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ABSTRACT

In many companies teamwork and interdependence are now integral elements of management innovations designed to increase worker productivity. The positive cross-functional relationships in an organization result in the increase of quality of service, conservation of resources and quick response time. The failure by Kenya Power and Lighting Company (KPLC) to offer expected, efficient services and hence meet its targets is as a result of the current uncoordinated departmental activities brought about by lack of teamwork. The purpose of this study was to determine the impact of teamwork on performance in the energy sector. The study was guided by the following objectives: To identify factors considered in the creation of teams, to determine factors that affect team building and performance, to establish top management’s support of teamwork at KPLC and to find out the effects of group dynamics on team performance.

The study population comprised 6676 staff. Nairobi region and central office was selected purposively because this region serves 50% of a total number of customers (405,932/802,000) and, has the highest number of employees and hosts the headquarters. Simple random sampling was used to select 10% of the target population (350 respondents). Descriptive survey methodology was used as the study design. The study was important because of the role KPLC plays in the economy of Kenya, being the sole distributor of electrical energy. The study used Questionnaires to collect both qualitative and quantitative data. The researcher engaged the assistance of 2 research assistants who were previously trained and piloted for reliability. They dropped the questionnaires, and picked them later as agreed between them and the respondents within 5 days. At the time
of picking they explained and addressed the questions that the respondents did not understand clearly. During the period of data collection which covered 4 weeks, the researcher met with the research assistants every once a week for updates. The raw data was continuously cleaned as questionnaires were returned, and then coded using MS - Excel software ready for analysis. The coded data was then analysed using descriptive statistics (frequency distribution, measures of central tendency). Findings were interpreted and inferences made and presented using charts, tables and percentages. The study has shown that for firms to realize their strategic objectives they should address both the internal and external factors that influence teambuilding. The internal factors that need to be addressed include organizational culture, employees, top management perception, the resources available and the organizational policy. The external factors that need attention include political influence, economic factors, social factors and changes in technology. The study recommends that top managers in organizations should be encouraged to always hold this view as disregard of teams hinders a company's attainment of its strategic goals.
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OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS

Energy: In this study energy is defined as a source of power such as electricity.

Performance: In this study performance refers to the manner or quality of functioning or production.

Power: In this study power is defined as a form of energy.

Teamwork: In this study teamwork is defined as a concept of people working together as a team.

Team: In this study Team refers to a group of people organized to work together.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

In many companies teamwork and interdependence are now integral elements of management innovations designed to increase worker productivity, such as participative decision-making, self regulating work teams, total management programmes (Rentsch, 1994), cross-functional and multi-disciplinary, strategies, and re-engineering organizations as learning organizations (Hodgetts, 1994).

From an employer's point of view, there is now abundant evidence that graduates with well-developed teamwork and 'people skills' are highly prized. Even the most cursory glance through the positions vacant sections of the newspapers demonstrates that positions ranging from factory floor to service industries, top management and professionals, all require teamwork skills. A series of interviews conducted with key education and business leaders in Australia revealed that employers consider professional knowledge 'less important than the development of skills in communication, decision making, problem-solving, the application of knowledge to the workplace, working under minimum supervision, and the ability to learn new skills and procedures' (Business/Higher Education Round Table, 1991, 1993), Coopers and Lybrand study 1991, in Queens land, and another conducted by Sheffield University in the United Kingdom (McNally, 1994) ranked team work skills as one of the top six criteria for employability.
Team building through interactive group drumming is a cutting-edge tool increasingly being used in the business environment across North America to develop unity in the workplace. It is the most fundamental way to reduce stress and learn to work together, celebrate success build community and work spirit. "for teamwork to work" the company has to focus on success now and in the future. Team building is creating a work culture that values collaboration. In a teamwork environment people understand and believe that thinking, planning, decisions and actions are better done cooperatively. Teamwork is being recognized as one of the variety of solutions to increase workforce productivity and thus improve the bottom-line.

The vision and mission of the company must be one that staff can relate to positively, In the new era of systematic innovation it is more important for an organization to be cross functionally excellent. Firms, which are successful in realizing the full returns from their technologies, have complementary expertise in other areas of their business such as manufacturing, distribution, Human Resources, Marketing and customer relationships.

To face today's complex challenges organizations need to incorporate a wide range of styles, skills and perspectives. In addition, to deliver quality service to customers companies have to develop strategies to strengthen their existing competencies and to build new ones in order to compete more effectively.
According to Charles and Gareth (1998), in today's global environment, change rather than stability is the order of the day. Rapid changes in technology, competition and customer demands have increased the rate at which companies need to alter their strategies and structures to survive in the marketplace.

Kenya Power and Lighting Company (KPLC) departments cannot function in isolation. They all work interdependently. Hence the importance of this study of the process of team building within the organization. The process of team formation is viewed to go through four stages, that is forming-storming-norming-performing (Lipnack and Stamp, 2000). This study therefore adopted this model but also modified it where necessary to suit the study.

1.1.1 Kenya Power and Lighting Company

The origin of the Company can be traced back to the 19th Century when in 1875, the Sultan of Zanzibar, Seyyid Bargash, on a visit to Europe, acquired a generator for lighting his house and the nearby streets. The generator was subsequently sold to Harrarali Esmailjee Jeevanjee, a wealthy merchant in Mombasa. In 1908, Mombasa Electricity Power and Lighting Company Limited was formed and Jeevanjee agreed to sell the former Zanzibar plant to the Company. In 1904, a Mr. Clement Hirzel was granted the exclusive right to supply electric light and power to the district and town of Nairobi. This gave birth to the Nairobi Electric Power and Lighting Syndicate (Macgoyee, 1983).
In 1922, the East African Power and Lighting Company Limited (EAPL) was incorporated and it acquired the two companies mentioned above. Ten years later, the Company extended its activities to Tanganyika by acquiring a controlling interest in the Tanganyika Electricity Supply Company Limited (TANESCO). In an endeavour to make power supplies truly "East African", the Company in 1936 obtained generating and distribution licenses from the Government of Uganda.

In 1948 however, the Government of Uganda formed the Uganda Electricity Board which took over the distribution of electricity in that country. Following the handing over of the Uganda undertaking, the Uganda Electricity Board (UEB) invited the Company to purchase electric power in bulk. As a result, the Kenya Power Company Limited was registered in February, 1954, for the purpose of raising money to construct the Tororo-Juja line, and subsequently entered into a supply agreement with the Uganda Electricity Board which is still in existence. In 1960, the East African Power & Lighting Company Limited acquired the Nyeri Electricity undertaking operated by the Director of Trade and Supplies, a Government body, with a view to synchronizing the power supply system. In 1964, the East African Power & Lighting Company Ltd. sold its majority stockholding in TANESCO to the Government of Tanganyika and in 1983, the Company was renamed The Kenya Power and Lighting Company Limited.
The government instituted reform programmes with the amendment of the Electricity power Act Cap 314 (1986) in 1997 the generation, distribution and transmission was separated. The generation companies were placed under KenGen (owned by the government) while KPLC was mandated to carry out transmission and distribution of electricity. KPLC operates as a monopoly in the distribution of electricity. In addition the amendment created the Electricity Regulatory board (ERB) whose mandate is to regulate the generation and distribution of electricity and it also approves the changes in tariffs for bulk and retail costs.

KPLC has 8 distinct divisions carrying out different tasks namely managing directors, distribution and customer service; energy transmission; information technology and telecommunications; finance; human resource and administration; planning research and performance monitoring; and company secretary. In addition KPLC is divided into four main regions namely Nairobi, Coast, Mt. Kenya and Western Kenya regions all of which are managed by regional managers.

The Kenya Power and Lighting Company (KPLC) functioned generally well for a long while after its inception and afforded consumers reasonably reliable supply of fairly priced electricity. This in addition to the fact that for many concurrent years, it consistently sort to increase capacity for generation of new electrical power. Many factors have however conspired to make restructuring
of power sector in Kenya inevitable: The government has been unable to
attract new commitments from donors to fund expansion of rural electrification
programmes; the international trend has been for the government to give way
to IPPs in power generation, and the deleterious impact of drought on
hydroelectric power plants have occasioned unprecedented power rationing
and energized proponents of privatization. Whether Kenya’s moves in the
direction of privatization and deregulation are beneficial have therefore ceased
to be issues (Okech and Nyoike, 2000).

The company is, however, charged with the responsibility of expanding its
consumer base by connecting at least 150,000 new consumers every year and
reduce the system losses from 20% (2004) to below 15% by 2006 and a power
outage from 11,000 currently to below 3000 per month by 2007 (Daily Nation
Newspaper May 3, 2004).

The need to carry out this study is prompted by the fact that Kenya Power and
lighting Company has 8 divisions which are supposed to carry out different
activities towards the core business of the organization. These departments
need to work harmoniously and as well coordinated teams. It is therefore
necessary to explore the factors that can affect effective team building to
enhance performance in the organization.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

In many organizations teamwork and interdependence are now integral elements of management innovations designed to increase worker productivity and the organizational performance (Rentsch, 1994). The positive cross-functional relationships in an organization result in the increase of quality of service, conservation of resources and quick response time. In addition, the age of globalization, which has implications of opening up of new and challenging markets, has resulted in the need to capture market advantage for survival. The in abilities of KPLC to offer the expected efficient services and hence meet its targets could be associated largely to uncoordinated departmental activities brought about by lack of teamwork (KPLC annual report, 2004/5). The purpose of this study was therefore to investigate factors that affect teamwork and ultimate group performance in the energy sector, a case of KPLC.

1.3. Objectives of the study

1.3.1 General Objective of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the impact of work on performance of staff of Kenya Power and Lighting Company.

1.3.2 Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of this study included the following:

1. To identify the factors considered in the creation of teams at KPLC.

2. To determine factors that affect teambuilding and performance at KPLC.
3. To establish top management’s concept and support of teamwork at KPLC.

4. To find out the effects of group dynamics in staff performance.

1.4 Research Questions

The study sought information to answer the following questions:

1. What factors are considered in the creation of teams?

2. Does team building affect performance of staff in KPLC?

3. What is the top management concept and support of teamwork at KPLC?

4. Do group dynamics affect staff performance at KPLC?

1.5 The Scope and limitations of the Study

This was a case study, of Kenya Power and Lighting Company. KPLC has a staff population of 6676, segmented into Mt Kenya (815), Coast region (738), West Kenya (1526), Nairobi (3497). The organization structure at KPLC includes top management, (118), middle management, (1653), unionisable, (4805), (KPLC annual report 2004/5).

Since the study used stratified random sampling method for choosing the sample size there was expected to exist an element of bias from the respondents, however the researcher strived to define the population as a sample that possesses the characteristics that are focused on the objectives of the
study. Due to the veil of secrecy around the corporate sector, most respondents were expected to be reluctant to participate. However, the researcher was objective and assured them that the information was to be used strictly for the study.

1.6 Significance of the Study

This study explored the factors for effective team building and performance in the organization specifically Kenya Power and Lighting Company. It was expected that the results of the study would depict the strategies to be employed in team building and the challenges that face teamwork in the company. From the findings of the study, a framework for team building can be developed and designed to improve the company work to boost interpersonal relationships. The information generated from this study was expected to be valuable to KPLC, the government policy and human resource managers. It was also envisaged that this study would bridge the gap in knowledge and information.

A framework to support teambuilding activities would be designed to improve the performance towards the company's targets and consequently boost profit margins. An application of this study would be the development of a model to improve work relations and enhance the well-being of the employees. This study was also expected to stimulate further research in the area of team building in organizations.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This section reviews literature on research conducted in organizational settings with emphasis on teamwork. Recent research have dwelt on issues relevant to work-group effectiveness, including team cohesiveness, team composition and performance, leadership, motivation, and group goals. They are generic issues in the sense that they pertain to almost all teams doing almost all kinds of work. Performance-relevant research topics are the ones most actively investigated in recent years.

2.2 Teamwork and Performance

Literature tends to classify teams into two facets: ‘operational’ and ‘project’. Operational teams are stable teams existing in the same business environment (Jaafari and Tooher, 2002). The notion of stability refers to the fact that those members are fixed and the team operates for an extended period of time over many projects. Teams, which form for a specific project, are defined as project teams (Jaafari and Tooher, 2002). These teams are primarily formed quickly and disbanded in the same manner. They are often comprised of members from different backgrounds (i.e. professions) who bring specialized skills to a project. Project teams often have multiple points of authority between the team members, and share ‘…decisions, results, and rewards…’ (Cleland and Ireland, 2002). Project teams form the basis of the review of virtual team literature as this research encompasses the early design process, which in the majority of
McDonough et al. (2001) who categorizes various types of teams, as follows:

Co-located teams are comprised of individuals who work together in the same physical location and are culturally similar; Virtual teams are comprised of individuals who have a moderate level of physical proximity and are culturally similar. One example of virtual team is where team members are in the same building but on different floors; Global teams are comprised of individuals who work and live in different countries and are culturally diverse.

"Team" has largely replaced "group" in the argot of organizational psychology. Is this a mere matter of wording or are there substantive differences between groups and teams? For many, "team" connotes more than "group." Katzenbach and Smith (1993), for example, assert that groups become teams when they develop a sense of shared commitment and strive for synergy among members. The definition of work groups presented above, we believe, accommodates the uses of the many labels for teams and groups, including empowered teams, autonomous work groups, semi-autonomous work groups, self-managing teams, self-determining teams, self-designing teams, crews, cross-functional teams, quality circles, project teams, task forces, emergency response teams, and committees—a list that represents, but does not exhaust, available labels. Consequently, we use the labels "team" and "group" interchangeably in this review, recognizing that there may be degrees
of difference, rather than fundamental divergences, in the meanings implied by these terms.

We use the terms interchangeably as a convenience. The word “group” predominates in the research literature, inter group relations, group incentives, group dynamics, and though it uses “group” as its root word, we believe the literature has great relevance for understanding virtually all forms of teams in organizations, too.

Characteristics for effective teams may be summarized as: common commitment and mutual accountability, balanced planned composition; shared purpose developed by the team itself; specific and appropriate performance goals; agreed strategy, rules and procedures; clearly defined work products; clear and open communication; constructive conflict; shared/rotating leadership; appropriate training and skills; suitable reward/assessment system; adequate resources and support (Katzenbach and Smith 1993)

2.3 Nature of Team Building and their Understanding

Team building refers to a broad range of planned activities that help groups improve the way they accomplish tasks and help group members enhance their interpersonal and problem-solving skills. Until recently work was designed to avoid the type of teams we view as so critical to today business. In the early United States history the first crude productivity teams were developed. Eli
Whitney responded to the need to manufacture muskets for the revolutionary army by creating an assembly-line work environment to help speed production. This type of environment accomplished the goal beyond anyone's expectation and, therefore, remained popular until the turn of the century (Rubinsteinien, 1987). Team building is an effective approach to improving teamwork and task accomplishments. It focuses explicitly on helping groups perform tasks and solve problems more effectively.

Team building helps members build on their strengths and minimize their weaknesses. It encourages them to manage their differences together and it promotes a better understanding between individuals which is a critical factor in the success of an organization. In short, team building is the single most important tool that can bring a team together in the pursuit of common goals. A team-building focus can pay off in several ways. As individuals become more effective in working with other team members, the team becomes more effective. The team can learn how to examine its own work and progress and identify areas for improvement.

2.4 Communication and implementation of Targets

The term 'team building' can refer generally to the selection and motivation of teams, or more specifically to group self-assessment in the theory and practice of organizational development. When a team in an organizational development context embarks upon a process of self-assessment in order to gauge its own
effectiveness and thereby improve performance, it can be argued that it is engaging in team building, although this may be considered a narrow definition. To improve its current performance, a team uses the feedback from the team assessment in order to: identify any gap between the desired state and the actual state and design a gap-closure strategy. As teams grow larger, the skills and methods managers must use to create or maintain a spirit of teamwork change. The intimacy of a small group is lost, and the opportunity for misinformation and disruptive rumors grows. Managers find that communication methods that once worked well are impractical with so many people to lead.

2.5 Top Management concept and support of Team Building

Cross-functionality is the idea that members of the top management work together with members of staff from different departments of a unit or organization form teams, bringing a variety of talents and resources to bear on the accomplishment of the overall mission of the unit or organization (Proehl, 1997). This method has proven positive results within for instance Hewlett Packard (Jayaram and Ahire, 1998). It also has application to organizations in two ways: one, Cross-functionality can be applied to the relationship between employees and other departments within a command; and secondly, it can be applied within the department in an organization itself in which this is the idea behind the three-pronged approach.
Cross-functional teams consist of the top management’s support to the people who serve in different departments or perform different functions within the organization (Wellins, et al., 1994). Some companies establish permanent and temporary cross-functional teams. The permanent teams work on issues companies face on a routine basis, while temporary teams are formed to handle special projects such as implementing new procedures, reorganizing procedures and processes, or solving unexpected problems.

2.6 Organizational Culture and Team Building

The notion of shared goals is essential to the teamwork because it is what ties the team together and induces them to take a vested interest in each other’s success, beyond acting in mere self-interest. Mutual awareness of the organizational goals is critical in teams which does not only involve just knowledge of shared goals, but other static information too, like the structure of the team (e.g. who is playing what role) and what the mission objective and plan for achieving it is, as well as transient information, such as current task assignments, achievement status of intermediate goals (for maintaining coordination), dynamic beliefs about the environment relevant to decision points, what the situation is, resource availability, and so on. To operate effectively, a team must maintain on-going dialogue to consistently exchange this information, reconcile inconsistencies, and develop a “common picture.” This mutual awareness is often described as a “shared mental model” (Rouse et al., 1992; Cannon-Bowers et al., 1993) in the team psychology.
literature, and fostering the development and acquisition of a shared mental model among team members is the target of specific training methods such as cross training (Blickensderfer et al., 1998; Cannon-Bowers et al., 1998).

2.7 Gaps to be filled by this Study

From the forgoing it has been proved that all teams are capable of producing at higher levels than sum total of the individuals on the team, but this does not always happen. It has also been postulated that high-performing teams have specific characteristics and practices in common. This study revealed that team characteristics exists at KPLC.

According to the reviewed literature, effectiveness in groups is indicated by (a) group-produced outputs (quantity or quality, speed, customer satisfaction, and so on), (b) the consequences a group has for its members, or (c) the enhancement of a team’s capability to perform effectively in the future. Research that assesses one or more of these three aspects of effectiveness in the energy sector is of primary interest towards increased productivity.

A historical trend for example in the construction industry has been that each time a project team is formed the make up of its member’s changes, resulting in little or no consistency of membership (Emmitt and Gorse, 2003). However, more recent trends, promoted in particular by large private and, more recently, public sector clients has led to the use of more ‘collaborative’ procurement
systems such as ‘strategic alliancing’ and ‘partnering’ (Love et al., 2002). Such alliances have, to some extent, encouraged and promoted the developments and utilization of newer technologies given that they promote longer-term relationships between participants and thus encourage investment and utilization of such technologies. For example, strategic partnering is used by companies to obtain advantages from long-term cooperative work on more than one particular project (Love et al., 2002). Therefore changes to the structure of the construction industry, in particular longer-term ‘alliances’, to work together on multiple projects, between different organizations, are seen as a driver of technological change and uptake. These studies have documented short-term teams, which have a short life span like in the construction industry.

This study therefore sets out to bridge the gaps in factors for effective team building in any organization in general and KPLC in particular.

2.8 The Conceptual Framework

This study adopted a conceptual framework which took into account the organization’s structural issues and integration; the nature of the work and the employee interrelationship, communication and implementation of organizational targets; the top management’s commitment to support the employee’s activities; and the organization’s culture and structure. These aspects are independent variables which determine the teamwork and performance in any organization. The intervening variable shown the
conceptual framework is factors/forces, which are in the macro environment of
the company, hence cannot be controlled by KPLC. They however affect the
teamwork and performance.
Figure 1.1: Conceptual Framework
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CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter dwells on the methodology of carrying out the study. Specifically, the chapter explains research design, the target population, sampling technique, the instruments and procedure for data collection and the data analysis procedure.

3.2 Research Design

This was descriptive research, which adopted an analytical approach to assess factors necessary for effective teamwork in KPLC. Gay (1981) defines descriptive research as a process of collecting data in order to test hypothesis or to answer questions concerning the current status of the subjects in the study. A descriptive research determines and reports the way things are. It attempts to describe such things as possible behavior, attitudes, values and characteristics. This design was adopted because it is suitable for an in-depth study of an institution.

3.3 Target population

The target population for this study comprised all staff at KPLC, a total of 6676 elements. This was divided into four regions namely Nairobi region and central office (3497), Coast (738), Mount Kenya (815) and Western Kenya (1526), KPLC was structured into three main divisions; Energy and transmission; distribution; and customer service.
3.4 Sampling Technique and sample size

Nairobi region and central office were purposively sampled. Purposive sampling was used because it allows the researcher to use cases that have the required information with respect to the objectives of the study (Mugenda and Mugenda, revised 2003). Sekaran(2003) also says that purposive sampling is confined to specific types of people who can provide the desired information either because they are the only ones who have it or conform to some criteria set by the researcher. The researcher selected Nairobi region and central office, because it serves the largest segment of customers (i.e. 405,000 out of a total customer base of 802,000), has the largest number of employees (i.e. 3497 out of 6676) and it hosts the headquarters of KPLC.

Simple random sampling was then applied to Nairobi region and central office staff. This is also is a probability sampling technique that selects a reasonable number of subjects that represents the target population. According to Gay (1981), for descriptive studies at least 10% of the accessible population is enough. The sample size was therefore

$$3497 \times 10\% = 350 \text{ respondents}.$$  

3.5. Data Collection Procedure

The study used questionnaires to collect both qualitative and quantitative data. Questionnaires were administered to the selected respondents. The questionnaires comprised both closed and open-ended questions. Closed ended questions sought specific information, while open-ended questions were to
enable the researcher to probe by in-depth information from respondents. Questionnaires were most useful as a data collection method especially because of the big number of people that were to be reached in the selected region. The researcher sought the assistance of two research assistants, who were sufficiently trained before the study commenced.

3.6. Data Analysis

The raw data were analyzed statistically where factor co-relations, and factor analysis, was done to find out the factors to be considered in developing effective organizational teamwork. Data were interpreted and inferences made and presented descriptively using charts and tables.
4.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to analyze the variables involved in the study. In the first two sections, data description and data analysis is presented.

4.2 Data Description

This section presents sources of data and the definitions for the dependent and the independent variables used in the study. The data used in the study was collected from employees of Kenya Power and Lighting Company at various departments. Tables and charts have been presented to show the distribution patterns of the variables under study.

4.3 Instrument return rate

The researcher issued out 400 questionnaires to the respondents from various departments at Kenya Power and Lighting Company. Three hundred and fifty (350) questionnaires were returned representing a response rate of 87.5%.

4.4 Descriptive statistics

4.4.1 Gender of the respondents

Respondents had been asked to indicate their gender. The results are presented in the table below.
Table 4.1: Gender of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.1: Gender of the respondents

From the responses, majority accounting for 91.4% were male, while 8.6% of the respondents were female.

4.4.2 Age distribution of the respondents

Respondents had been asked to indicate their age. Categories were given and the respondents were to choose the categories applicable to them. The table below gives a summary of their responses.
Table 4.2: Age distributions of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-30 years</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 years</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results indicate that 81.7% of the respondents were in the 31-40 years age bracket while 30.9% were in the 18-30 years age bracket. The remaining 18.3% of the respondents were aged between 41-50 years.
4.4.3 Working Department of the respondents

The respondents had been asked to indicate the departments they worked in. There are various departments within Kenya Power & Lighting Company. These are Human Resource, Distribution, Supplies, Stores & Transport, Technical services, and Energy transmission, Finance, Call Centre and Emergency. The table below gives a summary of the distribution of the respondents as per their departments.

Table 4.3: Respondents’ working departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Department</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stores &amp; Transport</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Transmission</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call centre</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.3: Number of respondents under respective respondents

Results indicate that 9.1% of the respondents were in HR, 22.3% in Distribution, 2.3% were in Supplies while those in Stores & Transport department accounted for 2.3%. Those working in the Technical services department accounted for 2.3% while those in energy transmission accounted for 4.0%. A further 6.9% worked in the finance department, Call centre 4.0%, and remaining 5.1% were in emergency.

4.4.4 Respondents’ highest level of professional qualification

Respondents were required to indicate their highest level of professional qualification. The table below gives a summary of the respondents’ qualifications.
Table 4.4: Respondents highest level of professional qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest level of professional qualification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA Sociology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polytechnic</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGD - HR</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip. in Supplies Management</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cert. in Computers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.4: Respondents highest level of professional qualification
Results indicate that among the respondents, 2.3% had an MA in Sociology, while 4.0%, and were Polytechnic graduates. Those with a PGD – HR accounted for 2.3%, while those with a College Certificate accounted for 16.6%. Respondents with a Diploma in Supplies Management accounted for 2.3% while a similar percentage had CPA qualifications. A significant 68.0% of the respondents did not respond.

4.4.5 Respondents’ job categories

The respondents were asked to state their job categories. The table below gives a summary of their responses.

Table 4.5: Respondents’ job Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current job category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unionisable</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard terms</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior standard</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results indicate that the majority, accounting for 64.0% of the respondents was unionisable while 8.6% were on standard terms. A further 20.6% were in the senior standard category while 6.9% were executives.

4.4.6 Number of Years Respondent’s had Worked at KPLC

The respondents were asked to state the number of years that they had worked at KPLC. Their responses are summarized in the table below.

Table 4.6: Number of Years Respondents had worked at KPLC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years at KPLC</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 -20 years</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results show that 46.3% of the respondents had worked for the organization for a period of between 6-10 years while 24.0% had worked for a period of less than 5 years. Further results indicate that 22.9% of the respondents had worked for a period of 11-20 years while 6.9% had worked for over 20 years.

4.4.7 Number of staff under respective respondents Department/Section

The respondents were asked to indicate the number of staff that were in their respective departments /section. Their responses are summarized in the chart below.
Results show that whereas 28.9% of the respondents departments had over 20 members of staff, 18.3% of them had less than 10 employees. The remaining 17.4% of the respondents indicated that they had between 10 and 20 members of staff in their department while 35.4% did not respond constituting a non-response.

4.4.8 Existence of work based teams

The question sought to establish whether the respondents had work based teams. The table below gives a summary of their responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
64.3% of the respondents indicated that they did not have work-based teams while 35.7% indicated that they indeed had work based teams.

4.4.9 Mechanism through which teams are formed at the company

The question sought to identify the mechanisms through which teams were formed at the company. Categories were given from which the respondents were to choose from. These categories were as follows: Based on various challenges of work, according to qualification, on the basis of shifts as well as by employees grade or depending on tasks at hand.
Table 4.8: Mechanism through which teams are formed at the company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on various challenges of work</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>According to qualifications</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By basis of shifts</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By grade</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depending on tasks at hand</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>350</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results indicate that teams were largely formed depending on tasks at hand as indicated by 10.9% of the respondents. However, a significant 9.2% indicated that teams were formed based on challenges of work as well as the qualifications. Grade of the employee also determined team membership as indicated by 4.6% of respondents.

4.4.10 Encouragement to work individually or teams

The question attempted to establish if the respondents were encouraged to work individually or teams. Table 9 below gives a summary of the responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individually</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. 9 Encouragement to work individually or in teams
Majority of the respondents accounting for 89.1% indicated that they were encouraged to work in teams while 10.9% indicated that they were encouraged to work individually.

4.4.11 Respondents’ opinion on teamwork

The question sought the opinion of the respondents on whether they liked to work in teams or individually when assigned a task. Their responses are summarized in the table below.
From the responses majority (95.4%) of the respondents indicated that they would like to work in teams while 4.6% of the respondents indicated that they liked to work in groups.

4.4.12 Reasons why the respondents’ liked to work in teams rather than individually

This was a follow-up question and sought to establish the reason for the respondents’ preference to working in teams over working individually. Their responses are summarized in the table below.
### Table 4.10 Reasons why respondents' carry out tasks in a group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To make work easier and faster</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To share ideas</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To benefit from different work experiences</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To achieve more due to synergy</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To achieve good results</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To meet set targets</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 4.12: Reasons why respondents' carry out tasks in a group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To make work easier and faster</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To share ideas</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To benefit from different work experiences</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To achieve more due to synergy</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To achieve good results</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To meet set targets</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results indicate that working in teams made work easier and faster as indicated
by 10.9%. Further respondents indicated that teamwork encouraged sharing of ideas (15.4%) besides benefiting from different work experiences as indicate by 8.6% of the respondents. Also, respondents preferred working in teams to achieve more due to synergy (6.3%), to achieve good results (6.3%) as well as meeting targets (6.9%).

4.4.13 Existence of team building activities at KPLC

The question sought to establish if there were team-building activities at KPLC’s department/function/section. The responses are summarized in the table below.

Table 4. 11 Existence of team building activities at KPLC’s departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the results, majority (76.3%) of the respondents indicated that there were team-building activities while 17.4% indicated that there were no team building activities. However, 6.3% of the respondents did not respond to this question constituting a non-response.

4.4.14 Motivation to work as a team

The question sought to establish whether the members of the respondents’ respective department/function/section were motivated to work as a team. This was a yes or answer question and respondents were required to indicate yes where there was motivation and no if no motivation to work as a team. The table below gives a summary of their responses.
Table 4.12 Motivation to work as a team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.14: Motivation to work as a team

From the responses majority (85.4%) of the respondents indicated that they were motivated to work in teams while 14.6% of the respondents indicated that they were not encouraged.

4.4.15. Whether teamwork culture was encouraged in KPLC as a whole

Respondents had been asked to indicate whether the culture of teamwork was encouraged at KPLC as a whole. They were to indicate yes incase teamwork was encouraged and no if not. The results are summarized in the table below.
Table 4.13 Whether teamwork culture is encouraged in KPLC as a whole

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>93.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.15: Whether teamwork culture is encouraged in KPLC as a whole

Results show that majority (92.7%) indicated that teamwork was indeed encouraged within KPLC as a whole while 6.3% of the respondents on the other hand indicated that teamwork was not encouraged.

The respondents further indicated that there was a lot of back passing, naming of staff as core or non-core staff as well as the lack of smooth workflow within departments. These, according to the respondents were indicators that teamwork was not encouraged across the organization.
4.4.16 Efforts in helping the team follow through the task at hand

The respondents had been asked to indicate whether they had put any effort in helping the team follow through the tasks at hand. Their responses are summarized as follows.

Table 4.14 Efforts in helping the team follow through the task at hand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the results, majority (96.0%) of the respondents indicated that they helped the team understand the task at hand while 1.7% indicated they had not.
4.4.17 Methods of solving conflicts at the work place

The question sought to understand how conflicts at the work place were resolved. Responses were summarized as per the table below.

Table 4. 15 Methods of solving conflicts at the work place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Through discussions and giving accounts within 72 hours</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through holding regular team building sessions and counseling</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting problems to supervisor who helps in sorting them out</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. 17: Methods of solving conflicts at the work place
Fifty point six per cent of the respondents indicated that conflicts were resolved through discussions and giving accounts within 72 hours while 28.9% indicated holding regular team building sessions and counseling. The remaining 20.5 % of the respondents indicated solving conflicts was by reporting problems to supervisor who helped in sorting them out.

4.4.18 Whether workers gave way forward if work didn’t progress well

Respondents had been asked whether they gave the way forward if work did not progress well. This was a yes or no question and respondents were required to indicate yes where way forward was given and no if vice versa.

Table 4. 16 Whether workers gave way forward if work didn’t progress well
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>29.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>350</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.18: Whether workers gave way forward if work didn’t progress well**

From the responses, 66% indicated that they indeed gave a way forward if work did not progress well while 29.4% indicated they did not. The remaining 4.6% of the respondents did not answer the question.

### 4.4.19 seniors understanding of the concept of teamwork

The question sought the respondents’ opinion on their seniors understanding of the concept of teamwork. Their responses are summarized in the chart below.
Results indicate that 75% of the respondents were of the opinion that that their supervisors indeed understood the concept of teamwork. However, a significant 10.0% indicated the contrary while 15% never responded.

4.4.20 Respondents’ performance towards achieving targets in the previous financial year

The question sought to establish the respondents’ performance towards achieving targets within the previous financial year. The respondents’ performances are summarized in the table below.

Table 4.17 Respondents’ performance towards achieving targets in the previous financial year
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achieved all targets</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved a great extent of</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the targets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.20: Respondents' performance towards achieving targets in the previous financial year

Whereas 38.6% of the respondents indicated that they achieved the targets to a large extent, 35.1% on the other hand indicated they had achieved all the targets. The remaining 26.3% of the respondents did not respond constituting a no response.

4.4.21 Respondents' attitude towards joining informal groups

Respondents had been asked to indicate their preference for joining informal
groups. Various choices were given and respondents were to choose among these. The table below gives a summary of their responses.

Table 4.18 Respondents' attitude towards joining informal groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To achieve personal development</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For social interaction</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For physical fitness</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To gain spiritually</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.21: Respondents' attitude towards joining informal groups

Results indicate that 57.4% of the respondents joined informal groups to
achieve personal development while 38.0% joined for social interaction. There was an equal percentage (2.3%) for those who joined the informal groups for physical fitness and those that joined to gain spiritually.

4.4.22 Respondents' membership to any group

This was a follow-up question and sought to establish whether the respondents belonged to any group. Respondents' membership to various groups is summarized as per the table below.

Table 4.19 Respondents' membership to any group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welfare group</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment club</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer group</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health club</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>350</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results indicate that the majority (55.4%) belonged to a welfare group while 35.4% belonged to an investment club. Results further indicate that 6.9% of the respondents belonged to a prayer group while the rest (2.3%) belonged to a health club.

4.4.23 Effect of group membership on respondents' work performance

The question sought to establish the effect the respondents’ involvement in other groups had on work performance. Respondents were to indicate whether involvement affected their performance positively or negatively. The responses are summarized as below.
Table 4.20 Effect of group membership on respondents’ work performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negatively</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positively</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.23: Effect of group membership on respondents’ work performance

Whereas 9.1% of respondents indicated a negative effect on performance as a result of group involvement, the majority accounting for 88.6% indicated there was a positive effect. However 2.3% of the respondents did not respond.
4.4.24 Superiors' support in resolving conflicts

Respondents had been asked to indicate whether their supervisors supported their efforts in resolving conflicts with other team members. The table below gives a summary of their responses.

Table 4.21 Superiors' support in resolving conflicts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.24: Superiors' support in resolving conflicts
Results indicate that supervisors did not support the workers in resolving conflicts as indicated by 87.7% of the respondents. Only a mere 10.0% indicated that they received some form of support from their supervisors. The remaining 2.3% did not respond.

**4.4.25 Respondents’ relationship with supervisors in other departments/function/section**

Respondents had been asked to indicate if they related well with supervisors in other departments/functions/sections. The table gives a summary of their responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>95.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>350</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.22 Respondents’ relationship with supervisors
Results indicate that 95.4% of the respondents indeed related well with supervisors in other departments/functions/sections. However 2.3% indicated they did not relate well with the supervisors while a similar percentage did not respond.

4.4.26 Government interference with teamwork and performance at KPLC

The respondents were asked to indicate their opinion on whether the government interfered with teamwork and performance at KPLC. The responses are summarized as per the figure below.
The majority accounting for 59.1% indicated that the Government did not interfere with teamwork in their organization. However a significant 34.0% were of the opinion that there was Government interference in the performance of KPLC and in effect affected teamwork. The remaining 6.9% of the respondents did not respond.
5.1 Summary of the Results

The purpose of this study was to investigate the factors that affected teamwork and performance of staff of the Kenya Power and Lighting Company. Specifically the study set out to achieve multiple objectives. First, the study sought to find out if the nature of work and interrelationships level affected teambuilding and performance of staff of KPLC. Though most respondents were quiet on the mechanisms of team formation, results indicate that teams were largely formed depending on tasks at hand as indicated by 10.9% of the respondents. However, a significant 9.2% indicated that teams were formed based on challenges of work as well as employee qualifications. Of importance too in the formation of teams was the grade of the employee. As a result of teamwork and group involvement, majority of the respondents (88.6%) indicated that there was a positive effect on their overall work performance. These results confirm the view that as individuals become more effective in working with other team members, the team becomes more effective (Rubinistien, 1987).

The second objective of the study was to establish whether organizational culture supports teamwork. Results show that majority (92.7%) indicated that teamwork was indeed encouraged within KPLC as a whole. The notion of shared goals is essential to the teamwork because it is what ties the team
together and induces them to take a vested interest in each other’s success, beyond acting in mere self-interest. Worth noting, however is that there was a lot of back passing, naming of staff as core or non-core staff as well as the lack of smooth work-flow within departments as indicated by 7.3% of the respondents. These, according to them were indicators that teamwork was not encouraged across the organization.

Thirdly, the study also sought to establish if communication and targets implementation of activities affected teambuilding and performance of staff of KPLC. Results indicate divergent views on how information about important issues affecting the organizations operations was obtained. These included company newsletters, meetings, Circulars, rumours, telephone, team talk briefs as well as newspapers. Although the channels were not clear, 73.7% of the respondents indicated that they achieved the set targets. However a significant 26.3% did not respond constituting a no response.

Lastly the study also sought to establish whether the top management’s commitment and support affected teambuilding and performance of staff. Results indicate that 75% of the respondents were of the opinion that their supervisors indeed understood the concept of teamwork. However, these supervisors did not support the workers in resolving conflicts as indicated by 87.7% of the respondents despite the fact they related well with these supervisors.
5.2 Conclusions and Recommendations

Team building helps members build on their strengths and minimize their weaknesses. It encourages them to manage their differences together and it promotes a better understanding between individuals which is a critical factor in the success of an organization. However, certain issues seem to emerge with the settings of the current study. First, there seems to be no clear definition of teams besides the mechanisms of team formation. 64.3% of the respondents indicated to the existence of work based teams. Also, the vast majority were not sure on how teams were formed and thus did not respond to the question on mechanisms of team formation. The management therefore needs to bring forth the idea of team work and explain the benefits of this otherwise they will be pulling in different directions.

The next question that arises is one of how to communicate since there seems to be as many sources and medium as the number of employees. As wellins, et al., 1994 observes, to improve its current performance, a team uses the feedback from the team assessment in order to identify any gap between the desired state and the actual state and design a gap-closure strategy. However as teams grow larger, the skills and methods managers must use to create or maintain a spirit of teamwork change. The intimacy of a small group is lost, and the opportunity for misinformation and disruptive rumors grows. This is evident from the study with a significant 22.3% indicating grapevine/rumours as their source of information. Managers need to identify communication
methods that will work to the benefit of the team.

Finally, it is worth noting that management support of team building does not end upon formation of teams. They need to go further and address issues affecting their respective teams. Results indicate that superiors did not support conflict resolution among team members. These conflicts will largely occur from the daily performance of team activities. Cross-functional teams consist of the top management’s support to the people who serve in different departments or perform different functions within the organization (Wellins, et al., 1994). He further notes that: temporary teams are formed to handle special projects such as implementing new procedures, reorganizing procedures and processes, or solving unexpected problems.

5.3 Suggestion for further Research

The current study was conducted among employees of Kenya Power & Lighting Company in Nairobi. However the issue of team building and performance is of a national concern. A national research would therefore be ideal to identify the factors affecting job satisfaction among employees of various parastatals. Furthermore, more variables could have been included were it not for time constraints.
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Dear Respondent,

RE: IMPACT OF TEAM WORK ON PERFORMANCE IN THE ENERGY SECTOR: A STUDY OF KENYA POWER AND LIGHTING COMPANY

I am a Postgraduate student in Kenyatta University pursuing a Master of Business Administration (Human Resources). I am carrying out study on IMPACT OF TEAM WORK ON PERFORMANCE IN THE ENERGY SECTOR: A STUDY OF KENYA POWER AND LIGHTING COMPANY". I hereby request you to respond to the questionnaire items as honestly as possible and to the best of your knowledge.

The questionnaire is designed for the purpose of this study only therefore the responses shall absolutely be confidential. No name shall be required from you.

The success of the research substantially depends on your cooperation. Thanking you in Advance.

Yours sincerely,

KEVINA A. WEPUKHULU
APPENDIX II: QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire

Instructions

- This is to request you kindly to fill in this questionnaire by responding to the questions concerning the teams and teamwork at the institution.
- Place a tick ☑ in your choice or provide brief explanation where appropriate.
- There is no right or wrong answer so you do not have to discuss or consult with a friend.
- You need not write your name.
- The information gathered shall be treated in confidence and shall be used for this research only.

Date of Interview ______________________
code_______________________________

SECTION A – BIO DATA

1. Gender:  Male ☐ Female ☐

2. Age:  18-30 ☐ 31-40 ☐ 41-50 ☐ over ☐ 50

3. Name of Department __________________________

4. Section ________________________________

5(a). Highest level of education  primary ☐ secondary ☐ university ☐

b) Other (specify) ________________________________

c) Highest professional qualification attained ________________________________

6. Current job category:  unionisable ☐ standard terms ☐

senior standard ☐ executive ☐
7. Number of years at KPLC:
   1. Less than 5 years
   2. 6-10 years
   3. 11-20 years
   4. Over 20 years

8(a). Are you head of department/section/region
   a. Yes □ No □

   b) If yes, how long have you been the head?
      Less than 2 years
      2-5 years
      Over 6 years

9. How many staff are in your department/section
   a. less than 10
   b. 10-20
   c. over 20

10(a). Do you have workbased teams? Yes □ No □
       If yes, how many teams are in your department/function/section.

......................................................
b) How were the teams formed


11. Are you encouraged to work individually or teams?

Individually

In Teams

12(a). If you were assigned a task, would you like to carry it out in a group?

Group

Individually

b) If yes, explain why


c) Explain why


13(a). Do you have team building activities in your

department/functional section?

Yes

No

b) If yes, name them?
14(a). Are members of your department/function/section motivated to work as a team?  

Yes [ ] No [ ]

b) If yes explain how

15(a). Is teamwork encouraged in KPLC as a whole?  

Yes [ ] No [ ]

b) If no explain why you think so

16(a). Do you put effort in helping the team follow through the task at hand?  

Yes [ ] No [ ]

b) If yes, why?

17. How do you solve conflicts at your work place?
18. If work is not progressing well, do you stop and give a way forward?
   Yes □  No □

19. Do you think your supervisor understands the concept of teamwork?
   Yes □  No □

20. Do you think teamwork is a good culture for good performance?
   Yes □  No □

21. How did you perform towards target achievement in the last financial year?
   i. Achieved all targets □
   ii. Achieved a great extent □
   iii. To a less extent □
   iv. Failed to achieve □

22. Do you belong to any informal group involving other KPLC employees
   i. Health club □
   ii. Prayer group □
   iii. Investment club □
   iv. Welfare group □

23. Why did you consider joining these informal groups?
   i. For personal developments □
   ii. For social interaction □
   iii. For physical fitness □
iv. For spiritual well being

24. Does your involvement in other groups affect your work performance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negatively</th>
<th>Positively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explain___________________________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_________________________________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. Does your supervisor support you efforts in resolving conflicts with other team members?

Yes □  No □

26. Do you relate well with supervisors in other departments/function/section?

Yes □  No □

If no, how has this affected your targets?

___________________________________________
___________________________________________
___________________________________________

27. In your opinion what measures can be put in place to encourage teamwork.

Explain___________________________________________
___________________________________________
___________________________________________
28. Do you think the government interferes with team work and performance at KPLC

Yes  No

If yes explain how

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

29. How do you get information about important issues affecting KPLC operations (you can tick more than one)

a) Newsletter  

b) Meetings  

c) Circulars/Notice boards  

d) Grapevine (rumours)  

e) Telephone  

f) Team talk brief  

g) Newspaper  

h) Others (specify)_________

30. The questions in the survey may not be all-embracing and comprehensive and may not therefore have afforded you an opportunity to report some things that you may want to say about your job, or the company. Please make any additional comments needed in the space provided

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

I sincerely appreciate your time and cooperation.
# APPENDIX III: TIME SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection &amp; Data Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Writing &amp; Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis Submission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX IV: BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Cost (Kshs.)</th>
<th>Total (Kshs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Assistants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>@ 5,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Materials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopy paper</td>
<td>3 reams</td>
<td>@ 550.00</td>
<td>1,650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball pens</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>@ 15.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foolscap</td>
<td>1 ream</td>
<td>@ 300.00</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling card (Telkom)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scratch card</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Travel expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Research Assistants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Data analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Report Preparation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>97,040.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>