

---

## TEAM COLLABORATION AND ORGANIZATIONAL SUCCESS OF CONSTRUCTION FIRMS IN RIVERS STATE

By

Ruth Waale Ijeoma-Charles<sup>1</sup> and B. Chima Onuoha<sup>2</sup>

1. Doctoral Student, Department of Management, University of Port Harcourt.
2. Professor of Management, Department of Management, University of Port Harcourt

### Abstract

*This study examined the relationship between team collaboration and the organisational success of a construction firm in Rivers State, Nigeria. The cross-sectional survey design was utilised, and a total population of 280 supervisors and managers from eight (10) construction firms in Rivers State was covered. A sample size of 162 managers and supervisors was drawn for the study. Data were collected using copies of a well-structured questionnaire, and a simple random sampling technique was utilised in the study. The data was analysed using Spearman's rank-order correlation. The result of the analysis revealed that the dimensions of team collaboration (team cooperation and shared decision-making) have a significant positive relationship with operational efficiency and organisational responsiveness. It was concluded that enhanced team collaboration in terms of team cooperation and shared decision-making will help improve the success of construction firms. The study recommends, amongst other things, that the management of construction firms should adopt a team cooperation process by constantly organising training and development programmes for employees of the organisation on how to form and work in teams before its implementation to improve organisational success.*

**Keywords:** Team Collaboration, Organizational Success, Team Cooperation, Share Decision Making, Operational Efficiency Organizational Responsiveness.

## Introduction

Organisational success in the construction industry is defined as the successful completion of planned projects notwithstanding the presence of unanticipated challenges (Hayen et al., 2007). Advantages, increased profits, decreased expenses, and increased productivity are all possible side effects. According to Mohammadi et al. (2017), a business is successful if and only if it is able to turn a profit and hold its own against rivals in its field. Such results may include, but are not limited to, meeting or exceeding predetermined sales, revenue, or market share targets; meeting or exceeding predetermined production targets; maintaining or exceeding predetermined quality standards; or meeting or exceeding predetermined safety targets. According to West (2012), "humans have always and everywhere lived, loved, aged, and laboured together in groups." Common experiences in daily life foster bonds between individuals, communities, and families. When people work together as a team, they can accomplish far more than they could on their own. To achieve organisational success, studies have repeatedly recommended participatory structures based on teamwork and collaboration (Connelly, 2007). The growing complexity of addressing social problems via multi-sector collaboration is a contributing factor. Leung (2013) argues that cooperation may improve the quality, timeliness, and cost-effectiveness of the delivery of goods and services. There is a lack of literature on the relationship between collaboration among teams and organisational success, despite the fact that many aspects enabling the success of organisations have been studied.

## Statement of the Problem

Opportunity costs of financial resources spent and the inability to obtain the intended advantages have hampered the organisational success of many enterprises today (Ortiz, 2014), and this is a major reason why so many businesses fail. There are clear impediments to the free flow of knowledge, and people tend to be reluctant to share what they do know. While teams may feel compelled to share information in order to accomplish their goals, research shows that this is also the time when communication breaks down the most (Mesmer-Magnus & Dechurch, 2009). Problems like this arise, as noted by Yaacob et al. (2011), when people are overworked, feel threatened, or believe that their superior expertise makes them important. It's a common misconception that the level of expertise of a team member is more significant than their enthusiasm, focus, and commitment to the work at hand. Another common misconception is that the team as a whole is responsible for the success or failure of the activities it undertakes. The fact is that the members are the team's most minute components, and that each member's skills contribute to the team's overall success. Teams can have varying degrees of engagement or connections within their ranks, depending on how far along the spectrum of communication, integration, and commitment each member is. Rather of struggling to solve the problem on their own, they may work together to find a common solution and complete the task at hand. Despite several efforts to address the issue, achieving organisational success remains difficult. This fact motivates us to investigate the connection between effective teamwork in the form of team cooperation and shared decision-making and the organisational success of construction enterprises in Rivers State.

## Hypotheses

The null hypotheses were formulated as a tentative answer to the research questions;

**H<sub>01</sub>:** There is no relationship between Team Cooperation and Operational Efficiency of construction firms in Rivers State

**H<sub>02</sub>:** There is no relationship between Team Cooperation and Organizational Responsiveness of construction firms in Rivers State

**H<sub>03</sub>:** There is no relationship between Shared Decision-Making and Operational Efficiency of construction firms in Rivers State

**H<sub>04</sub>:** There is no relationship between Shared Decision-Making and Organizational Responsiveness of construction firms in Rivers State

## 2.0 Literature Review

Social identity theory is central to this investigation. The foundation of Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) is the idea that people's sense of self is both protected and strengthened by the social organisations to which they belong. One's "in-group" is defined in relation to a "out-group," and one's own group is likely to be seen favourably in comparison to the "out-group" while forming a group identity. As a result, members of the group come to identify with a shared, impersonal identity that is shaped by their shared experiences and values (e.g., Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). According to this theory, a group consists of a collection of individuals who view themselves as part of the same social category and who use the social identity-defining attributes of that category in assessing who they are and how they measure up to others (attributes that capture and accentuate intragroup similarities and intergroup differences; Tajfel & Turner, 1986).

### Team Collaboration

Working together entails devising a plan of action that helps diverse external and internal players with varying capacities meet their shared objectives and compete successfully on a global scale. According to Ning et al. (2013) and Kumar et al. (2016), collaboration is a key aspect in the success of any given company. Sanders (2007) proposes two varieties of workplace cooperation. Inter-collaboration is similar to intra-collaboration but focuses on cooperation between two or more organisations, and both need careful planning, coordination, and the exchange of relevant information and procedures. Working together as a team has several benefits that may help businesses succeed. Among these benefits is the ability to better achieve the stated goals, save costs via better shared practises, and increase decision-making and creativity through the sharing of information and ideas (Teruel et al., 2018).

### Team Cooperation

A team is a group of people that decide to live, work, play, and collaborate with one another in order to accomplish a goal. Dyer (2016) defines teams as "groups of people who trust in cooperation;" if team members are specialists, the likelihood of achieving the goal is increased. When members of a team work together, they are able to divide up the burden and pool their resources. Working as a team relieves pressure on individual members, allowing them to focus on and accomplish the organization's most critical projects. It also gives workers a chance to bond with their co-workers. Additionally, it fosters the growth of relationships between team members, who are therefore more likely to feel valued for their contributions to the team's success (Mangi et al., 2019). Members of a team will naturally have a wide range of expertise and experience; yet, they may learn new things from one another as they collaborate. Rather of struggling to solve the problem on their own, they may work together to find a common solution and complete the task at hand. Teams often perform better in the workplace when they have a common objective and work together to achieve it. The organisation gains, but employee morale and productivity are also boosted by this (Merriam, 2019).

### **Shared Decision-Making**

According to Abdulai and Shafiwu (2014), decision making is "the process of identifying and selecting a course of action to solve a particular problem." In the context of choosing a choice, it may also be seen as the mental operation of zeroing in on the most rational alternative. According to Eromafuru (2016), deciding on a solution entails identifying the issues at hand and picking one from among the available options. According to Welhrich and Koontz (2018), selecting choices is fundamental to the planning process. In this manner, managerial decision-making is central to any endeavour, necessitating the application of managerial creativity, subjectivity, logic, and, at times, some quantitative approaches to issues of corporate, group, or individual relevance. Murew (1967) argues that including workers in the creation of rules, procedures, and processes that influence them has particular applicability to shared decision-making. As a result, it is a collaborative effort between upper management and staff. According to Kloeze et al. (1980), it is necessary to describe involvement in terms of intensity and valence. The degree of participation in an organisation describes the extent to which each employee contributes to strategy development and execution. How power is distributed and how significant people's input is will both play a role. It is largely dependent on the spelled out degree of participation in that organisation as to whether or not the employees are truly allowed to be involved and allowed to make decisions, or whether or not they are merely allowed to have some input that is not fully incorporated in decision-making (pseudo-participation).

### **Organizational Success**

To thrive in the fiercely competitive business environment of today companies will need to adapt to meet new and varied challenges. In popular opinion, a business is successful if and only if it is able to turn a profit and hold its own against rivals in its field. Such results may include, but are not limited to, meeting or exceeding predetermined sales, revenue, or market share targets; meeting or exceeding predetermined production targets; maintaining or exceeding predetermined quality standards; or meeting or exceeding predetermined safety targets. Each of these results may be thought of as a global or composite assessment of the company's overall health. Companies cannot depend just on things like their stellar reputation, ground-breaking goods, rock-bottom prices, ingenious marketing, or formidable sales force in today's highly competitive business climate. In modern business, cooperation across departments is essential for success. An organization's success is measured by the sum of its parts, and those parts are the results and achievements of many people and teams throughout time. What individuals accomplish at all levels of the organisation is, therefore, very crucial to its success. Managers and academics alike have an ongoing issue when trying to quantify an organization's performance. Despite the widespread use of financial metrics for so long, new frameworks have evolved in recent years to broaden the lens through which businesses view themselves.

### **Operational Efficiency**

The capacity to provide goods and services at low cost without sacrificing quality is what we mean when we talk about operational efficiency. It is viewed as a method for getting valuable goods and services to consumers in the most efficient and timely manner possible (Neil, 2019). Ndolo (2015) argues that a company's operational efficiency is the single most important factor in whether or not it would eventually fail. Companies may improve their operational efficiency by simplifying their core processes in order to respond more quickly and cheaply to the ever-evolving demands of the market. In other words, businesses may improve their operational efficiency by reducing waste and duplication, making the most of

their resources, and maximising the effectiveness of their staff, innovations, and business procedures. Operating more efficiently helps businesses save money, which is especially useful in highly competitive marketplaces where every advantage counts (Vangie, 2019). Organisational operational efficiency is dependent on a wide variety of factors, including but not limited to competent experts, legal creative motion, proper acquisition execution, business return to scale, and supply chain management (Ranjan & Bishnu, 2017).

### **Organizational Responsiveness**

To be responsive, an organisation must be flexible and creative enough to respond to shifting market conditions, such as shifting client demands and an intensifying competitive landscape (Wei et al., 2014). In today's highly competitive business environment, the ability to quickly and effectively respond to client demands is one of the most important differentiating factors you can provide. According to Holweg (2018), a company's responsiveness indicates how well it can meet shifting consumer needs. Adopting an agile strategy that attempts to promote a team's long-term sustainability by strengthening the team's competence can help teams be more responsive in contexts with high levels of uncertainty (Loss & Crave, 2011). The ability and capability to respond to environmental concerns appears to be the primary strategic challenge for most enterprises. Organisational processes of hearing, comprehending, and responding may be conceptually reflected upon with greater granularity thanks to the active notion of responsiveness. One of the first steps towards a responsive practise on the micro level is creating the environment for reflective discussion to take place. Most organisations in today's tumultuous organisational contexts have to cope with both the "here and now" and the future, and they need to be able to combine routine conduct with improvisation (Winter, 2003). Thus, there are strategic and operational dimensions to organisational responsiveness.

### **Empirical Review**

Contributions from organizational collaboration to business intelligence solutions success was examined by Villamarin-Garcia (2020). According to the multi-methodology proposed by Mingers (2006), the research was carried out in four stages: appreciation, analysis, assessment, and action. This way, a systematic literature review, a survey application to people who have participated in BI research and/or implementation projects, an exploratory factorial analysis, a composite additive indexes analysis and; finally, a Pearson's correlation analysis was developed. It resulted in 14 factors grouped in five dimensions showing that both intra and inter-organizational collaboration factors, contribute to the success of BI solutions from a managerial-organizational perspective.

The study of Harris (2015) empirically validated the link between organization support of collaboration and organization effectiveness. Data was collected via a web-based questionnaire administered to a broad sample of individuals who work in organizations. Results supported a model of Organization Support of Collaboration with six factors (Connect to the Environment, Craft a Culture of Collaboration, Understand Work Processes, Design Using an Array of Structures, Build Shared Leadership, and Align Support Systems) and a model of Organization Effectiveness with six factors (Performance, Employee Involvement, Flexibility, Customer Satisfaction, New Customer Development, and Treatment of People). Connect to the Environment predicted five of the six Organization Effectiveness factors, and Craft a Culture of Collaboration predicted four of the six, notably with a connection to Performance. For the predicted relationships between the models, nine hypotheses were supported, six were not supported, and three unexpected significant relationships were found.

Agarwal and Adjirackor (2016) assessed the impact of teamwork on organizational productivity on the staff members of Kwashieman Anglican Basic School of the Accra Metropolitan Assembly, Omanjor M/A Basic School -Accra Region. The study utilized quantitative techniques to analyze the relationship between the variables that is Teamwork, Esprit de corps (Team Spirit), team trust, recognition and rewards and organizational productivity. The study shows that there is a significant positive impact of the predictors on the response variable with an adjusted R<sup>2</sup> of 70.5%. The study recommends that teamwork activities have to be adopted in order to enhance Organizational Productivity.

Torrente (2012) studied the function of team work engagement as a mediator between team social resources and team performance. Data from 533 people has been compiled. Employees were divided into 62 teams and 13 organizations, with team performance being measured. Supervisory ratings are used to evaluate the work. Teamwork, as expected, was found via structural equation modeling. Engagement acts as a bridge between team-level social resources and team-level social resources.

### **3.0 Methodology**

For this study, researchers employed a cross-sectional survey to collect data from 162 managers and supervisors at 8 different construction companies in Rivers State. The sample size was calculated using the formula used by Krejcie and Morgan (1970). As a consequence, 162 surveys were sent out to managers and supervisors at the selected eight businesses. A basic random sample method was employed for this research. This strategy was adopted since it fairly represents the population at large and minimises the potential for bias on the part of the researchers. Team cooperation and shared decision making were used as indicators of team collaboration (an independent variable). Team cooperation was measured using five things (e.g., there is great cooperation between members of the project team in my company) and shared decision-making was measured using five items (e.g., workers are permitted to participate in the decision-making process in the organisation). The success and responsiveness of operations were used as indicators of organisational success (the dependent variable). Five items were used for assessing operational efficiency (e.g., my company runs at peak efficiency) and five items were used to gauge organisational responsiveness (e.g., my organisation adapts well to change). A Likert scale was used, with 1 representing significant disagreement, 2 representing disagreement, 3 representing agreement, and 4 representing strong agreement. The Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient in SPSS version 21 was used to facilitate analysis of the bivariate hypotheses.

### **4.0 Result**

A total of 162 questionnaires were distributed to respondent, however, only 153 (94%) copies were returned and used for the study. The hypotheses test was undertaken at a 95% confidence interval implying a 0.05 level of significance. The decision rule is set at a critical region of  $p > 0.05$  for acceptance of the null hypothesis and  $p < 0.05$  for rejection of the null hypothesis.

**Table 1: Team Cooperation and Operational Efficiency**

Correlations				
			Team Cooperation	Operational Efficiency
Spearman's rho	Team Cooperation	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.781**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	153	153
	Operational Efficiency	Correlation Coefficient	.981**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	153	153
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).				

Source: SPSS Output, 2022

**Ho<sub>1</sub>: There is no significant relationship between Team Cooperation and Operational Efficiency of construction firms in Rivers State.**

The result of the analysis in Table 1 shows a significant level  $p < 0.05$  ( $0.000 < 0.05$ ),  $\rho = 0.981$  between team cooperation and operational efficiency. This means that there is a significant relationship between Team Cooperation and Operational Efficiency. The null hypothesis is rejected, and we restate that *there is a significant relationship between team cooperation and operational efficiency*.

**Table 2: Team Cooperation and Organizational Responsiveness**

Correlations				
			Team Cooperation	Organizational Responsiveness
Spearman's rho	Team cooperation	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.753**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	153	153
	Organizational Responsiveness	Correlation Coefficient	.753**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	153	153
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).				

Source: SPSS Output, 2022

**Ho<sub>2</sub>: There is no significant relationship between Team Cooperation and Organizational Responsiveness of construction firms in Rivers State.**

The result of the analysis in Table 1 shows a significant level  $p < 0.05$  ( $0.000 < 0.05$ ),  $\rho = 0.753$  between team cooperation and organizational responsiveness. This means that there is a significant relationship between Team Cooperation and Organizational Responsiveness. The null hypothesis is rejected, and we restate that *there is a significant relationship between team cooperation and organizational responsiveness.*

**Table 3: Shared Decision Making and Operational Efficiency**

Correlations				
			Shared Decision Making	Operational Efficiency
Spearman's rho	Shared Decision Making	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.724**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	153	153
	Operational Efficiency	Correlation Coefficient	.724**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	153	153
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).				

Source: SPSS Output, 2022

**Ho<sub>3</sub>: There is no significant relationship between Shared Decision Making and Operational Efficiency of construction firms in Rivers State.**

The result of the analysis in Table 1 shows a significant level  $p < 0.05$  ( $0.000 < 0.05$ ),  $\rho = 0.724$  between share decision making and operational efficiency. This means that there is a significant relationship between Shared Decision Making and Operational Efficiency. The null hypothesis is rejected, and we restate that *there is a significant relationship between shared decision making and operational efficiency.*



**Table 4: Shared Decision Making Organizational Responsiveness**

Correlations				
			Shared Decision Making	Organizational Responsiveness
Spearman's rho	Shared Decision Making	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.751**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	153	153
	Organizational Responsiveness	Correlation Coefficient	.751**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	153	153
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).				

Source: SPSS Output, 2022

**Ho<sub>4</sub>: There is no significant relationship between Shared Decision Making and Organizational Responsiveness of construction firms in Rivers State.**

The result of the analysis in Table 1 shows a significant level  $p < 0.05$  ( $0.000 < 0.05$ ),  $\rho = 0.751$  between shared decision making and organizational responsiveness. This means that there is a significant relationship between Shared Decision Making and Organization Responsiveness. The null hypothesis is rejected, and we restate that *there is a significant relationship between shared decision making and organizational responsiveness.*

**5.0 Discussion of Findings**

**Team Cooperation and Operational Efficiency**

The bivariate hypotheses between team Cooperation and Operational Efficiency reveal a remarkable relationship between the two variables. The spearman correlation coefficient reveal that the p-value of 0.000 was less than 0.05 ( $p = 0.000 < 0.05$ ) which implies that Cooperation has a significant relationship with Operational Efficiency. Thus the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternate hypothesis was accepted. The result of the correlation coefficient (r) is 0.981. This thus shows that team cooperation accounts for up to 98.1% level of operational efficiency. Therefore increasing team cooperation will enable the operational efficiency to increase. The first objective of the study which sought to examine if team cooperation relates with operational efficiency was achieved. This conclusion is consistent with the opinion of Terry et al. (1980), who stated that teams may solve issues more efficiently and with better results than individuals working alone by pooling their talents, competences, and efforts and creating mutually agreeable priorities.

**Team Cooperation and Organizational Responsiveness**

The bivariate hypotheses between team Cooperation and Organizational Responsiveness reveal a remarkable relationship between the two variables. The spearman correlation coefficient reveal that the p-value of 0.000 was less than 0.05 ( $p = 0.000 < 0.05$ ) which implies that Team Cooperation has a significant relationship with Organizational Responsiveness. Thus the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternate hypothesis was accepted. The result of

the correlation coefficient ( $r$ ) is 0.753. This thus shows that team cooperation accounts for up to 75.3% level of Organizational Responsiveness. Therefore increasing team cooperation will enable the organizational responsiveness to increase. The second objective of the study which sought to examine if team cooperation relates with organizational responsiveness was achieved. This conclusion is consistent with the opinion of Loss and Crave (2017), who argue that an agile strategy that seeks to promote a team's long-term sustainability through strengthening the team's capabilities is key to achieving responsiveness in unstable circumstances.

### **Shared Decision Making and Operational Efficiency**

The bivariate hypotheses between Shared Decision Making and Operational Efficiency reveal a remarkable relationship between the two variables. The spearman correlation coefficient reveal that the  $p$ -value of 0.000 was less than 0.05 ( $p=0.000<0.05$ ) which implies that Shared Decision Making has a significant relationship with Operational Efficiency. Thus the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternate hypothesis was accepted. The result of the correlation coefficient ( $r$ ) is 0.724. This thus shows that shared decision making accounts for up to 72.4% level of operational efficiency. Therefore increasing shared decision making will enable the operational efficiency to increase. The third objective of the study which sought to examine if shared decision making relates with operational efficiency was achieved. These results are consistent with those found by Lundgren (1984), who argues that, like many forms of leadership, the goal of collaborative decision making is to boost productivity without sacrificing employee morale.

### **Shared Decision Making and Organizational Responsiveness**

The bivariate hypotheses between Shared Decision Making and Organizational Responsiveness reveal a remarkable relationship between the two variables. The spearman correlation coefficient reveal that the  $p$ -value of 0.000 was less than 0.05 ( $p=0.000<0.05$ ) which implies that Shared Decision Making has a significant relationship with Organizational Responsiveness. Thus the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternate hypothesis was accepted. The result of the correlation coefficient ( $r$ ) is 0.751. This thus shows that Shared Decision Making accounts for up to 75.1% level of Organizational Responsiveness. Therefore increasing Shared Decision Making will enable the organizational Responsiveness to increase. The fourth objective of the study which sought to examine if Shared Decision making relates with Organizational Responsiveness was achieved. This conclusion is consistent with the opinion of Ng et al. (2012), who argue that businesses may successfully operate in concert with one another and adapt to shifts in the market when decision-making processes encourage input from employees based on their firsthand knowledge of the company and the industry.

## **6.0 Conclusion and Recommendations**

The primary motivation for collaboration is to boost productivity. The most effective method of increasing productivity in the workplace is to divide workers into skill-based teams and have those teams work together. Teams often perform better in the workplace when they have a common objective and work together to achieve it. This helps the company out, but it also has an effect on the employees' morale and productivity. When members of a team collaborate, they are able to divide up the burden and pool their resources. Everyone has to learn how to function effectively as a team member since they will inevitably be a part of several teams throughout their lives. In conclusion, construction business success may be quickly increased by fostering team collaboration through team cooperation and shared decision-making. The following suggestions are made in light of the results and discussion:

- i. Before implementing the team cooperation method, management of construction businesses should teach and educate their staff on how to effectively establish and operate in teams to maximise the company's chances of success.
- ii. Every employee's ideas, proposals, and opinions should be evaluated for their value and implemented when possible following conversation with staff.
- iii. To maximise productivity, every worker in a construction company must adopt a culture of cooperation.
- iv. In order to be more responsive as an organisation, construction company management should adopt an agile strategy that prioritises the long-term viability of a team through the development of its members' skills.

## References

- Agarwal, S. & Adjirackor, T. (2016) Impact of teamwork on organizational productivity in some selected basic schools in the Accra Metropolitan Assembly. *European Journal of Business, Economics and Accountancy* 4(6), 12-27.
- De-Waard, E., Volberdia, H. & Soeters, J. (2013) Experiences of a military crisis response organization. *Journal of Organization Design*, 2(2), 1-14.
- Dyer, W.G. (2016). T Studies of individualism-collectivism: Effects on cooperation in groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 152-172.
- Holweg, M. (2018). The three dimensions of responsiveness. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 25(7), 603-622.
- Loss, L., & Crave, S. (2017). Agile business Models: An approach to support collaborative networks. *Production Planning & Control*, 22(5-6), 571-580.
- Mangi, A.A., Kanasro, H.A., Burdi, M.B & Rehman, F.N. (2019) The Government: Research *Journal of Political Science Supplementary Edition*, 3, 88-98.
- Merriam, (2019) Group influences on individuals in organizations. M.D. Dunnette & L.M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, 3, 199-267.
- Ndolo, P. S. (2015). "The relationship between operational efficiency and financial performance of firms listed at the Nairobi Securities Exchange". A Research Project Presented in Partial Fulfillment of The Requirements for the Award of the Degree of Master of Science Finance, School of Business, University of Nairobi.
- Neil, K. (2019). What is the meaning of operational efficiency? *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 3(5), 1-9.
- Ngo, L.V. & O'Cass, A. (2012). Performance implications of market orientations, marketing resources and marketing capabilities. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 28, 173-187.
- Ranjan, K. M., & Bishnu, K. A. (2017). Determinants of financial performance: Empirical evidence from the textile sector in Bangladesh. *Journal of Accounting and Finance*, 17(8), 110-120.
- Tajfel, H. (1978). The achievement of inter-group differentiation. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Differentiation between social groups* (pp. 77–100). London: Academic Press.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of inter-group conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of inter-group relations* (pp. 33–47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Terry L. Gibson, et al (1980) in *Cooperative Extension Programs*. University of Wisconsin, Gale L. V, Director in Cooperation with the US Dept.: of Agriculture.
- Torrente, D. (2012). Teams make it work: How team work engagement mediates between social resources and performance in teams”, *Psicothema*, 24(1) 106-112.
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M., Oakes, P., Reicher, S., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.
- Wei, Y. S., Samiee, S., & Lee, R. P. (2014). The influence of organic organizational cultures, market responsiveness, and product strategy on firm performance in an emerging market. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 42(1), 49-70.
- West M.A. (2012). *Effective: practical lessons from organizational research*. Oxford, Blackwell Publishing.