

Influencers of Team Effectiveness Among University Sports Teams in Kenya on Soccer and Volleyball Teams in Kusa-Nairobi North

Rachael Njoki Mwaura¹, Mucheke Charles¹, Janet Wanjira Kamenju²

¹Department of Physical Education, Exercise and Sports Science, Kenyatta University, Kenya

²Department of Physical Education and Sports, University of Nairobi, Kenya

Corresponding author email: rachaelmwaura20@gmail.com

Accepted: 08 July 2026 || Published: 15 August 2026

Abstract

This study examined the influence of leadership style, communication, performance feedback, and organizational structure on team effectiveness among soccer and volleyball players in the KUSF Nairobi North Conference. This study used a descriptive cross-sectional research design, and data were collected using structured questionnaires administered to soccer and volleyball players from 12 universities in the conference. A total of 202 participants were targeted (per the Yamane formula), and a 92.1 percent response rate was achieved, with 186 responses collected. Demographic characteristics were summarized using descriptive statistics, and the relationships and predictive effects of the study variables were tested using inferential statistics, including Pearson correlation and multiple regression analysis. The regression results showed that the four variables combined explained a statistically significant variance in team effectiveness, indicating that they all play a significant role in influencing performance outcomes. The authors conclude that three factors are crucial to ensuring the success of teams in the context of university sport: effective leadership, communication, and meaningful feedback, as well as supportive organizational structures. Future research is suggested to ensure the team's best use in university sports departments by training coaches as leaders, fostering clear communication, developing structured feedback systems, and improving team organization.

Keywords: *Leadership style, communication, performance feedback, organizational structure, team effectiveness*

How to Cite: Mwaura, R. N., Mucheke, C., & Kamenju, J. W. (2026). Influencers of Team Effectiveness Among University Sports Teams in Kenya on Soccer and Volleyball Teams in Kusa-Nairobi North. *Journal of Education*, 6(6), 1-16.

1. Introduction

The sports industry plays a central role in economic activities such as business transactions, investments, tax revenues, and employment opportunities, and it has a fundamental role in people's physical and social growth (Onag & Tepeci, 2014). Participation in sports has been widely acknowledged for its positive effects on physical fitness and social skills (Cotterill & Fransen, 2016). The sense of teamwork cultivated through sports has a profound effect on team performance. This cohesion not only contributes to success in the field but also equips individuals with invaluable skills applicable to various social contexts in the future.

Sports have also played a significant role in curbing violence, crime, radicalization, and (violent) extremism amongst youths (UN, 2021). World over, university students participate in sports organized by their National Federations while the International Federation of University Sports (FISU) organizes the World University Games (FISU, 2023). In Kenya, university sports are organized by the Kenya University Sports Federation (KUSF), which is in the process of being renamed to a Federation. This is divided into conferences representing the Western, Rift, Central, Coast, Nairobi North and Nairobi South regions.

Leadership style plays a significant role in determining team effectiveness in sports teams, just as it does in other organizational contexts (Cotterill & Fransen, 2021). Different leadership styles can have varying impacts on team dynamics and performance (Aldoshan, 2016). Further, Cotterill and Fransen (2016) noted that the effectiveness of a leadership style in sport teams depends on various factors, including the team's composition, the team manager's personality, and the specific context. Additionally, a combination of leadership styles, known as situational leadership, can be effective in addressing different situations and challenges that arise within sport teams (Hegde et al., 2022).

The organizational structure of a sport team can have a significant impact on its effectiveness (Halevy et al., 2012). The way a team is organized and structured can influence communication, decision-making, roles and responsibilities, and overall team dynamics. There is no one-size-fits-all organizational structure that guarantees team effectiveness in sports, and the ideal structure may vary depending on the sport, the team's goals, the coaching philosophy, and the individual personalities and strengths of team members (Ji & Yan, 2020). Team managers and team leaders should consider the unique needs and circumstances of their team when designing or adjusting the organizational structure. Flexibility to adapt to changing situations is also key, as what works best for a team may evolve over time. The effectiveness of a team's organizational structure depends on its ability to support the team's mission, goals, and values while fostering cohesion and maximizing performance (Mitchell, Parker & Giles, 2012). Team structure was found to positively influence team performance through improved team coordination (Hao & Yan, 2020). Gonzalez-Ponce et al. (2022) conducted a study on the effects of group structure in sports teams and found that it influences team effectiveness.

Additionally, according to feedback from De Wit, Greer, and Jehn (2012), for a team to perform effectively, key factors influencing team motivation include team cohesion, team efficacy, and strategies for resolving team conflicts. These factors are closely linked to a team's effectiveness. Team cohesion, which results from various factors that encourage team members to stay together, has different aspects, such as commitment to tasks, social relationships, and group pride. The way stakeholders interact, address problems, and provide positive feedback can impact team cohesion.

1.1 Problem Statement

In Kenya, sports thrive within a well-organized framework characterized by competitive leagues and tournaments (Mucheke, Bailasha & Waiganjo, 2023). According to Science of Sport (2014), Kenya participates in competitions at the regional, continental, and global levels across various sports disciplines, including both male and female athletes. Among Kenyan universities, conference games are extremely competitive in all sports, with some universities doing very well in almost all disciplines in their respective conferences. Some universities have been very dominant, especially in ball games, and have consistently represented their conferences at the national games. This has raised concerns among stakeholders who wish to

understand why some teams are highly effective and high-performing, while others remain only at the level of participation. Understanding and addressing these factors will help in meeting the expectations of these stakeholders, ensuring a positive and supportive sports culture within the university. Further, a culture of success can be cultivated within university sports teams by addressing the factors that influence team effectiveness. There may be questions about whether team effectiveness is due to facilities, equipment, coaching, training time, inter-team communication, or team leadership. Many studies on team effectiveness have focused on national teams and clubs in different leagues, but few have examined university teams, and none have examined Kenyan university teams; thus, there is a need to provide insights into the factors affecting the effectiveness of university sports teams in Kenya. This research therefore aimed to identify the factors influencing team effectiveness among university sports teams in Kenya, specifically soccer and volleyball, in KUSF-Nairobi North.

1.2 Purpose of the Study

To investigate the influencers of team effectiveness among Kenyan university teams in KUSF Nairobi North.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

- i. To examine the effect of leadership style on team effectiveness among university sports teams in Kenya.
- ii. To investigate the effect of communication on team effectiveness among university sports teams in Kenya.
- iii. To establish the effect of performance feedback on team effectiveness among university sports teams in Kenya.
- iv. To investigate the effect of organizational structure on team effectiveness among university sports teams in Kenya.

1.4 Research Hypotheses

H01: There is no significant relationship between leadership style and team effectiveness among university sports team in Kenya.

H02: There is no significant relationship between communication and team effectiveness among university sports team in Kenya.

H03: There is no significant relationship between performance feedback and team effectiveness among university sports team in Kenya.

H04: There is no significant relationship between team's organizational structure and team effectiveness among university sports team in Kenya.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Empirical Review

Merce, Aristides, and Antonio (2022) conducted research into how transformational leadership cultivates team performance. Their study involved 690 respondents who were professional athletes from 59 premier professional teams across interactive team sports leagues in Spain and employed a moderated-mediation model. It revealed that transformational leadership had an indirect effect on objective team performance, mediated by team cohesion. The research examined the dynamics of team cohesion, exploring its interaction with the team's prior

performance and leadership consensus, while the current study will focus on team effectiveness.

Acharya and Dasbiswas (2017) conducted a preliminary investigation into the correlation between teamwork potential and leadership styles in a sample of 20 paramedical professionals. Two questionnaires were developed to assess teamwork capability and leadership style. Results showed that leadership style and teamwork ability were strongly related. The current study focuses on leadership style and teamwork ability, while the current study will be on leadership style and team effectiveness.

Oh (2023) conducted a study investigating whether communication and team cohesion moderate the relationship between transformational leadership and athletic performance. The study sample consisted of 263 athletes registered with the Korea Sports and Olympic Committee. The study examined variables including communication, team cohesion, and athletic performance. Study findings revealed a significant interaction, suggesting that communication influences athletic performance through its mediation by team cohesion. The study focused on athletic performance and was done in Korea, while the current study will focus on soccer and volleyball and will be carried out in Kenya.

Weakley et al. (2023) investigated how feedback affects performance in resistance training, drawing from twenty studies. Their investigation revealed that both verbal and visual feedback outperformed the absence of feedback. Additionally, visual feedback was more effective than verbal feedback. The study focuses only on resistance training performance, whereas this study focuses on team effectiveness.

A study exploring the interactive usefulness of organizational structure in enhancing project success in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan, was conducted by Hayat et al. (2022). Data were gathered via questionnaires distributed among 200 employees employed in project-based organizations within the non-profit sector. The results revealed a significant relationship between organizational structure and project success. The study was conducted in Pakistan, where the generalizability of the findings may differ from Kenya.

Gonzalez-Ponce et al. (2022) conducted a study on the dynamics of group structure within sports teams, using a conceptual framework to examine various facets. A total of 581 professional soccer players participated in the study, completing a comprehensive questionnaire designed to assess a range of variables related to group dynamics. The findings showed that the group structure plays a role in teams' effectiveness. The study focused only on professional soccer players, whereas the current study focused on soccer and volleyball teams and targeted players and their captains.

2.2 Theoretical Review

This study was conducted using the Lencioni model, which addresses team dynamics and cohesion (Lencioni, 2002). Five key dysfunctions are highlighted in the model that can affect team effectiveness: Absence of trust, Avoidance of conflict, Inadequate commitment, Evasion of accountability, and Disregard for outcomes. The Lencioni model consists of a series of steps, including building trust, engaging in healthy conflict, committing and accounting, and having clear goals and expectations, in which the dysfunctions can be systematically addressed by teams to ensure that they can foster trust, have a healthy conflict, commit and account, and have clear goals and expectations (Jones, 2005). Furthermore, Curphy and Hogan (2012) stated that leadership is an important element in demonstrating these behaviors and in creating a culture of teamwork.

Lencioni's model is presented as a more pragmatic and more actionable approach to tackling specific team issues. Lencioni's model offers tips for common team dysfunctions that can occur at any phase of team development, including lack of trust and avoidance of conflict, as well as the natural stages of team development found in Tuckman's model. Furthermore, Hackman's model explained team effectiveness comprehensively, while Lencioni's model outlined behaviors and actions teams can follow to overcome dysfunctions and enhance effectiveness.

The Lencioni model has several implications for sports teams, where building teamwork and success is important. Teams that embrace this approach tend to experience better communication, greater team spirit among athletes, and enhanced problem-solving abilities and resilience in the face of challenges. Emphasizing group outcomes rather than personal ones helps build a stronger-performing team, where the individual's self is not so out of focus that it hampers team performance (Lencioni, 2002).

3. Methodology

The research design was a descriptive cross-sectional study, which allowed the researcher to obtain results on soccer and volleyball players at a single point in time and analyze the relationships among leadership style, communication, performance feedback, organizational structure, and team effectiveness. The target population was 782 soccer and volleyball players in 12 universities in KUSF-Nairobi North. These were Kenyatta University, JKUAT, Mount Kenya University, Daystar University, USIU-Africa, St. Paul's University, KCA University, GRETSA University, Mama Ngina University College, Kiriri Women University of Science and Technology, and Pioneer International University. The twelve universities in the KUSF North region participated in the study, where soccer and volleyball teams were sampled. With standard team sizes of 11 players and 10 substitutes in soccer and 6 players and 6 substitutes in volleyball, 408 respondents of both genders were targeted. This was applicable to all institutions except Kiriri Women University of Technology, which is a single gender university. The study determined the sample size of respondents using Yamane's (1967) formula, which ensures that the selected sample accurately represents the entire population.

$$n = \frac{408}{1 + (408 \times 0.0025)} = 202 \text{ respondents}$$

$$1 + (408 \times 0.0025) = 202 \text{ respondents}$$

At each of the 12 universities, 17 players were sampled by sport: 11 from the soccer team and 6 from the volleyball team participated in the study.

Table 1: Sample Size

University	Soccer		Volleyball	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Kenyatta university	6	5	3	3
KCA	6	5	3	3
Daystar	6	5	3	3
GRETSA	6	5	3	3
SPU	6	5	3	3
JKUAT	6	5	3	3
MAMA NGINA	6	5	3	3
USIU	6	5	3	3
MKU	6	5	3	3
PIONEER	6	5	3	3
KWUST		11		6
KU RUIRU	6	5	3	3
TOTAL	66	66	33	39

A self-administered structured questionnaire containing demographic and Likert-scale questions was used to collect data.

Data were analyzed in SPSS, where descriptive statistics included summaries of demographic characteristics and mean scores. Pearson correlation and multiple regression were used as inferential analyses to identify relationships among variables and the predictive power of leadership, communication, feedback, and organizational structure on team effectiveness, respectively. These were displayed in tables to clarify them. The quantitative data interpretation was systematic because of the analytical approach. It was also consistent with the hypotheses that were being tested in the research. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to draw conclusions.

4. Results

4.1 Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were used to provide an initial understanding of the leadership styles used in university sports teams. The analysis focused on determining which dominant leadership styles were used and how consistent the responses to these leadership behaviors were. This descriptive assessment was later used to conduct correlation and regression analyses to determine how leadership style affects team effectiveness.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics of leadership style

Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation
Coaching staff's leadership style affects the overall team culture and atmosphere	4.6	0.5
The leadership style of a team captain or key player impacts overall effectiveness	4.4	0.6
Consistency of a coach's leadership style contributes to team resilience in the face of setbacks	4.3	0.7
Alignment of a coach's leadership style with team goals and values impacts overall success	4.5	0.5
The leadership style of a team captain or key player influences the rest of the team, affecting effectiveness	4.4	0.6
A coaching staff's leadership style affects the overall team culture and atmosphere (duplicate)	4.6	0.5
Average	4.47	0.57

The statement, “Coaching staff's leadership style affects the overall team culture and atmosphere”, has an average score of 4.60, indicating that respondents strongly agree that the coach's leadership approach is a key factor in creating team climate. There is a high level of agreement, with a very low standard deviation (0.50), indicating that most players held similar views on this aspect.

The responses for “The leadership style of a team captain or key player impacts overall effectiveness” had a mean of 4.40. With a standard deviation of 0.60, which indicates slightly greater variation, the overall interpretation of the results remained strongly positive regarding the impact of player leadership on team performance.

The statement regarding “Consistency of a coach's leadership style contributes to team resilience in the face of setbacks” had a mean score of 4.30, suggesting a positive view of how consistent leadership style can help teams deal with setbacks more effectively. The standard deviation of 0.70 indicates moderate variation, suggesting that although a large proportion of respondents agreed, a small proportion were neutral.

The results of the rating scale for “Alignment of a coach's leadership style with team goals and values impacts overall success” have a mean of 4.50, indicating a high degree of agreement that when a coach's leadership style is aligned with team goals and values, team results improve. The 0.50 standard deviation is also a good indication of the level of agreement between players.

The mean of the scores on the statement “The leadership style of a team captain influences the rest of the team, affecting effectiveness” was 4.40 with a standard deviation of 0.60. This shows that respondents generally believe peer leadership has a significant impact on team effectiveness, consistent with previous findings.

The leadership style subscale had a mean of 4.47, a standard deviation of 0.57, and a mean score of 4.66 based on the item results. This indicates a high level of consensus across all categories, suggesting that leadership – whether coaches or captains – is seen as a significant factor in team effectiveness, with little variation in respondents' opinions.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics of Communication

Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation
Effective communication contributes to overall team cohesion and unity	4.5	0.6
Clear and open communication positively impacts the performance of individual athletes within a team	4.4	0.7
Effective communication contributes to the successful execution of game strategies and tactics in various sports	4.6	0.5
Miscommunication or a lack of communication impacts team dynamics	4.3	0.8
Non-verbal communication, such as body language and gestures, plays a role in conveying information and building rapport	4.2	0.7
Communication between teammates on the field impacts coordination and success during competitions	4.5	0.6
Average	4.42	0.65

The overall mean score for the statement “Effective communication contributes to overall team cohesion and unity” was 4.50, with 99% of the respondents agreeing that communication plays an important role in building team harmony. The standard deviation is 0.60, indicating that most players share this opinion, with only a small deviation.

The statement “Clear and open communication positively impacts the performance of individual athletes within a team” was also rated positively with a mean of 4.40. The standard deviation of 0.70 indicates moderate variation in responses, but the overall perception remains positive regarding the importance of this for individual performance.

The highest mean score in this section was for the statement, “Effective communication contributes to the successful execution of game strategies and tactics in various sports”, with a score of 4.60. The standard deviation of 0.50 is quite low, reflecting a high level of agreement: consistently, players feel that communication is directly related to strategy execution.

The mean score for “Miscommunication or a lack of communication impacts team dynamics” was 4.30, indicating that respondents agreed that a lack of communication in the workplace negatively affects team dynamics. The relatively high SD (0.80) indicates a fair amount of variation in responses, suggesting that communication experiences are not uniform across all sampled teams. This variation could be explained by differences in how coaches approach communication, the availability of established lines of communication, team cohesiveness, and organizational support systems, all of which contribute to players' perceptions and sense of communication within their teams.

A mean score of 4.20 for “Non-verbal communication, such as body language and gestures, plays a role in conveying information and building rapport” indicates agreement that non-verbal cues are important within sports teams. Moderate variation in perceptions: The standard deviation of 0.70 indicates a moderate degree of variation.

The statement “Communication between teammates on the field impacts coordination and overall success during competitions” recorded a mean of 4.50, further emphasizing strong agreement among respondents. The standard deviation of 0.60 again shows relatively consistent views among participants.

Overall, the communication subscale had a mean of 4.42 and a standard deviation of 0.65. This suggests that players highly value communication as a key component of team effectiveness, with consistently positive perceptions across all items. Despite minor variations, the implication is that effective communication significantly enhances team cohesion, strategy execution, and in-game coordination.

Table 4: Descriptive statistics of Performance Feedback

Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation
Timely and constructive feedback from coaches impacts the motivation and growth of individual athletes	4.3	0.6
Constructive performance feedback contributes to the continuous improvement of players' performance	4.4	0.5
The frequency and format of performance feedback influence the development of a positive and goal-oriented team culture	4.1	0.7
Performance feedback contributes to building trust between the coach and players	4.2	0.6
Collective feedback sessions or debriefs after games impact the overall performance	4.0	0.7
The coach balances constructive criticism with recognizing and reinforcing positive aspects of players' performances	4.3	0.6
Average	4.2	0.6

Respondents agreed that timely feedback is important for individual players' motivation and development, with a mean score of 4.30. Reliability is relatively high, with a standard deviation of 0.60, indicating that responses were consistent and suggesting that most athletes share similar views.

Respondents strongly agreed that “Constructive performance feedback contributes to the continuous improvement of players' performance” (4.40). The lower standard deviation in the lower group (0.50) indicates a high level of consensus, suggesting that feedback is recognized as a very important tool for improving player performance.

The statement ‘The frequency and format of performance feedback influence’ received a score of 4.10. This means a degree of consensus, but less than for previous items. The standard deviation of 0.70 indicates a moderate level of variation and suggests that there may be some differences across teams in the extent of structured feedback practices experienced.

The mean score for “Performance feedback contributes to building trust between the coach and players” was 4.20. This indicates a consistent response overall, with a standard deviation of 0.60, meaning that athletes feel that feedback enhances relationships and trust within their team.

The lowest in this category was the statement "Collective feedback sessions or debriefs after games impact the overall performance", which had a mean rating of 4.00. The standard deviation of 0.70 suggests a wider range of responses to the statement, which may reflect variation in the frequency of debriefing conducted by teams and/or the quality of the debriefs.

The mean score of "The coach balances constructive criticism with recognizing and reinforcing positive aspects of players' performance" was 4.30, with a standard deviation of 0.60, and the responses were generally in agreement with this statement.

Overall, the performance feedback subscale had a mean of 4.20 and a standard deviation of 0.60. This indicates that respondents generally consider feedback a vital part of motivation, improvement, and team culture. While there is general agreement across all areas, there are some minor differences, suggesting that while most teams are receiving effective feedback, some teams could develop more regular and formal feedback structures and routines.

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics for Organizational Structure

Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation
A clear and well-defined hierarchy within a sports team contributes to better coordination and execution of game strategies	4.2	0.6
Roles and responsibilities impact the efficiency of communication and decision-making within the team	4.3	0.7
The alignment of the team's organizational structure with the coaching philosophy and team culture contributes to players' satisfaction	4.1	0.6
The size of a sports team influences the complexity of its organizational structure	3.9	0.8
Clarity of roles and responsibilities contributes to the effective development of individual players and the team as a whole	4.2	0.6
A well-established organizational structure contributes to the development and implementation of long-term goals and strategies	4.1	0.7
Average	4.13	0.67

The statement "A clear and well-defined hierarchy within a sports team contributes to better coordination and execution of game strategies" had a mean score of 4.20, indicating agreement that structured leadership and hierarchy lead to better coordination and execution of game strategies. The consistency of the responses is indicated by a standard deviation of 0.60, suggesting a general appreciation of the importance of hierarchy.

Respondents generally agreed that "Roles and responsibilities impact the efficiency of communication and decision-making within the team," with a mean of 4.30. The overall score is positive, with a standard deviation of 0.70, suggesting moderate variance, but indicating that team roles are clearly defined and facilitate processes.

The mean of the statement "The alignment of the team's organizational structure with the coaching philosophy and team culture contributes to players' satisfaction" was 4.10. This indicates that most respondents accept that there is a structural consistency between coaching and their satisfaction. A standard deviation of 0.60 indicates consistent responses by teams.

The mean score of “The size of a sports team influences the complexity of its organizational structure” was 3.90. This is the smallest mean in this section, indicating that although players see team size as a factor, it does not seem to be as well agreed upon. The higher standard deviation of 0.80 indicates greater variation in opinions, which might be attributed to differing team sizes across institutions.

The mean of the statement “Clarity of roles and responsibilities contributes to the effective development of individual players and the team as a whole” was 4.20 with a standard deviation of 0.60. This is a statement of agreement and consensus that clear-cut responsibilities aid the development of individuals and teams.

The same was true for the statement “A well-established organizational structure contributes to the development and implementation of long-term goals and strategies,” which received an average rating of 4.10 and a standard deviation of 0.70. This represents consensus with moderate Variation, suggesting that although many teams have a clear long-term plan, some may not be as well-structured in their systems.

The average mean for the organizational structure subscale was 4.13 with an SD of 0.67. This indicates that respondents view organizational structure as a significant factor in team coordination, decision-making, player satisfaction, and long-term planning. The strength of the agreement is good, but some differences suggest there is no consistent organizational structure across teams, which may indicate ways for teams to increase structure and alignment.

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics for Team Effectiveness

Statement	Means	Standard Deviation
The team has strategies to enhance player motivation that promote teamwork to improve team effectiveness	4.2	0.6
Effective team-building activities and exercises contribute to improved cohesion and communication among team members	4.3	0.7
The coach fosters a culture of continuous individual learning and skill development	4.1	0.6
The team stakeholders effectively scout and recruit players and effectively train the team to develop new skills	4.0	0.7
The team has strategies in place for talented and more skilled players to effectively share their individual skills and talent to optimize performance	4.1	0.6
The team has strategies for rotation of players and effective substitution patterns to maximize team effort for effective performance during games	4.2	0.6
Average	4.15	0.63

A mean score of 4.20 was obtained against the statement “The team has strategies to enhance player motivation that promote teamwork to improve team effectiveness”. This suggests that the respondents generally agree that strategies for increasing player motivation, including psychological encouragement, recognition, and morale building, can increase team unity and improve the overall effectiveness of the team. The standard deviation of 0.60 is interpreted as

a measure of stability in agreement and indicates consensus on the importance of motivation in team performance.

On the question of whether “Effective team building activities and exercises contribute to improved cohesion and communication among team members”, respondents gave a mean of 4.30, indicating agreement. The average of 0.70 indicates moderate variation, suggesting that while most teams have opportunities for meaningful bonding, the degree and quality of bonding may vary across universities.

The mean rating for the statement “The coach fosters a culture of continuous individual and knowledge learning and skill development” was 4.10, indicating overall consensus in agreement that coaches encourage continuous individual learning, skill development, and knowledge acquisition. The coefficient of variation of 0.60 reflects the consistency of team responses, with the majority emphasizing players' personal development in the coaching environment.

The average score was 4.00 in “The team stakeholders effectively scout and recruit players and effectively train the team to develop new skills”. There is agreement, but it is slightly lower than for other items, suggesting that talent scouting and skill development exist but may be applied non-uniformly. The moderate standard deviation of 0.70 indicates response variability, which may be attributed to differences in team resources and recruitment practices across institutions.

The mean and standard deviation for the statement “The team has strategies in place for talented and more skilled players to effectively share their individual skill and talent to optimize performance” were 4.10 and 0.60, respectively. This means the respondents believe there are peer learning mechanisms, such as when experienced players help less experienced players on the team improve their overall performance.

Likewise, a mean score of 4.20 with a standard deviation of 0.60 was observed for “The team has strategies for rotation of players and effective substitution patterns to maximize team effort for effective performance during games”. There is a shared view of the importance of rotating and changing tactics in the game to keep players fresh, avoid fatigue, and ensure players perform to their potential.

The overall mean for the team effectiveness subscale was 4.15 with a standard deviation of 0.63. This shows that participants generally view their teams as effective operational units in which all aspects of motivation, skills exchange, effective recruitment, team building, and tactical coaching are seen to impact team performance. The variation is moderately low, indicating that all teams had similar experience, though there were some differences in technical capability and focus within the university sports program.

4.2 Regression Analysis

4.2.1 Model Summary

Table 7: Regression Model Summary

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	Standard Error Estimate	F-statistic of	p-value
1	0.85	0.72	0.69	0.71	24.5	< 0.001

The regression analysis results showed that the combined predictors (Leadership style, Communication, Performance feedback, and Organizational structure) were strongly related to team effectiveness ($R=0.85$), as seen from the model summary. With a coefficient of determination (R^2) of 0.72, the model explains a significant amount of variation in the performance outcomes of university sports teams, accounting for 72% of the variation in team effectiveness. The 28% of the variance in performance not explained by the other variables is likely due to other external or unmeasured factors, such as individual skill level, training intensity, facilities, or psychological factors, but ultimately this high level of explanatory power indicates that leadership, communication, feedback systems, and structural organization have a significant influence on the team's function and performance.

4.2.2 Regression coefficient

Table 8: Regression Coefficients

Predictor	Coefficient (β)	Standard Error	t-value	p-value
Intercept	0.85	0.22	3.86	0.001
Leadership Style	0.3	0.08	3.75	0.002
Communication	0.28	0.09	3.11	0.005
Performance Feedback	0.22	0.07	3.14	0.004
Organizational Structure	0.18	0.06	3	0.006

The regression coefficient results indicate that all four independent variables are significant for team effectiveness. Leadership style had the highest standardized coefficient ($\beta = 0.30$, $p = 0.002$), indicating that leadership is the most predictable factor for team effectiveness, meaning that team performance outcomes are significantly better when leadership practices are effective and consistent. Communication ($\beta = 0.28$; $p = 0.005$) was also moderately related to team effectiveness. This meant that when communication flows more smoothly among teammates and between coaches and players, execution during competition, cohesion, and results improve. Performance feedback also had a significant positive effect ($\beta = 0.22$, $p = 0.004$), which illustrates that feedback and improvement mechanisms are important to have in place, they are important to have in time, and they must be constructive to build confidence and trust in the team and to help achieve continuous improvement. Finally, organizational structure was positively related to team coordination, strategic planning, and consistency of performance ($\beta = 0.18$, $p = 0.006$), meaning that structured systems, clear roles, and a well-defined hierarchy help facilitate these areas of team functioning. All p-values are < 0.01 , indicating that each predictor is statistically significant and should not be dropped from the model without compromising the regression equation's predictive ability.

5. Conclusion

In addition to technical competence and physical capabilities, the superior team performance of certain sports teams at the university can be explained by a superior psychosocial climate fostered by leaders, effective communication, and well-organized team systems. Leadership (especially supportive and transformational styles) also seems to contribute to athletes' motivation, cohesion, and overall commitment to team objectives, which aligns with the view that relational coaching is the key factor in maintaining optimal performance in developing athletes. Communication also proved to be a key determinant of how players organized themselves, exchanged information, and tracked tactics throughout the competition. Since communication is a controllable behavioral area, teams are well positioned to enhance their performance by ensuring clear, consistent communication channels both in and out of the field.

Even though the effectiveness of the university teams was moderate to high across several indicators, there are gaps in feedback systems, clarity within the university, and uniformity in communication practices. These weaknesses continue to challenge the ideal operation of a team, especially in stiff competition, where accuracy, confidence, and synchronized decision-making are essential. The findings indicate a great opportunity to enhance the psychological and organizational underpinnings that anchor team performance through an improved feedback structure and better integration of team structure with the coaching philosophy.

The majority of players noted that they were highly motivated and confident in their ability to contribute to continuous improvement, citing leadership behaviors, communication patterns, and the quality of feedback, which demonstrates the centrality of these factors. It is worrisome that this indicates limited growth in certain structural elements, which can create stable organizational structures that promote role clarity, accountability, and shared commitment among the university teams. Good teams don't just happen. For cohesive and coordinated action, constant encouragement, periodic communication channels, periodic performance evaluations, and a team environment that demands team responsibility are utilized.

6. Recommendations

In a bid to improve the overall performance of university sports teams, coaches and team leaders ought to adopt leadership styles that consistently foster motivation, cohesion, and accountability in training and competition. It should be emphasized that transformational and participatory leadership practices are important for building trust among players, improving communication, and fostering team commitment to a shared objective. Support will be provided by establishing clear, supportive leadership that enables athletes to play more clearly and with greater resilience across different sporting contexts. Improving communication is also paramount, and the teams need to incorporate effective verbal and nonverbal communication into daily training sessions to coordinate their activities during the games.

The disproportionate levels of communication, feedback, and structural clarity observed in the teams indicate the need for more deliberate efforts to enhance team and interpersonal dynamics. The coaches and team captains ought to develop communication patterns that promote free flow of ideas, tactical sense, and shared decision-making. This may involve organized pre-game and team meetings, and the habitual use of tactical signals in games. Among sportspeople who might find it difficult to interact or lack confidence, a formal approach in which they are mentored by the more seasoned teammates can be a convenient and available measure to improve participation.

The significance of leadership, communication, feedback, and organization in team performance should be reinforced in the context of university sports. Team meetings, sports clinics, or even institutional communication channels could be used to run campaigns that help players and coaches gain more insight into the role of psychological and organizational factors in determining results. It would be useful to players and the university sports culture at large to integrate these principles in their daily undertakings. It has also been demonstrated that well-organized team environments are strongly associated with improved performance, underscoring the need to emphasize these factors. This highlights the need for ongoing improvement of leadership practices, communication logs, and feedback procedures across sports teams at the university.

The impacts of leadership, communication, feedback, and organizational structure on team performance require policy interventions in university sports programs. Sports departments ought to formulate policies that establish standardized leadership training systems for coaches and captains to achieve uniformity in team management. Opportunities should also be offered within institutions to receive continuous training in communication, conflict resolution, and athlete management. The interventions could be reflected in institutional policy to have a sustainable effect on team effectiveness.

References

- Acharya, S., & Dasbiswas, K. (2017). *Leadership styles and teamwork potential among paramedical professionals: A preliminary investigation*
- Aldoshan, M. A. (2016). *Leadership styles and team effectiveness in sports organizations*.
- Cotterill, S. T., & Fransen, K. (2016). *Athlete leadership in sport teams: Current understanding and future directions*. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 9(1), 116–133. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750984X.2015.1124443>
- Cotterill, S. T., & Fransen, K. (2021). *Leadership in sport teams*. In D. Hackfort & R. Schinke (Eds.), *The Routledge International Encyclopedia of Sport and Exercise Psychology*. Routledge.
- Curphy, G. J., & Hogan, R. (2012). *The rocket model: Practical advice for building high-performing teams*. Tulsa, OK: Hogan Press.
- de Wit, F. R. C., Greer, L. L., & Jehn, K. A. (2012). The paradox of intragroup conflict: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(2), 360–390. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024844>
- González-Ponce, I., Díaz-García, J., Ponce-Bordón, J. C., Jiménez-Castuera, R., & López-Gajardo, M. A. (2022). Using the conceptual framework for examining sport teams to understand group dynamics in professional soccer. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 19(23), 15782.
- González-Ponce, I., Leo, F. M., Sánchez-Miguel, P. A., Amado, D., & García-Calvo, T. (2022). *Group structure and team effectiveness in professional soccer: A multilevel analysis*. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19, Article 10092.
- Halevy, N., Chou, E. Y., & Galinsky, A. D. (2012). A functional model of hierarchy: Why, how, and when vertical differentiation enhances group performance. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 2(1), 32–52. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2041386611427373>
- Hao, & Yan, J. (2020). How team structure can enhance performance: Team longevity's moderating effect and team coordination's mediating effect. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 554823.
- Hayat, M., Khan, M. A., Ullah, I., & colleagues. (2022). Organizational structure and project success: The interactive role of organizational effectiveness in project-based organizations in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. *Journal of Management Development*.
- Hegde, S., et al. (2022). *Situational leadership and team effectiveness in sports*.
- International University Sports Federation (FISU). (2023). *FISU World University Games*. <https://www.fisu.net>

- Jones, G. (2005). *Teamwork, trust, and leadership: Applying Lencioni's model to organizational effectiveness*.
- Kenya University Sports Federation (KUSF). (n.d.). *Kenya University Sports Federation*. <https://kusf.or.ke>
- Lencioni, P. M. (2002). *The five dysfunctions of a team: A leadership fable*. Jossey-Bass.
- Merce, C., Aristides, F., & Antonio, S. (2022). *Transformational leadership, team cohesion, and objective team performance in professional sports*.
- Mitchell, R., Parker, V., & Giles, M. (2012). *When do interprofessional teams succeed? Investigating the moderating roles of team and professional identity in interprofessional effectiveness*. *Human Relations*, 64(10), 1321–1343.
- Mucheke, P., Bailasha, N., & Waiganjo, E. (2023). *Sports management and performance in Kenyan universities*.
- Oh, H. (2023). Communication and team cohesion as mediators of the relationship between transformational leadership and athletic performance. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20
- Onag, Z., & Tepeci, M. (2014). Team effectiveness in sport organizations: The effects of transformational leadership. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 150, 423–430.
- United Nations. (2021). *The role of sport in preventing violent extremism*. <https://www.un.org>
- Weakley, J. J. S., Mann, B., Banyard, H. G., et al. (2023). The effects of verbal and visual feedback on resistance training performance: A systematic review. *Sports Medicine*, 53.