports. Data was analyzed using SPSS. The analyzed data was presented through logical narratives, tables, graphs and charts.

## **RESULTS OF THE STUDY**

Data analyzed was summarized in line with the research objective and appropriate frequency tables and charts inserted for presentation.

### **Response rate**

The number of questionnaires that were administered to all the respondents was 45. A total of 32 questionnaires were properly filled and returned. This represented an overall successful response rate of 71% as shown on Table 1.

**Table 1: Response Rate**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Returned	32	71%
Unreturned	13	29%
<b>Total</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100%</b>

### **Demographics Characteristics**

The respondents were required to provide about their gender, size of their team and duration served in the team. Results revealed that majority (63%) of the team members were men while 37% of the respondents were women. However, the results of the team leaders revealed that majority (80%) of the team leaders were female while only 20% were male. Results also revealed that 31% of the team members indicated more than 20 members, 27% indicated that their group had 5-10 members, 23% indicated that their group had 11-20 members while 19% indicated that their group had 2-4 members. These results were consistent with those of the team leaders who indicated that 40% of their groups had more than 20 members, 40% of their groups had between 11 – 20 members

while only 20% of the team leaders indicated that their teams had between 2 – 4 members. Further, results revealed that 41% of the team members indicated above 5 years, 37% indicated above 2-5 years while 11 % of the team members indicated 1-2 years and less than 1 year each. This implies that majority of the team members had served in their teams for more than 2 years. However, the results from the team leaders were inconsistent as they indicated that majority (60%) of the team leaders had served for less than one year, 20% had served for more than five years while another 20% had served for 2 – 5 years.

### **Descriptive Statistics Shared Leadership**

The first objective of the study was to identify the influence of shared leadership on team performance. The team members were asked to respond to statements on shared leadership. The responses were rated on a five likert scale as presented in Table 2. Majority (89%) of the respondents agreed with the statement that they participate in setting goals for key assignments and projects within my team while 11% of the respondents neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. Majority (81%) of the team members agreed with the statement that they are consulted on how problems facing my team are to be resolved, 15% of the team members neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement while 4 % of the team members disagreed with the statement. Majority (96%) of the team members agreed that they collaborate with others on making decisions around tasks and assignments given while 4% neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement.

Results in Table 2 also show that majority (71%) of the team members agreed that they are consulted on how resources such as time, are to be allocated with regard to the team's priorities, 19% of the respondents neither agreed nor disagreed while 10% of the team members disagreed with statement. Majority (81%) of the team members agreed with the statement that they participate in identifying and resolving the problems that my team faces while 19% neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. Majority (88%) of the team members agreed with the statement that they feel free to chip in (even if it is outside my area of responsibility) to ensure that the team fulfills its obligation, 4% neither agreed nor disagreed while 4% disagreed with the statement.

Further, results in Table 2 revealed that majority (96%) of the team members agreed with the statement that they are free to share their perceptions regarding a situation facing the team while 4% neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. Majority (96%) of the team members agreed with the statement that they receive information from other members which helps me work more effectively while 4% neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. Majority (96%) of the team members agreed with the statement that they are encouraged by others during challenging times at work while 4% neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. Majority (85%) of the team members agreed with the statement that they learn job skills from other team members, 4% neither agreed nor disagreed while 11% disagreed with the statement. This implies that majority of the team members agreed with the statements on shared leadership.



**Table 2: Shared leadership**

Statement	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
I participate in setting goals for key assignments and projects within my team	0.0%	0.0%	11.0%	56.0%	33%
I am consulted on how problems facing my team are to be resolved	0.0%	1.0%	15.0%	44.0%	37.0%
I collaborate with others on making decisions around tasks and assignments given.	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%	52.0%	44.0%
I am consulted on how resources such as time, are to be allocated with regard to the team's priorities.	0.0%	2.0%	19.0%	41.0%	30.0%
I participate in identifying and resolving the problems that my team faces.	0.0%	0.0%	19%	48.0%	33.0%
I feel free to chip in (even if it is outside my area of responsibility) to ensure that the team fulfils it's obligation.	0.0%	4.0%	4.0%	59.0%	30.0%
I am free to share my perceptions regarding a situation facing the team	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%	67.0%	30.0%
I receive information from other members which helps me work more effectively.	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%	52.0%	41.0%
I am encouraged by others during challenging times at work	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%	70.0%	26.0%
I learn job skills from other team members	0.0%	4.0%	4.0%	63.0%	22.0%

The team leaders were asked to indicate whether they assigned leading roles to individuals within their team. Results in table 3 reveal that 60% of the team leaders asserted that they always assign leading roles to individuals within their team while 40% of the team leaders reiterated that they assign leading roles to individuals within their team often.

**Table 3: Assigning Leading Roles**

Response	Frequency	Percent
Always	3	60
Often	2	40
Total	5	100

The team leaders were also asked to indicate whether they assign major leading roles to any individual. All the team leaders were in agreement that they assigned major leading roles to some of the team members. Results were shown in table 4.

**Table 4: Shared Leadership**

Statement	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
Each member of my team shares in establishing goals for assignments and projects given.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%
Each member shares in deciding the best course of action when a problem arises	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%
Members collaborate with one another in making decisions that affect team assignments and projects.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%
Each members has a say in deciding how resources such as time.... are to be allocated with regard to the team's priorities.	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	60.0%	20.0%
Members helps to identify and resolve the problems that the team is facing.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	80.0%
Each member feels free to chip in (even if it is outside their area of responsibility) to ensure that the team fulfils it's obligation.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%
The opinions of members counts when they share perceptions regarding a situation facing the team.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%

Each member shares information with others so that all members work more effectively.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%
Team members encourage one another during challenging times at work.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%
Team members learn important job skills from one another.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%

Team leaders were asked to respond to statements on shared leadership. The responses were rated on a five likert scale as presented in Table 4. All the team leaders agreed that each member of their team shares in establishing goals for assignments and projects given. All the team leaders also agreed that each member shares in deciding the best course of action when a problem arises. All the team leaders were also in agreement that members collaborate with one another in making decisions that affect team assignments and projects.

Results in Table 4 also show that majority (80%) of the team leaders agreed with the statement that each member has a say in deciding how resources such as time are to be allocated with regard to the team's priorities while 20% disagreed. All the team leaders agreed with the statement that team members help to identify and resolve the problems that the team is facing. All the team leaders also agreed that each member feels free to chip in (even if it is outside their area of responsibility) to ensure that the team fulfils its obligation.

Further, results in Table 4 revealed that all the team leaders agreed that the opinions of members' counts when they share perceptions regarding a situation facing the team. All the team leaders also agreed that each member shares information with others so that all members work more effectively. All the team leaders also agreed that team members encourage one another during challenging times at work as well as team members learn important job skills from one another. This implies that majority of the team leaders agreed with the statements on shared leadership.

## Trust

The second objective of the study was to establish the influence of trust on team performance. The team members were asked to respond to statements on trust. The responses were rated on a five likert scale as presented in Table 5. All (100%) of the team members agreed with the statement that they feel free to admit their mistakes within the team. Majority (76%) of the team members agreed with the statement that they freely acknowledge their weaknesses to other team members, 19% of team members neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement while 4 % of the team members disagreed with the statement.

Results in Table 5 also showed that all (100%) of the team members agreed that they are free to ask for help without hesitation. Majority (96%) of the team members agreed that they allow other members to give them feedback regarding their responsibilities while 4% of the team members disagreed with statement. Majority (85%) of the team members agreed with the statement that in

their team they tap into one another's skills and experiences, 4% neither agreed nor disagreed while 11% disagreed with the statement. Majority (96%) of the team members agreed with the statement that they offer and accept apologies from other team members while 4% neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. Majority (90%) of the team members agreed with the statement that they trust their team members, 3% neither agreed nor disagreed while 7% disagreed with the statement. Majority (89%) of the team members agreed with the statement that their team members trust them while 11% neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. Majority (82%) of the team members agreed with the statement that their team members know some aspects about their personal life while 18% neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. This implies that majority of the team members agreed with the statements on trust.

**Table 5: Trust**

Statement	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
I feel free to admit my mistakes within the team.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	59.0%	41.0%
I freely acknowledge my weaknesses to other team members	0.0%	4.0%	19.0%	52.0%	26.0%
I am free to ask for help without hesitation.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	44.0%	56.0%
I allow other members to give me feedback regarding my responsibilities. In my team we tap into one another's skills and experiences.	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%	44.0%	52.0%
I offer and accept apologies from other team members.	0.0%	7.0%	4.0%	48.0%	37.0%
I trust my team members.	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%	37.0%	59.0%
My team members trust me.	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	56.0%	33.0%
My team members know some aspects about my personal life.	0.0%	0.0%	11.0%	52.0%	37.0%
	<u>0.0%</u>	<u>0.0%</u>	<u>19.0%</u>	<u>63.0%</u>	<u>19.0%</u>

Results in Table 6 show the responses of the team leaders with regard to trust. Majority (60%) of the team leaders agreed that team members admit their mistakes while 40% neither agreed nor disagreed. Majority (60%) of the team leaders agreed that team members acknowledge their weaknesses to one another while 40% neither agreed nor disagreed. Majority (60%) of the team leaders agreed that team members ask for help without hesitation while 40% neither agreed nor disagreed. All the team leaders agreed that team members ask one another for input regarding their

areas of responsibility. All the team leaders agreed that team members acknowledge and tap into one another's skills and expertise

Results in Table 6 also revealed that majority (80%) of the team leaders agreed that team members willingly apologize to one another while 20% neither agreed nor disagreed. Majority (60%) of the team leaders neither agreed nor disagreed that team members are unguarded and genuine with one another while 40% agreed. Further, results revealed that 60% of the team leaders agreed that team members comfortably discuss their lives outside work with one another while 40% neither agreed nor disagreed. The results reveal that most of the team leaders agreed with the statements on trust.

**Table 6: Trust**

<b>Statement</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>
Team members admit their mistakes.	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%	60.00%	0.00%
Team members acknowledge their weaknesses to one another.	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%	60.00%	0.00%
Team members ask for help without hesitation.	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%	40.00%	20.00%
Team members ask one another for input regarding their areas of responsibility.	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	80.00%	20.00%
Team members acknowledge and tap into one another's skills and expertise.	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	80.00%	20.00%
Team members willingly apologize to one another.	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	60.00%	20.00%
Team members are unguarded and genuine with one another.	0.00%	0.00%	60.00%	20.00%	20.00%
Team members comfortably discuss their lives outside work with one another.	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%	60.00%	0.00%

### **Conflict Management Style**

The third objective of the study was to identify the influence of conflict management style on team performance. The team members were asked to respond to statements on conflict management style. The responses were rated on a five likert scale as presented in Table 7. Majority (74%) of the team members agreed with the statement that they need to attain excellent results and they cannot be limited by others, 15% neither agreed nor disagreed while 11% disagreed with the statement. Majority (96%) of the team members agreed with the statement that they are willing to listen to other's opinions but they are also willing to give them theirs while 4% of the team members

neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. Majority (73%) of the team members disagreed with the statement that once they have taken a position they do not like taking a lot of time discussing it with others, 22% neither agreed nor disagreed while 7% agreed with the statement. Majority (73%) of the team members agreed that they after they make a decision they defend it, 15% neither agreed nor disagreed while 14% of the team members disagreed with statement. Majority (85%) of the team members agreed with the statement that they make slight modifications in their goals to accommodate other people's needs while 15% neither agreed nor disagreed. Majority (66%) of the team members agreed with the statement that they think it is more important to get along than win an argument, 19% disagreed while 15% of the team members neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement.

Majority (63%) of the team members agreed with the statement that they think it's more important to stand on their principles, 30% neither agreed nor disagreed while 7% disagreed with the statement. Majority (71%) of the team members agreed with the statement that they are firm and not swayed by others, 19% neither agreed nor disagreed while 11% disagreed with the statement. Majority (52%) of the team members disagreed with the statement that they like to meet people halfway while 29% agreed while 19% neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. Thirty eight percent (38%) of the team members disagreed with the statement that they find conflicts challenging and exhilarating; they enjoy the battle of wits that usually follows, 33% agreed while 33% neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. Majority (92%) of the team members agreed with the statement that when conflicts arise they take time to talk things through as they seek the opinion of others while 8% neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. The results imply that the team members depicted both competitive and cooperative approach of conflict management style.

**Table 7: Conflict Management Style**

<b>Statement</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>
I need to attain excellent results and					
I cannot be limited by others I am willing to listen to other's opinions but I am also willing to	0.0%	11.0%	15.0%	33.0%	41.0%
give them mine	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%	44.0%	52.0%
Once I have taken a position I do not like taking a lot of time discussing it with others	19.0%	52.0%	22.0%	7.0%	0.0%
After I make a decision I defend it I make slight modifications in my goals to accommodate other	7.0%	7.0%	15.0%	52.0%	19.0%

people's needs.	0.0%	0.0%	15.0%	59.0%	26.0%
I think it is more important to get along than win an argument. I think it's more important to stand on my principles.	7.0%	11.0%	15.0%	33.0%	33.0%
I am firm and not swayed by others	0.0%	7.0%	30.0%	33.0%	30.0%
I like to meet people halfway I find conflicts challenging and exhilarating; I enjoy the battle of wits that usually follows.	0.0%	11.0%	19.0%	52.0%	19.0%
When conflict arise I take time to talk things through as I seek the opinion of others	19.0%	33.0%	19.0%	15.0%	15.0%
	19.0%	19.0%	30.0%	26.0%	7.0%
	0.0%	0.0%	7.0%	44.0%	48.0%

Results in Table 8 show the responses of the team leaders with regard to conflict management style. Results reveal that majority (60%) of the team leaders agreed with the statement that they need to attain excellent results and they cannot be limited by others while 40% neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. All the team leaders agreed that they are willing to listen to other's opinions but they are also willing to give them theirs. Majority (60%) of the team leaders disagreed with the statement that once they have taken a position they do not like taking a lot of time discussing it with others, 20% neither agreed nor disagreed while 20% agreed with the statement. Majority (60%) of the team leaders disagreed with the statement that after they make a decision they defend it while 40% agreed with the statement.

Further, results revealed that majority (80%) of the team leaders agreed with the statement that they make slight modifications in their goals to accommodate other people's needs while 20% disagreed with the statement. Majority (60%) of the team leaders agreed with the statement that they think it is more important to get along than win an argument, 20% neither agreed nor disagreed while 20% disagreed with the statement. All the team leaders agreed that they think it's more important to stand on their principles. Majority (60%) of the team leaders agreed with the statement that they are firm and not swayed by others, 20% neither agreed nor disagreed while 20% disagreed with the statement.

**Table 8: Conflict Management Style**

Statement	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
I need to attain excellent results and I cannot be limited by others	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	0.0%
I am willing to listen to other's opinions but I am also willing to give them mine	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%
Once I have taken a position I do not like taking a lot of time discussing it with others	40.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	0.0%
After I make a decision I defend it	20.0%	40.0%	0.0%	20.0%	20.0%

I make slight modifications in my goals to accommodate other people's needs.	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	40.0%	40.0%
I think it is more important to get along than win an argument.	0.0%	20.0%	20.0%	40.0%	20.0%
I think it's more important to stand on my principles.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%
I am firm and not swayed by others	0.0%	20.0%	20.0%	40.0%	20.0%
I like to meet people halfway	0.0%	20.0%	40.0%	20.0%	20.0%
I find conflicts challenging and exhilarating; I enjoy the battle of wits that usually follows.	0.0%	20.0%	40.0%	40.0%	0.0%
In my team people cooperate rather than compete with each other.	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	60.0%	20.0%
When conflicts arise I take time to talk things through as I seek the opinion of others	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%

Results in Table 8 also showed that 40% of the team leaders agreed with the statement that they like to meet people halfway, 40% neither agreed nor disagreed while 20% disagreed with the statement. Another 40% of the team leaders agreed with the statement that they find conflicts challenging and exhilarating; they enjoy the battle of wits that usually follows, 40% neither agreed nor disagreed while 20% disagreed with the statement. Majority (80%) of the team leaders agreed with the statement that in their team people cooperate rather than compete with each other while 20% neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. Finally, all the team leaders agreed that when conflicts arise they take time to talk things through as they seek the opinion of others. The results imply that the team leaders depicted both competitive and cooperative approach of conflict management style.

### Team Performance

The team members were asked to respond to statements on team performance. The responses were rated on a five likert scale as presented in Table 9. Majority (97%) of the team members agreed with the statement that they believe their participation in leadership responsibilities contributes positively to their team performance while 3% of the respondents disagreed with the statement. Majority of (96%) of the team members agreed with the statement that they believe the trust they have for their teammates contributes highly to their team's performance while 4% of the team members neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. All (100%) of the team members agreed with the statement that they believe their way of solving problems has contributed to good performance in their team.

**Table 9: Team Performance**

Statement	Strongly disagree	<u>Disagree</u>	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree



I believe my participating in leadership responsibilities contributes positively to our team performance.	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%	30.0%	67.0%
I believe the trust I have for my team members contributes highly to our team’s performance. I believe my way of solving problems has contributed to good performance in my team	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%	56.0%	41.0%
	<u>0.0%</u>	<u>0.0%</u>	<u>0.0%</u>	<u>56.0%</u>	<u>44. .0%</u>

Results in Table 10 show the responses of the team leaders with regard to team performance. Results reveal that all the team leaders agreed that the practice of sharing leadership has contributed positively to their team performance. All the team leaders also agreed with the statement that the way team members trust one has an impact on our team performance. Further, results in Table 10 show that all the team leaders also agreed with the statement that they believe their way of solving problems has contributed to good performance in their team.

**Table 10: Team Performance**

Statement	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
The practice of sharing leadership has contributed positively to our team performance.	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%	60.00%
The way team members trust one an impact on our team performance.	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	80.00%	20.00%
I believe my way of solving problems has contributed to good performance in my team	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%	60.00%

### Inferential Statistics

Inferential analysis was conducted to generate the regression analysis which comprised the model of fitness, and analysis of the variance and regression coefficients

### Regression Analysis

The results presented in Table 11 present the fitness of model used of the regression model in explaining the study phenomena. Shared leadership, trust and conflict management style were found to be satisfactory variables in team performance. This is supported by coefficient of determination also known as the R square of 61.6%. This means that shared leadership, trust and conflict management style explain 61.6% of the variations in the dependent variable which is team performance. This results further means that the model applied to link the relationship of the variables was satisfactory.

**Table 11: Model Fitness**

Indicator	Coefficient
R	0.785
R Square	0.616

In statistics significance testing the p-value indicates the level of relation of the independent variable to the dependent variable. If the significance number found is less than the critical value also known as the probability value (p) which is statistically set at 0.05, then the conclusion would be that the model is significant in explaining the relationship; else the model would be regarded as non-significant.

Table 12 provides the results on the analysis of the variance (ANOVA). The results indicate that the overall model was statistically significant. Further, the results imply that the independent variables are good predictors of team performance. This was supported by an F statistic of 14.982 and the reported p value (0.000) which was less than the conventional probability of 0.05 significance level.

**Table 12: Analysis of Variance**

Indicator	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	3.284	3	1.095	14.982	0.000
Residual	2.046	28	0.073		
Total	5.33	31			

Regression of coefficients results in Table 13 show that shared leadership and team performance are positively and significantly related ( $\beta=0.306$ ,  $p=0.040$ ). The table further indicates that trust and team performance are positively and significantly related ( $\beta=0.519$ ,  $p=0.000$ ) while conflict management style and team performance were positively and significantly related ( $\beta =0.346$ ,  $p=0.020$ ).

**Table 13: Regression of Coefficients**

Variable	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.
(Constant)	1.071	0.602	1.779	0.086
Shared Leadership	0.306	0.142	2.156	0.040

Trust	0.519	0.123	4.214	0.000
Conflict Management Style	0.346	0.117	2.96	0.020

Thus, the optimal model for the study is;

Team Performance =  $1.071 + 0.306$  Shared leadership +  $0.519$  Trust +  $0.346$  Conflict management style

## CONCLUSIONS

The study concluded that shared leadership influences the team performance in WVK. The study also concluded that trust influences the team performance in WVK. Further, the study concluded that conflict management style influences the team performance in WVK.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the study findings the study recommended that the team leaders in World Vision Kenya should continually delegate leadership roles to team members. This would help to increase team performance as members feel part of the team. The study also recommended that team leaders should encourage good interaction, honest and open communication, sharing of experiences among the members. This would help to build trust among the members and thus improve team performance since trust has a positive impact on team performance. The study also recommended that team leaders in WVK should consider adopting a cooperative approach of conflict management. This would impact team performance directly since team outcomes are greatly affected by whether team members adopt a cooperative or a competitive conflict management approach.

## REFERENCES

- Alper, S., Tjosvold, D., & Law, K. S. (2000). Conflict management, efficacy, and performance in organizational teams. *Personnel Psychology*, 53(3), 625-642.
- Caple, R. B. (1978). The Sequential Stages of Group Development. *Small Group Behavior*, 9(4), 470-76.
- Carson, J. B., Tesluk, P. E., & Marrone, J. A. (2007). Shared leadership in teams: An investigation of antecedent conditions and performance. *Academy of management Journal*, 50(5), 1217-1234.
- Cassidy, J., & Cassidy, D. (2007). What's hot, what's not for 2007. *Reading Today*, 24(4), 1.

Chapman, C. (2013). *High-leverage leadership: improving outcomes in educational settings*. Routledge.

D’Innocenzo, L., Mathieu, J. E., & Kukenberger, M. R. (2014). A meta-analysis of different forms of shared leadership–team performance relations. *Journal of Management*, 0149206314525205.

De Silva, D. G. (2012). Geographic concentration and high tech firm survival. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 42(4), 691-701.

Eichenwald, K. (2012). Microsoft’s lost decade. *Vanity Fair*, August. Retrieved from <http://www.vanityfair.com/news/business/2012/08/microsoft-lost-mojo-steve-ballmer>.

Gersick, C. J. (1988). Time and transition in work teams: Toward a new model of group development. *Academy of Management journal*, 31(1), 9-41.

Hakanen, M., & Soudunsaari, A. (2012). Building trust in high-performing teams. *Technology Innovation Management Review*, 2(6), 38.

Katzenbach, J., & Smith, D. (1993). *The wisdom of teams: Creating the high performance team*. Boston: Harvard Business Scholl Pres, 175.

Kormanski, C., & Mozenter, A. (1987). A new model of team building: A technology for today and tomorrow. In J.W. Pfeiffer (Ed.), *The 1987 annual: Developing human resources* (pp. 255–268). San Diego, CA: University Associates.

Lencioni, P. M. (2000). *The five temptations of a CEO: A leadership fable* (Vol. 21). John Wiley & Sons.

Mackin, D. (2007). *The team building tool kit: tips and tactics for effective workplace teams*. AMACOM Div American Mgmt Assn.

Mankins, M. C., & Steele, R. (2005). Turning great strategy into great performance. *Harvard business review*, 2607.

- Maruping, L. M., & Agarwal, R. (2004). Managing team interpersonal processes through technology: a task-technology fit perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(6), 975.
- McMorris, L. E., Gottlieb, N. H., & Sneden, G. G. (2005). Developmental stages in public health partnerships: A practical perspective. *Health Promotion Practice, 6*(2), 219-226.
- Miller, D. L. (2003). The stages of group development: A retrospective study of dynamic team processes. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences/Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration, 20*(2), 121-134.
- Morgan Jr, B. B., Salas, E., & Glickman, A. S. (1993). An analysis of team evolution and maturation. *The Journal of General Psychology, 120*(3), 277-291.
- Raynolds, J., Lodato, A., Gordon, R., Blair-Smith, C., Welsh, J., & Gerzon, M. (2007). Leadership the Outward Bound Way.
- Ricci, R. & Wiese, C. (2011). The collaboration imperative: Executive strategies for unlocking your organization's true potential. San Francisco, CA: Cisco Systems, Inc.
- Rickards, T., & Moger, S. (2000). Creative leadership processes in project team development: an alternative to Tuckman's stage model. *British journal of Management, 11*(4), 273-283.
- Scholtes, P. R. (1988). *The team handbook: How to use teams to improve quality*. Madison, WI: Joiner Associates.
- Scholtes, P. R., Joiner, B. L., & Streibel, B. J. (2003). *The team handbook*. Oriel Incorporated.
- Tuckman, B. W. (1965). Developmental sequence in small groups. *Psychological bulletin, 63*(6), 384.
- Tuckman, B.W., & Jensen, M.A.C. (1977). Stages of small group development revisited. *Group and Organizational Studies, 2*, 419-427.

Warrick, D. D. (2016). What leaders can learn about teamwork and developing high performance teams from organization development practitioners. *Performance Improvement*, 55(3), 13-21.

West, M. A. (2012). *Effective teamwork: Practical lessons from organizational research*. John Wiley & Sons.

Wheelan, S. A. (2009). Group size, group development, and group productivity. *Small Group Research*.