

The Effect of Teamwork and Conflict Management on Perceived Individual Performance

Begüm AL¹

Abstract

This study focuses on the effect of conflict management and teamwork on individual performance. Since some industries require teamwork and some does not, sector comparison is also utilized in this study and following five sectors were selected to be compared: retailing, information technology, banking and finance, textile and manufacturing. According to findings, teamwork in workplaces is considered as highly effective however, conflict management in workplaces is considered as not good among the participants. Regression analysis results showed that "total teamwork" scale has a positive and statistically significant effect on job performance. Sectoral differences was also discovered in this study. For example, teamwork perception of the participants working in the information technology was found as higher compared to those working in other sectors. It was also discovered that the participants working in the banking and finance industry tend to have a more negative perception of organizational conflict compared to others. From the job performance perspective, it was found that the performance perceptions of employees in manufacturing and retailing sector are higher compared to those working in other sectors.

Keywords: Conflict Management, Teams, Teamwork, Job Performance

Takım Çalışması ve Çatışma Yönetiminin Algılanan Bireysel Performans Üzerindeki Etkisi

Öz

Bu çalışmanın amacı, ekip çalışması ve çatışma yönetiminin algılanan bireysel performans üzerindeki etkisini belirlemektir. Bazı endüstriler daha fazla ekip çalışması gerektirirken diğerleri ise bireysel çalışmayı gerektirebilir. Bu doğrultuda bu çalışmada sektörel farklılıkları belirlemek üzere sektör karşılaştırması yapılmıştır. 5 farklı sektör seçilmiştir. Seçilen sektörler: Perakende, bilgi teknolojisi, bankacılık ve finans, tekstil ve imalattır. Sonuçlar, işyerlerinde ekip çalışmasının oldukça etkili olduğunu ancak işyerlerindeki çatışma yönetiminin katılımcılar tarafından iyi olarak algılanmadığını göstermiştir. Regresyon analizi sonuçları ise toplam takım çalışması ölçeğinin iş performansı üzerinde olumlu ve istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir etkiye sahip olduğunu göstermiştir. Bu çalışmada sonuçlar arasında sektörel fark olduğu da ortaya çıkmıştır. Örneğin bilgi teknolojisi alanında çalışan katılımcıların takım çalışması algısı diğerlerine göre daha yüksektir. Ayrıca bankacılık ve finans alanında çalışanların örgütsel çatışma algısı diğerlerine göre daha yüksektir. İş performansı açısından değerlendirildiğinde imalat ve perakende sektöründe çalışanların performans algılarının diğer sektörlerde çalışanlara göre daha yüksek olduğu görülmüştür.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Çatışma Yönetimi, Takım, Takım Çalışması, İş Performansı

¹ Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Kent Üniversitesi, İşletme Anabilim Dalı, begum.al@kent.edu.tr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8839-4478>.

Introduction

Bringing together the talented people in a business and managing them effectively are the two greatest opportunities businesses face today. The concepts of team and teamwork emerge at this point. The team consists of a small number of people who have complementary skills, act in line with common goals and performance goals and are responsible to each other within this framework (Katzenbach & Douglas, 1998: 87). In other words, a team is a group of two or more people who work together and who are connected to each other to achieve a specific goal (Aksu, 2012: 3). The key difficulty that the teams must overcome is due to conflict within the team.

In fact, there will always be conflicts in any group or organization. While preventing from conflicts may not be highly probable, it may be possible to handle conflicts by identifying the potential indications of conflict on a timely manner. It is important to regularly monitor the symptoms of conflict in an organization because these symptoms indicate the presence of the conflicts. If these signals of conflict are not responded on a timely manner, then the conflicts direct the organization. The organizations which rely on cooperation, teamwork and innovation for success are the ones that these conflicts are most widely observed and as these organizations are more result-oriented, the individuals and their interaction is likely to be overlook (Turkalj et al., 2008). Conflicts may arise due to low performance, thus improvement can be measured. Based on this, the ultimate objective of this study was established as to find out the effects of teamwork and conflict management on perceived individual performance. Some industries require more teamwork, and some requires individual working. As a result, this study applied sector comparison to identify sectoral differences.

Concept of Conflict

The concept of conflict has been diagnosed as a social phenomenon, with regards to both conflict within and conflict among organizations (Pondy, 1967: 298). It is challenging to make the definition of conflict as it exists in several varying backgrounds. However, conflict can be considered as a form of resistance, divergence, and disharmony. Conflict represents opposite beliefs or behaviours on the part of various individuals, resulting in an antagonistic situation (Tschannen, 2001: 3). Comprehension of goal incompatibility is a precondition for conflict (Schmidt & Kochan, 1972: 360). The worst conflicts could be prevented through appropriate organization plan, or through the teaching of members to

maintain similar opinions and objectives (Pondy, 1992: 259). Conflict is thought to be rooted in negative feelings, such as opposition, discord, or disagreement. Conflicts may exist because of conflicting targets, understanding, or feelings among or between people or societies, leading to opposition or incompatible relationships. Three conflict categories are listed in the definition. A goal conflict exists when the targeted result or wished consequences are contradictory. Next, there is Cognitive Conflict, which describes a situation in which differing views or ideas cannot be reconciled. The last one is Affective Conflict, where disharmony is observed among the feelings or sentiments (Luthans, 1998: 24).

Types of Conflict

Conflict definitions can create a situation where approaches to conflict as well as concepts about its functions are also diverse. Conflicts arise among multiple people due to the constant communication within an organization. Conflict is defined as aggression, opposition, and comprehension being distributed amongst the members of the organization. In the light of these, Madalina (2016: 809) identifies four conflict types, which are listed below.

Interpersonal conflict represents a conflict taking place between two people. The root cause of this conflict is typical of the differences between individuals (Madalina, 2016: 809). Two managers competing for the same raise in position can be given as an example of interpersonal conflict. A similar situation may be described as two directors competing to gain a large capital share of the company. There are numerous examples in which opposing parties are part of the same team. Personal characteristics, varying conceptions, disagreements about benefits and values, distinctions in status and authority, and scarce resources are cited as being main contributors to this conflict (Luthans, 1998: 25).

Intrapersonal conflict is a kind of conflict that takes place inside a person. The conflict appears on the mental scale of an individual. This is described as a psychological conflict which encompasses the ideas, values, beliefs and senses of an individual (Madalina, 2016: 810). The intrapersonal conflict is also classified into three as follows (Hellriegel et al., 1989: 34-36):

- Approach-approach conflict: This is a form of conflict where an individual faces at least two options with positive consequences. As an instance, when an individual has the

option to choose from two occupational prospect which are equally desirable, he/she can experience approach-approach conflict.

- **Avoidance - avoidance conflict:** Contrary to the Approach-approach conflict type, in this kind of conflict, the individual has to decide between at least two options where all options provide negative consequences. As an instance, a company's members of staff may face the threat of penalty like downgrading if they do not agree to conduct a behaviour they do not favour such as travelling.
- **Approach-avoidance conflict:** In this kind of conflict, an individual has to determine if they will undertake something which drives both desirable and undesirable results. As an instance, when one has to decide to whether or not accept a good job at an undesirable location, he/she experiences approach-avoidance conflict.

Intra-group conflict represents a conflict type which takes place within a group. Oppositions and contradictions within a group generate intra-group conflict (Madalina, 2016: 810). Intragroup conflict can be classified into two distinct classes: substantive conflict and affective conflict. "Substantive conflict" describes a certain kind of conflict that is based on the parameters of the assignment or problems connected with "substance". This class of intra-group conflict is related to rational controversies between the members of the group. On the contrary, affective conflict is mainly caused by the relations between the groups members. Emotional reactions through the disagreements in interactions are the source of this conflict (Luthans, 1998: 26).

Inter-group conflict increases when different groups within an organization confuse each other. Additionally, other factors of this conflict style include competition. In addition, inter-group conflict is triggered by other factors as well. A number of these aspects may encompass a competition regarding the employment of resources or the limits determined by a group against out-of-group individuals to create a sense of identity within the team (Donohue & Kolt, 1992: 23).

It is proposed that there are four categories of inter-group conflict; namely, vertical conflict, horizontal conflict, line-staff conflict and role conflict. It is conceivable that different kinds of inter-group conflicts can intersect, in particular with respect to role conflict. However, all of these different kinds have varying features (Hellriegel et al., 1989: 39).

Vertical Conflict: This is a kind of conflict which takes place among different levels in an institution. For this kind of conflict, superior-subordinate conflict can be shown as an

example. The cause of vertical conflict is mainly the superiors' pursuit to exert power on their subordinates.

- **Horizontal Conflict:** This kind of conflict represents a conflict among those individuals or functional departments that are at the same hierarchical level in a company.
- **Line-Staff Conflict:** In the majority of companies, there are staff departments in order to support the line departments. It is often witnessed that there is a conflict between staff departments and line departments within companies. In usual, managers of staff departments and line departments differ from each other in terms of characteristics. While members of staff departments are more likely to have higher educational and social background, they are younger in age compared to those members of line departments. These personal changes also refer to varying principles and perception which lead to conflicts as a result.
- **Role Conflict:** Role is defined as the combination of conducts that other people within the organization anticipate one to undertake to fulfil their tasks. A conflict is often included when considering roles.

Alternatively, it is suggested by Jehn & Mannix (2001: 240) that there are three kinds of conflict, which are; relationship conflict, task conflict, and process conflict. The root of relationship conflict is considered as discordance of individuals' interaction, while task conflict refers to divergences of attitudes and beliefs regarding a specific assignment, and process conflict is regarded as the antagonism related to the understanding of assignment, techniques to be applied and the group course of action. Relationship conflict and process conflict cause destruction. On the other hand, task conflict is considered as a useful kind of conflict since this conflict inspires different ideas while it should be handled prudently in order to prevent it from changing into relationship conflict or process conflict (Donohue & Kolt, 1992: 32). Amason & Sapienza (1997: 496) also compare cognitive conflict and affective conflict. According to the authors, affective conflict is related to feelings and the root of this conflict is clashes and divergences in personalities whereas cognitive conflict is focussed on the assignment and stems from standpoint or opinion disparities.

Process of Conflict

The conflict process includes four different levels of conflict based on the degree of relationship development of the groups to each other. The initial level is referred to as a state where the individual features, interaction, formation, and various characteristics of people

come into conflict. It is essential to highlight that all of these three conditions do not necessarily have to take place concurrently as the presence of one factor is sufficient.

It is widely agreed that effective communication is important in a company. On the other hand, the excess of communication or blockages in communication, absence of mutual understanding, or unhealthy communication passages can eventually develop conflict as well. Cognition and personalization is known as the second conflict phase which evolves as a result of the initial level conflict effects. It is offered that this level encompasses two sub-levels, which are (Turkalj et al., 2008: 506):

- Opinion of the parties in conflict. This may not indicate that the conflict has taken place.
- It is not possible to claim that the conflict is present unless the consciousness and recognition of conflict is openly expressed.

The third level is the one when the conflict is demonstrated. In this level, opposing conducts against each other is present among the involved parties and the conflict is obvious. In the final level, the consequences of the conflict are apparent where the progress of the conflict and its effects on the involved parties' relationship can be observed. The results of the conflict can show itself as a rise in the organizational efficiency or a fall in the organizational efficiency (Turkalj et al., 2008: 506).

Management of Conflict

Managers can be uncertain about conflict. To most, it is a phenomenon to be suppressed in all circumstances. With rational perspective, however, we can see that there are more fundamental reasons for conflict. A more enlightened view is that managers will also see conflict as an indication that something needs their recognition (Darling & Walker, 2001: 233). Transformations are fundamental for conflict management. It can create stress in the workplace, personal relationships, job performance and productivity also may decrease (Mayer & Louw, 2012: 4). It is critical to notice conflict within an organization because the organization's future success depends on how the conflict is managed. The term management of conflict means incorporation of elements that can take part in conflict resolution. These mentioned elements include enhancement in the communication, exercising discipline within the company and recognising the phases of conflict (All Answers, 2018: 1).

Collaborating style

The style of collaboration is appropriate when there are complex problems to deal with. In case there is a problem that cannot be solved by a single party (like a situation when a combination of opinions are necessary for producing a more effective result), it is healthier to use this style. Moreover, this style is beneficial for exploiting from the competencies, know-how and further resources that various people have in order to recognise or redefine a current problem and develop diverse ways to solve it (Darling & Walker, 2001: 232).

Also, in case involved parties' dedication is required to apply an effective solution to the problem at hand, it is better to employ this style. This style calls for a sufficient period of time for settling problems (Rahim, 2001: 370).

Accommodating style

Accommodating style is appropriate in case one of the involved parties does not possess much information related to the problem within a conflict or alternatively, when the opposite party's argument is precise and the matter is more essential for them. It is more appropriate to employ this style in case one of the parties is ready to surrender on one subject in the anticipation that he/she will gain a form of advantage from the opposing party when a requirement is present (Mayer & Louw, 2012: 4). It may be beneficial to employ this style when a party is aiming for a superior position in relationship and is in the opinion that maintaining the relationship is valuable. On the other hand, employing this style is not suitable if the involved parties both think that they are right and also the given problem is important for them. Likewise, it is not useful for a conflict in which one party is in the opinion that the opposing party is immoral or incorrect in their argument (Rahim, 2001: 370).

Competing style

Competing style can be correctly employed in a situation where the problems in the given conflict are significant for the group or the argument of the opposing group is to deliver destructive results for this party. It may be useful to apply this style through a supervisor when the problems encompass daily concerns or a rapid assessment is needed. It can be an option for a supervisor to handle employees with high self-confidence and low level of proficiency to take technical conclusions. Furthermore, this style can prove successful in the course of managing the enactment of undesirable processes (Mayer & Louw, 2012: 4).

On the other hand, this style may not be suitable to be applied if the problems related to a conflict at hand are complicated and a sufficient period of time to solve the problems

effectively is present. In case the parties involved possess equal degree of power, employment of this style by either of the parties or both of them may create an impasse situation. If they do not accept to shift their style for solving the conflict, it may not be possible to overcome this situation. Moreover, if the problems related to a conflict do not represent consequence to the party, employment of this style is not suitable. High-skilled employees may not be willing to accept their supervisor to employ such a controlling style (Rahim, 2001: 371).

Avoiding style

It may be more advantageous to employ this style in a situation that the possible undesirable consequence of opposing the other party involved is considered more critical than the advantages the solution of the conflict may derive (Darling & Walker, 2001: 233). This style may be suitable in handling unimportant or negligible problems or in a situation that a term of relaxation is required in advance of a successful solution of a complicated problem. On the other hand, it is not appropriate to apply this style when the problems involved are significant for one or both of the parties. Thus, it is not suitable in a situation that one of the parties has to take the decision, the parties involved are not ready to delay result, or a quick solution is needed (Rahim, 2001: 371).

Compromising style

Compromising style is most widely useful in a situation where both parties' purposes are correspondingly important, both of these parties' power are similarly high (such as in a management and employees conflict) and the negotiation has arrived in a deadlock state. In case a mutually accepted solution cannot be achieved, a short-term solution to a complicated issue is required, or further styles have already been tested and proved ineffective to solve the conflict, compromising style can be used (Darling & Walker, 2001: 233). If there is the possibility of a continued conflict, it may be useful to choose this style. It is not suitable to apply this style when a problem-solving attitude is required for handling a complicated problem. It is frequently observed that managers inappropriately attempt to use this style for solving complicated issues and eventually create a state of affairs that a long-term and successful result is not achieved. It can also be suggested that this style is not appropriate in case one of the parties is more dominant than the opposing party and is in the opinion that he/she is right in the conflict. Similarly, it may not be useful to apply this style for an attempt to resolve complicated problems (Mayer & Louw, 2012: 4). Also, it is not a proper style to handle conflicts related to values. It is expected from members of an organization to handle

their conflicts in a positive manner when they are communicating with one another. It is necessary to know which style to employ while dealing with varying conflict with diverse factors (Rahim, 2001: 372).

Concept of Teamwork

Team is defined as a group of interdependent two or more people who come together to achieve predetermined goals (Eren, 2020: 14). According to another definition, team is a group of people from different specialties who come together to perform a task by merging their skills (Donnollen, 1998: 43). Based on all these definitions, an effective team is a group that believes the cooperation is the best way to achieve a common objective and acts in an atmosphere of common responsibility with the principles of openness, trust and honesty (Becerikli, 2013: 95). In order for a team to perform its defined function effectively, it must have the following features (Baltaş, 1997: 22-23):

- Two or more people are needed to form a team.
- Team members have a common goal to work together.
- Each of the team members has different abilities and qualifications. They use them in an integrative way to achieve their goals. Team members are mutually dependent and need each other's expertise.
- The shared leadership role succeeds within the team.
- Team members have a voice in the decision-making process.
- Team members are responsible from each other.
- Collaboration and measurement of joint performance among team members are dominant.
- Members strongly believe that working together as a team leads to more accurate decisions and better results. In other words, they create a synergy to achieve their targets.

The Importance of Teamwork

The strength of teamwork is that it brings together different skill sets within an organization (Barutçugil, 2004: 36). As a result, when an organization concentrates on improving its competitiveness and output, it will more often form teams that draw on the most capable employees. Teams are more flexible and responsive to inconstant situations than traditional departments or other forms of permanent groups and they quickly meet, share

tasks, refocus and dissipate (Robbins & Judge, 2009: 42). In this context, teamwork has some important features such as the fact that it consists of a group of people with a very high level of communication and that team members have different infrastructure, skills and abilities. In addition, teams need to have a common sense of mission, and teams must have clearly defined goals and know what they want to achieve (Çetin, 2009: 45). Accordingly, teams have started to take their place as the basic elements of productivity, development, innovation, competitiveness and advantage in organizations (Zehir & Özşahin, 2008: 267).

The most effective features in determining team characteristics and measuring their performance are team commitment, distinctive task commitment and social commitment (Huber et al., 2007: 115). When all these features are viewed from the perspective of the employees, teamwork provides greater autonomy and job satisfaction. However, from the perspective of professional employees seeking success and personal performance, teams constitute the sense of sociability and significant responsibility that many aspire to (Keçecioglu, 2005: 98). In this regard, employees and employers support each other for team success. As a result, creative thinking and practices are carried out by individuals or team members empowered in organizations (Eren & Gündüz, 2000: 76). Within the framework of all these features, it can be said that teamwork is essential for businesses (İlhan & İnce, 2015: 128). It has been concluded that the most important feature of the best hundred companies in the US is an effective teamwork (Staiculescu & Mina, 2009: 503).

Factors Affecting Team Performance

Studies by Cohen and Bailey identified five groups of potential factors that affect team success (1997). These terms are described below (Akgün et al., 2004: 300):

1. Environmental factors: These factors include external characteristics such as industry characteristics, environment of turmoil, conditions of customers.

2. Design factors: Task, team structure, organizational design are among the important factors affecting team success. For example, there are variables in task design such as full independence, loyalty to other units, partnership with other units. Team structure design includes variables such as the number of the team, the demographic structure of the team, and the diversity of team members. In the organizational structure design, there are variables such as training, resources, rewarding system, career system, and supervision.

3. Intra-team process factors: These factors cover variables such as communication, conflict and cooperation that are related to the interactions of team members with each other.

4. Out of team process factors: These factors include variables such as communication, conflict and cooperation that are related to team members' and team's interactions with outside.

5. Psychosocial factors: These are factors linked to the psychosocial qualities of the team. These factors include variables such as team commitment, team norms defined as shared standards by team members.

According to Cohen and Bailey (1997: 240), design factors affect the outcomes of process factors and psychosocial factors indirectly, and team effectiveness directly. Psychosocial factors occur on a team basis, are directly affected by design factors and affect process factors. In addition, environmental factors directly affect the design factors.

Types of Team

Different methods were used in the classification of teams and as a result, a wide variety of team types were acquired. Teams are classified within the framework of different variables according to their goals, structures, membership status, continuity, place in the organizational chart (Ataman, 2002: 89). The structure of these teams varies according to the work to be done and business management. Team members also work alone, together, temporarily or continuously, depending on the situation (Koçyiğit, 2014: 45). Therefore, the needs of each team member must be known in order to achieve maximum benefit. Teams can be grouped into two main groups, depending on the type of use and the nature of the work to be done. Teams can be classified as follows according to the type of use: problem-solving teams, special-purpose teams and self-management groups. In another classification, teams can be classified as follows according to the nature of the work: individual teams, orchestral teams and supplementary teams (Koçyiğit, 2014: 45). Apart from these classifications, when a broader grouping is made, the following types of teams can be identified.

Self-managed teams

These teams usually consist of 5 to 10 people and are advanced types of quality control rings in enterprises (Eren, 2020: 15). The main purpose of self-managed teams is to turn the individual into active and dynamic decision makers from passivity and intermediary position (İnce et al., 2004: 424).

Cross-functional teams

These teams are formed by bringing together employees working in the same hierarchical level but in different departments (Keçeciöđlu, 2005: 99). In cross-functional teams, employees from different departments are brought together so that these departments are informed about each other. In this way, it is aimed to solve more complex problems more easily (Parker, 2003: 85).

Problem solving teams

These teams are usually a small group of volunteers ranging from 5-10 people who are in the same professional activity or work in the same unit. These teams hold periodic meetings by working together, find the sources and causes of the identified problems by researching them, solve them and present them to the senior management (İnce et al., 2004).

Virtual teams

Nowadays, intranet and extranet systems have started to emerge with the widespread use of the internet within businesses. With the development of these systems, the concepts of virtual workers and virtual teams have emerged. Thus, team concepts have differentiated as a result of the use of new technologies and advanced information technologies in organizations (Erođlu, 2003: 22).

Perceived (Based on Self-Assessment) Individual Performance

Due to the fact that performance is a multidimensional concept, there are various explanations. The concept of performance can be defined as the quality of labour, the comparison of what is expected from the individual and the result achieved by the individual. At the same time, performance can be explained as the process and the action itself, not the result and success (Açıkaldn, 1999: 12).

Performance is the level of success achieved by an individual over all the efforts he or she has spent to fulfill his/her job. A person's performance depends on his/her qualities and abilities as well as his/her beliefs and values. In other words, individual performance is open to change and influence (Büte, 2011: 173).

Performance is a concept that indicates what a person working in a workplace can achieve in relation to the intended target job in terms of quantity and quality. Employees' individual performance is the most important performance criterion for organizations. Therefore, it means that the better the performance of the personnel working in the

organization, the higher the performance of the organizations will be (Şehitoğlu & Zehir, 2010: 88).

A classification of performance was made by Shields & Hanser (1990: 242). According to them, there are two groups of “can do” and “will do” factors. The “can do” factor is related to capacity and ability, while the “will do” factor is related to the candidate’s willingness to work, attitudes and behaviours and his/her interest in his/her job.

Another performance classification was made by Borman & Motowidlo (1993: 12). According to them, performance is classified as “task” and “context” performance. This classification is based on the view that it is not enough to perform work-related tasks only. “Context” performance that will contribute to the social structure of the work includes actions such as helping others, guiding, and volunteering. Contextual performance, also known as citizenship performance, includes various behaviours such as making extra effort in completing a job, being a volunteer, helping other individuals in their work, cooperating, and following organizational rules and procedure (Diaz-Vilela et al., 2005: 1). “Task” performance is associated with higher ability, while “context performance” is associated with personality (Aktaş & Şimşek, 2014: 26). Task performance is also defined as the successful performance of an employee in an organization in accordance with organizational goals.

Performance evaluation refers to the measurement of performance according to some standards or similar others. It is a multi-dimensional and complex process and can be used with different approaches and methods with behavioural, cognitive, affective tendencies (Sümer, 2000: 58). In other words, performance evaluation is the determination of the level of realisation of the work done by an individual within a certain period of time within the framework of a specific task and job description (Fındıkçı, 1999: 89).

METHODOLOGY

To determine the effect of teamwork and conflict management on perceived individual performance is the main aim of this study. Followings are the hypothesis:

H₁: Teamwork has a positive effect on the individual performance.

H₂: Conflict management has a positive effect on the individual performance.

H₃: Results differentiate based on the industry sector.

In this study questionnaire technique was used to determine the effect of teamwork and conflict management on perceived individual performance. Data for this study was collected in April 2019 from employees of targeted sectors, therefore an ethic committee report was not requested. Necessary permission was obtained from the employers whom the data was collected.

Three types of measurement scale were used. The first one is “Team Performance Scale”. This scale was developed by the Alagöz (2007), and it has 25 questions and 5 sub-dimensions. These dimensions are: performance of instructor, team vision and trust, team motivation, harmony in the team and participation and personal development. 5-point Likert scale was used for the answers (strongly disagree-strongly agree).

The second scale which was used in this study is “Organizational Conflict Inventory II”. This scale was developed by Rahim (1983: 369) and it has 28 questions and 5 sub-dimensions. These dimensions are: collaborating style, accommodating style, competing style, avoiding style, and compromising style. 5-point Likert scale was used for the answers (strongly disagree-strongly agree).

In the last part of the questionnaire, “Two-Dimensional Job Performance Scale” was used in which employees evaluate themselves (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993: 23; Borman et al., 1995: 169). One of the important issues in performance measurement is the content validity of the scale used. Concerns about what performance is and measuring its dimensions comprehensively were tried to be reduced by measuring both task and situation performance in this study. The performance of the employee can be measured by the individual himself, supervisors, subordinates or stakeholders, depending on the purpose of evaluation.

All evaluations contain some bias and errors. Ideally, measuring with different evaluators as possible is better. However, Bose et al. (2001: 4) state that supervisor evaluation is an expensive and difficult method, and stakeholder evaluations cause some problems. For this reason, it is increasingly common to measure performance with self-assessment. It is stated that self-assessment has benefits such as increasing performance, determining learning needs, and improving cognitive ability (Aktaş & Şimşek, 2014: 27). Therefore, in this study, self-assessment method was used to determine individual performance.

In the 24-question self-assessed job performance questionnaire, the first four statements are used to measure task performance, while the remaining 20 statements measure contextual performance.

This study aimed at comparing the results based on the industry / sector. Therefore, 5 different sectors were chosen by the researcher and results are compared and contrasted. Chosen sectors are: retailing, information technology, banking and finance, textile and manufacturing. In the analysis, SPSS was used and relationships are determined through correlation and regression analysis.

This study was conducted in Istanbul, Turkey. The study was conducted between the dates of 14 October 2019 – 1 December 2019. As of April 2019, there were 28.199.000 employee in Turkey. By sample size calculation (95% confidence level, 7% error), 196 were achieved. Therefore, minimum 196 people were targeted to participate this study. In this manner, a total of 230 people were fully answered to questions this makes it 46 people from each chosen sector. In collecting data, snowball sampling technique was used in each sector.

ANALYSIS

In the analysis, first, characteristics of the participants are given by using frequency analysis. The information here collected only for showing the characteristics of the participants of this study. Following to this, factor and reliability analyses were carried out for each scale used in the questionnaire. In terms of factor analysis, explanatory factor analysis was used. In this study, even though referenced measurement scales are used, sub-dimensions of the scales can be different in this study's sample case. Therefore, determining the number of sub-dimensions (Avşar, 2007: 9) was important for this study, thus explanatory factor analysis was preferred.

Next, descriptive statistics were provided by using mean-median analysis. Following to this correlation and regression analysis were carried out to find out the relationship between team performance and conflict management on the individual performance. And finally, comparison analysis was done to identify the difference between chosen industry / sectors.

Table 1. Characteristics of the Participants

		Percentage (%)	Total
Gender	Male	53	122
	Female	47	108
Age	18-25	15	35
	26-35	35	81
	36-45	38	87
	46 and more	12	27
Marital status	Married	65	150
	Single	35	80
Education level	High school	24	55
	University	65	150

	Master degree	11	25
Employment status	Full-time	72	166
	Part-time	28	64
Sector	Manufacturing	22	51
	Textile	20	46
	Banking and finance	12	28
	Information technology	12	28
	Retailing	34	77

As can be understood from the table above, 53% of the participants are men and 47% are women. Most of the participants are between the ages of 26-45 (72%) and married (65%). Again, most of the participants are university graduates (65%). Additionally, 72% of the participants work full time in their workplaces.

Shapiro-Wilk normality test was applied to the data. As a result of the analysis, sig. values were found to be greater than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$). In this sense, the data have a normal distribution and parametric tests were applied in the analysis.

Table 2. KMO and Barlett Test of Teamwork Scale

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO)		,837
Bartlett Test	Approx. Chi-Square	3057,257
	df	153
	Sig.	,000

As a result of the KMO and Barlett test analysis, the KMO test result of teamwork scale was 0.837; Bartlett test result ($p = 0.00$; $p < 0.05$) was also found statistically significant. According to these results, it is understood that there is a high level of correlation between the variables in the scale and the data set is suitable for factor analysis. The factor analysis table applied to the scale is given below:

Table 3. Factor Analysis of Teamwork Scale

	Component					Variance explained (%)
	1	2	3	4	5	
TW1	,800					21,172
TW2	,774					
TW3	,755					
TW4	,636					
TW5	,618					
TW6	,782					
TW7		,695				20,599
TW8		,721				
TW9		,673				
TW10		,804				
TW11		,823				
TW12		,706				
TW13			,909			16,934
TW14			,850			
TW15			,821			
TW16				,676		15,561
TW17				,605		
TW18				,754		

TW19					,730
TW20					,705
TW21					,887
TW22					,892
TW23					,704
TW24					,606
TW25					,690
					Total variance: % 74,266

As can be seen from the table above, there are 5 sub-dimensions of the teamwork scale.

Table 4. KMO and Barlett Test of Organizational Conflict Inventory

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO)		,870
Bartlett Test	Approx. Chi-Square	4629,025
	df	136
	Sig.	,000

As a result of the KMO and Barlett test analysis, the KMO test result of organizational conflict inventory was 0.870; Bartlett test result ($p=0.00$; $p<0.05$) was also found statistically significant. According to these results, it is understood that there is a high level of correlation between the variables in the scale and the data set is suitable for factor analysis. The factor analysis table applied to the scale is given below:

Table 5. Factor Analysis of Organizational Conflict Inventory

	Component					Variance explained (%)
	1	2	3	4	5	
OC1	,810					49,532
OC4	,890					
OC5	,807					
OC12	,736					
OC22	,718					
OC23	,780					
OC28	,896					
OC2		,951				14,519
OC10		,923				
OC11		,814				
OC13		,993				
OC19		,756				
OC24		,909				
OC8			,790			7,099
OC9			,721			
OC18			,876			
OC21			,806			
OC25			,854			
OC3				,710		4,227
OC6				,705		
OC16				,835		
OC17				,798		
OC26				,794		
OC27				,607		
OC7					,990	3,579
OC14					,830	

OC15				,730	
OC20				,670	
					Total variance: % 78,956

As can be seen from the table above, there are 5 sub-dimensions of the organizational conflict inventory.

Table 6. KMO and Barlett Test of Job Performance

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO)		,902
Bartlett Test	Approx. Chi-Square	3735,032
	df	152
	Sig.	,000

As a result of the KMO and Bartlett test analysis, the KMO test result of job performance scale was 0.902; Bartlett test result ($p=0.00$; $p<0.05$) was also found statistically significant. According to these results, it is understood that there is a high level of correlation between the variables in the scale and the data set is suitable for factor analysis. The factor analysis table applied to the scale is given below:

Table 7. Factor Analysis of Job Performance

	Component		Variance explained (%)
	1	2	
JB1	,940		17,412
JB2	,990		
JB3	,937		
JB4	,896		
JB5		,815	42,910
JB6		,890	
JB7		,848	
JB8		,759	
JB9		,890	
JB10		,846	
JB11		,946	
JB12		,886	
JB13		,868	
JB14		,718	
JB15		,780	
JB16		,896	
JB17		,818	
JB18		,780	
JB19		,896	
JB20		,778	
JB21		,970	
JB22		,966	
JB23		,972	
JB24		,980	
			Total variance: % 60,322

As can be seen from the table above, there are 2 sub-dimensions of the job satisfaction scale.

Table 8. Reliability Analysis

		Number of items	Cronbach Alpha (α)
Teamwork Scale	Performance of instructor	6	.933
	Team vision and trust	6	.822
	Team motivation	3	.937
	Harmony in the team	3	.845
	Participation and personal development	7	.935
	Teamwork scale-total	25	.928
Organizational conflict inventory	Collaborating style	7	.956
	Accommodating style	6	.945
	Competing style	5	.856
	Avoiding style	6	.735
	Compromising style	4	.789
	Organizational conflict - total	28	.912
Job performance scale	Task performance	4	.835
	Contextual performance	20	.856
	Job performance - total	24	.898

The table above contains information about the reliability coefficients of the scales and their sub-dimensions. The reliability coefficients of the results are between .730 and .956. These values mean that scales and sub-dimensions have high reliability.

Table 9. Descriptive Statistics

		N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. deviation
Teamwork Scale	Performance of instructor	230	1,00	5,00	4,15	,4092
	Team vision and trust	230	1,00	5,00	4,36	,6021
	Team motivation	230	1,00	5,00	4,10	,5032
	Harmony in the team	230	1,00	5,00	4,05	,6324
	Participation and personal development	230	1,00	5,00	4,26	,5119
	Teamwork scale-total	230	1,00	5,00	4,19	,5937
Organizational conflict inventory	Collaborating style	230	1,00	5,00	3,58	,5001
	Accommodating style	230	1,00	5,00	3,89	1,003
	Competing style	230	1,00	5,00	2,35	,5222
	Avoiding style	230	1,00	5,00	2,90	,1344
	Compromising style	230	1,00	5,00	3,34	,5409
	Organizational conflict - total	230	1,00	5,00	3,22	,972
Job performance scale	Task performance	230	1,00	5,00	3,80	,4966
	Contextual performance	230	1,00	5,00	3,98	,2457
	Job performance - total	230	1,00	5,00	3,89	,2569

Above table indicates that teamwork in their workplaces is considered as highly effective however, conflict management in their workplaces is considered as not good among the participants. In addition, participants consider their individual performances as good.

Table 10. Correlation Matrix

		Collaborating style	Accommodating style	Competing style	Avoiding style	Compromising style	Organizational conflict - total	Task performance	Contextual performance	Job performance - total
Task performance	Pearson (r)	,535	,546	,535	,570	,643	,467	1		
	Sig. (p)	,174	,357	,677	,336	,245	,090			
Contextual performance	Pearson (r)	,745	,546	,897	,367	,550	,268	,467	1	
	Sig. (p)	,167	,357	,488	,336	,245	,090	,000		
Job performance - total	Pearson (r)	,415**	,646**	,797	,546	,784	,346	,536	,468	1
	Sig. (p)	,001	,012	,174	,357	,789	,743	,000	,000	
Performance of instructor	Pearson (r)	,579	,466	,654	,578	,785	,644	,654	,652	,677
	Sig. (p)	,296	,357	,377	,226	,245	,080	,095	,135	,090
Team vision and trust	Pearson (r)	,754	,678	,654	,546	,786	,433	,453	,463	,478**
	Sig. (p)	,466	,467	,677	,445	,546	,090	,224	,244	,001
Team motivation	Pearson (r)	,799	,566	,125	,564	,466	,574	,356	,479	,357**
	Sig. (p)	,678	,067	,099	,245	,478	,053	,232	,268	,068
Harmony in the team	Pearson (r)	,789	,543	,579	,356	,325	,532	,854	,472	,678**
	Sig. (p)	,568	,368	,364	,467	,454	,134	,124	,356	,030
Participation and personal development	Pearson (r)	,327	,125	,456	,356	,367	,547	,468	,466	,680**
	Sig. (p)	,055	,099	,125	,689	,563	,059	,355	,224	,000
Teamwork scale-total	Pearson (r)	,333	,568	,374	,394	,457	,446	,546	,633	,874**
	Sig. (p)	,062	,643	,345	,545	,356	,072	,354	,937	,000

Above results indicate that there is a positive and statistically significant relationship between the work performance scale total score and the “collaborating style” sub-dimension ($r=.415$, $p=.001<0.05$). Similarly, there is a positive and statistically significant relationship between the work performance scale total score and the “accommodating style” sub-dimension ($r=.646$, $p=.012<0.05$).

In addition, there is a positive and statistically significant relationship between the work performance scale total score and the “team vision and trust” sub-dimension ($r=.478$, $p=.001<0.05$) and there is a positive and statistically significant relationship between the work performance scale total score and the “harmony in the team” sub-dimension ($r=.678$, $p=.030<0.05$).

In another result it was found that, there is a positive and statistically significant relationship between the work performance scale total score and the “participation and personal development” sub-dimension ($r=.680$, $p=.000<0.05$) and there is a positive and statistically significant relationship between the work performance scale total score and teamwork scale total score ($r=.874$, $p=.000<0.05$).

Table 11. Regression Analysis / Task Performance and Contextual Performance

	R²	β	Sig (p)
*Task performance ← Performance of instructor	.135	.345	.073
Task performance ← Team vision and trust	.274	.443	.009
Task performance ← Team motivation	.170	.368	.130
Task performance ← Harmony in the team	.425	.757	.013
Task performance ← Participation and personal development	.333	.466	.045
Task performance ← Teamwork scale-total	.135	.566	.001
Task performance ← Collaborating style	.357	.356	.006
Task performance ← Accommodating style	.322	.379	.249
Task performance ← Competing style	.138	.578	.374
Task performance ← Avoiding style	.125	.433	.763
Task performance ← Compromising style	.246	.893	.324
Task performance ← Organizational conflict - total	.490	.305	.234
* Contextual performance ← Performance of instructor	.359	.506	.130
Contextual performance ← Team vision and trust	.366	.578	.006
Contextual performance ← Team motivation	.467	.332	.230
Contextual performance ← Harmony in the team	.356	.442	.031
Contextual performance ← Participation and personal development	.322	.838	.049
Contextual performance ← Teamwork scale-total	.467	.385	.032
Contextual performance ← Collaborating style	.367	.367	.010
Contextual performance ← Accommodating style	.322	.364	.356
Contextual performance ← Competing style	.446	.366	.135
Contextual performance ← Avoiding style	.255	.357	.765
Contextual performance ← Compromising style	.345	.367	.436
Contextual performance ← Organizational conflict - total	.388	.644	.268

*Dependant variable

Table 12. Regression Analysis / Job Performance Total

	R²	β	Sig (p)
*Job performance-total ← Performance of instructor	.235	.485	.090
Job performance-total ← Team vision and trust	.174	.654	.001
Job performance-total ← Team motivation	.270	.520	.135
Job performance-total ← Harmony in the team	.325	.570	.008
Job performance-total ← Participation and personal development	.225	.369	.028
Job performance-total ← Teamwork scale-total	.274	.418	.021
Job performance-total ← Collaborating style	.340	.550	.000
Job performance-total ← Accommodating style	.115	.467	.139
Job performance-total ← Competing style	.145	.356	.257
Job performance-total ← Avoiding style	.133	.418	.574
Job performance-total ← Compromising style	.356	.680	.256
Job performance-total ← Organizational conflict - total	.563	.584	.385

*Dependant variable: Job performance

Total teamwork scale has a positive and statistically significant ($\beta = .418, p = .021 < 0.05$) effect on job performance. “Team vision and trust” sub-dimension has a positive and statistically significant effect ($\beta = .654, p = .001 < 0.05$); “harmony in the team” sub-dimension has a positive and statistically significant effect ($\beta = .570, p = .008 < 0.05$) and

“participation and personal development” sub-dimension has a positive and statistically significant effect ($\beta = .369$, $p = .028 < 0.05$) on job performance. Again, the “collaborating style” sub-dimension of the organizational conflict scale has a positive and statistically significant ($\beta = .550$, $p = .000 < 0.05$) effect on job performance.

Table 13. Comparison Analysis

		N	Mean	Std. deviation	Sig (p)
Teamwork	Manufacturing	51	4,15	,4477	.033
	Textile	46	3,96	,4341	
	Banking and finance	28	3,90	,4844	
	Information technology	27	4,96	,6044	
	Retailing	78	3,83	,5445	
Organisational conflict	Manufacturing	51	3,15	,2327	.000
	Textile	46	2,96	1,3641	
	Banking and finance	28	4,10	,4794	
	Information technology	27	2,96	,2494	
	Retailing	78	2,83	,9475	
Job performance	Manufacturing	51	4,01	,8484	.010
	Textile	46	3,26	,3636	
	Banking and finance	28	3,50	,8478	
	Information technology	27	3,56	,3848	
	Retailing	78	4,83	,9954	

There is a statistically significant difference in the job performance, organizational conflict and teamwork perceptions of the participants according to the sector they work in. According to the results, teamwork perception of the participants working in the information technology is higher than others. Also, organizational conflict perception of the participants working in the banking and finance is higher than others. When evaluated in terms of job performance, it is seen that the performance perceptions of employees in manufacturing and retailing sector are higher compared to those working in other sectors.

Table 14. Hypothesis Testing

H1	Teamwork has a positive effect on the individual performance.	Partly Accepted
H2	Conflict management has a positive effect on the individual performance.	Partly Accepted
H3	Results differentiate based on the industry sector.	Accepted

According to results, even though total teamwork scale has an effect on the individual performance, some dimensions of it has no effect on the individual performance. therefore, the hypothesis 1 was partly accepted. Similar results were obtained in the conflict management case. Therefore, hypothesis 2 was also partly accepted. However, results clearly differentiated based on the sector. Therefore, hypothesis 3 was accepted.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

The main objective of this research was to investigate how team dynamics, such as teamwork and conflict management, affect individual performance. Although some industries require absolutely more teamwork, some requires especially individual working. Therefore, sector comparison is utilized to highlight sectoral differences. The following five sectors were selected to be compared. The sectors in which people were being actively recruited were: retailing, information technology, banking and finance, textile and manufacturing. In this study, individual and team performance was measured by conducting surveys. Three types of measurement scales were utilized: the team performance scale, the inventory of organizational conflict II, and the two-dimensional job performance scale. In the analysis, SPSS was used.

Results showed that teamwork in their workplaces is considered as highly effective however, conflict management in their workplaces is considered as not good among the participants. In addition, participants consider their individual performances as good. In terms of relationships, it was found that there is a positive and statistically significant relationship between the work performance scale total score and the “collaborating style”; “accommodating style”; the “team vision and trust” and the “harmony in the team” sub-dimensions of the conflict management.

It is also found out that there is a positive and statistically significant relationship between the work performance scale total score and the “participation and personal development” sub-dimension and teamwork scale total score.

Regression analysis results on the other hand showed that total teamwork scale has a positive and statistically significant effect on job performance. Similarly, “team vision and trust”; “harmony in the team” and “participation and personal development” sub-dimensions of teamwork scale have positive and statistically significant effects on job performance. These results are aligned with the literature. In fact, it was claimed in the literature that one of the important advantages of teamwork is that it brings together the knowledge, skills and experiences of different disciplines in an organization (Barutçugil, 2004: 43) and improves innovation and performance (Zehir & Özşahin, 2008: 267). Similar to these indications, in this study, effect of teamwork on the individual performances is confirmed. Nevertheless, as stated above, it is also found in this study that conflict management in their workplaces is considered as not good among the participants. Conflict management is claimed as very

important determinant of the effective teamwork by some scholars (e.g. Sun et al., 2014: 135). Therefore, it is very important by the managements to implement conflict management structure, plan and practices within their organizations.

Regression results in terms of conflict management showed that the “collaborating style” sub-dimension of the organizational conflict scale has a positive and statistically significant effect on job performance. In the literature it was claimed that when there is a situation in which complicated problems need to be handled successfully, employing collaborating style conflict management is convenient (Tabassi et al., 2018: 101). Indeed, it was stated that if a problem cannot be solved by a single party (like a situation when a combination of opinions are necessary for producing a more effective result), it is healthier to use this style (Tabassi et al., 2018: 101). Additionally, this style is beneficial for exploiting from the competencies, know-how and further resources that various people have in order to recognise or redefine a current problem and develop diverse ways to solve it (Rahim, 2001: 372). This means that employees are willing to see further opinions in their cases rather than being solved by only one or two people and therefore, implementing this style can increase the job performance of the employees (Rahim, 2001: 372).

However, in this study it was also found out that there is a sectoral difference between the results. For example, teamwork perception of the participants working in the information technology is higher than others. According to Akgün et al. (2004: 300) environmental factors which include external characteristics such as industry characteristics, environment of turmoil, conditions of customers influence the effect of teamwork on the individual performance. Therefore, this indication was also confirmed with the findings of this study. From this perspective, it can be said that management of the organizations must be specifically understand their sector’s employees needs and wants in order for employees to better perform in their jobs. In this manner, sectoral changes and workforce needs should be carefully followed by the managers. In doing this, periodic researches can be done by the management to understand the employees’ perceptions, needs and wants and; two-way communications in which the employees’ voice can be heard should be promoted within the organizations.

Also, organizational conflict perception of the participants working in the banking and finance is higher than others. In other words, people working in the banking and finance industry put more importance to the conflict management. Considering the effect of conflict management on the individual performance it can be said that conflict management should

be improve for the banking employees. In fact, Akgün et al. (2004: 301) claimed that design factors such as training, resources, rewarding system, career system, and supervision effect the performances of the teams and employees. Based on this, it can be said that design factors are mostly important for the banking and finance employees compared to others.

When evaluated the results based on the job performance, it is seen that the performance perceptions of employees in manufacturing and retailing sector are higher compared to those working in other sectors. According to the literature in some industries employees and teams may feel that they are working more than others (e.g. Somech et al., 2009: 360). This is a psychosocial situation, and it is one of the important factors which effect teams and employees' performances (Akgün et al., 2004: 301). This means that psychosocial factors mostly effected for manufacturing and retailing sector employees' performances.

Based on the findings further studies can be conducted by the academicians. A study can be conducted to find difference between other sectors which were not included in this study. Another study can also be conducted to find factors effecting team performances. By conducting these studies number of important issues can be identified by the scholars which at the end can influence the overall performance of the economy.

Despite the study has carefully undertaken, some limitations were occurred. First limitation occurred due to sample size. 46 people from each sector was participated to this study and this may seem small for some scholars. Use of small size sample may increase the error percentage, however, provides idea about for the future studies. Second limitation comes from the performance measurement way. In this study performance was measured based on the individual opinions. This may create bias; however, it is believed that all the answers obtained from the participants were given in full honesty.

References

- Açıkalin, A. (1999). İnsan Kaynağının Yönetimi Geliştirilmesi, PegemA Yayınları, Ankara.
- Akgün, A.E., Keskin, H. ve Özdemir, M. (2004). "Geçici (ephemeral) takımlarda amacın açıklığı, hızlı bilgi yayılımı ve takım performansı arasındaki ilişkiler", *İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, (3-4), 299-316.
- Aksu, G. (2012). "Takım liderinin çalışanların motivasyonu üzerindeki etkisi: çağrı merkezi incelemesi", *Akademik Bakış Dergisi*, 32, 1-21.
- Aktaş, H. ve Şimşek, E. (2014). "Örgütsel sessizlik ile algılanan bireysel performans, örgüt kültürü ve demografik değişkenler arasındaki etkileşim", *Akdeniz İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi*, (28), 24-52.
- All Answers Ltd. (2018). Conflict Resolution Strategies and Styles. <https://ukdiss.com/examples/productivity-and-efficiency-for-organizational-goals.php?vref=1>. Erişim tarihi: 11.01.2021

- Amason, A.C. and Sapienza, H.J. (1997). "The effects of top management team size and interaction norms on cognitive and affective conflict", *Journal of Management*, 23(4), 495-516.
- Avşar, F. (2007). "Doğrulayıcı Faktör Analizi ve Beck Depresyon Envanteri Üzerine Bir Uygulama", Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi.
- Ataman, G. (2002). "Takım çalışması: mobil iletişim sektöründe bir örnek olay incelemesi", *Journal of İstanbul Kültür University*, 2, 87-96.
- Baltaş, A. (1997). *Ekip Oluşturma ve Geliştirme El Kitabı, Remzi Kitabevi, İstanbul.*
- Barutçugil, İ. (2004). *Stratejik İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi, Kariyer Yayıncılık, İstanbul.*
- Becerikli, S.M. (2013). "Takım çalışmaları ve verimlilik ilişkisi: karar alma süreçlerinin etkinlik kazanmasında liderin rolü", *Verimlilik Dergisi*, 3, 93-116.
- Borman, W.C. and Motowidlo, S.J. (1993). *Expanding the Criterion Domain to Include Elements of Contextual Performance, Personnel Selection in Organizations, Jossey-Bass, New York.*
- Borman, W.C., White, L.A. and Dorsey, D.W. (1995). "Effects of ratee task performance and interpersonal factors on supervisor and peer performance ratings", *Journal of Applied Psychology*. (80), 168-177.
- Bose, S., Oliveras, E. and Edson, W.N. (2001). "How Can Self-Assessment improve the quality of Healthcare?", *Operations Research Issue Paper 2(4)*.
- Büte, M. (2011). "Etik iklim, örgütsel güven ve bireysel performans arasındaki ilişki", *Atatürk Üniversitesi İ.İ.B. Dergisi*, 25(1), 171-189.
- Çetin, C. (2009). *Liderlik Stilleri, Değişim Yönetimi ve Ekip Çalışması, İstanbul Ticaret Odası Yayınları, İstanbul.*
- Cohen, S.G. and Bailey, D.E. (1997). "What makes teams work: group effectiveness research from the shop floor to the executive suite", *Journal of Management*, 23(3), 239-290.
- Darling, J.R. and Walker, E.W. (2001). "Effective conflict management: use of the behavioral style model", *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 22(5), 230-242.
- Díaz-Vilela, F.L., Rodríguez, N.D., Isla-Díaz, R., Díaz-Cabrera, D., Hernández-Fernaud, E. and Rosales-Sánchez, C. (2005). "Relationships between contextual and task performance and interrater agreement: are there any?", *Plos One*, 10(10), 1-3.
- Donnollen, A. (1998). *Takım Dili, Çev. O. Akınhay, Sistem Yayıncılık, İstanbul.*
- Donohue, W.A. and Kolt, R. (1992). *Managing Interpersonal Conflict, Sage Publications, Newbury Park.*
- Eren, E. ve Gündüz, H. (2002). "İş çevresinin yaratıcılık üzerindeki etkileri ve bir araştırma", *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 5, 65-84.
- Eren, E. (2020). *Örgütsel Davranış ve Yönetim Psikolojisi*, 17. Baskı, Beta Yayıncılık, İstanbul.
- Eroğlu, U. (2003). "İnsan kaynakları yönetiminde yeni yönelimleri hazırlayan iki güç: sanal organizasyonlar ve stratejik tabanlı düşünce", *İş, Güç, Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi*, 3(2).
- Fındıkçı, İ. (1999). *İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi*, 3. Baskı, Alfa Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Hellriegel, D., Slocum, Jr. J.W. and Woodman, R.W. (1989). *Organizational Behaviour*, 5th Edition, West St.Paul, New York.
- Huber, R.K., Eggenhofer, P.M., Römer, J., Sebastian, S. and Titze, K. (2007). "Effects of individual and team characteristics on the performance of small-networked teams", *The International C2 Journal*, 1(1), 113-144.
- İlhan, A. ve İnce, E. (2015). "Takım çalışması ve takım etkinliğini belirleyen faktörlerin ölçülmesi: gaziantepe üniversitesinde bir uygulama", *Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 5(1), 127-152.
- İnce, M., Bedük, A. ve Aydoğan, E. (2004). "Örgütlerde takım çalışmasına yönelik etkin liderlik nitelikleri", *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 11, 423-446.
- Jehn, K.A. and Mannix, E.A. (2001). "The dynamic nature of conflict: A longitudinal study & quot", *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(2), 238-251.

- Katzenbach, R. ve Douglas, S. (1998). Takımların Bilgeliği; Yüksek Performanslı Organizasyonlar Yaratmak, Çev. N. Muhallimoğlu, Epsilon Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Keçecioglu, T. (2005). Takım Oluşturmak, 2. Baskı, Alfa Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Koçyiğit, S. (2014). Ekip çalışması ve temel öğeleri, York University, Türkiye Temsilciliği, İşletme Bölümü.
- Luthans, F. (1998). Organizational Behaviour, Irwin/McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Madalina, O. (2016). "Conflict management, a new challenge", *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 39, 807-814.
- Mayer, C.-H. and Louw, L. (2012). "Managing cross-cultural conflict in organizations", *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management*, 12(1), 3-8.
- Parker, G.M. (2003). *Team Players and Teamwork: New Strategies for Developing Successful Collaboration*, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Pondy, L. (1967). "Organizational Conflict: Concepts and Models", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 12(2), 296-320.
- Pondy, L. (1992). "Reflections on Organizational Conflict", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13(3), 257-261.
- Rahim, M.A. (1983). "A measure of styles of handling interpersonal conflict", *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(2), 368-376.
- Rahim, M.A. (2001). *Managing Conflict in Organizations*, 3rd Edition, Quorum Books, Westport.
- Robbins, S.P. and Judge, T.A. (2009). *Organizational Behavior*, 13th Edition, Pearson Prent. Hall, New Jersey.
- Schmidt, S. and Kochan, T. (1972). "Conflict: Toward Conceptual Clarity", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17(3), 359-370.
- Şehitoğlu, Y. ve Zehir, C. (2010). "Türk kamu kuruluşlarında çalışan performansının, çalışan sessizliği ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı bağlamında incelenmesi", *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, 43(4), 87-110.
- Shields, J.L. and Hanser, L.M. (1990). "Designing, planning and selling project A", *Personnel Psychology*, 43(2), 241-245.
- Somech, A., Desivilya, H. S. and Lidogoster, H. (2009). "Team conflict management and team effectiveness: the effects of task interdependence and team identification", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30 (3), 359-378.
- Staiculescu, A.R. and Mina, S. (2009). "Building conflict competent teams creating high performance in organizational behavior", *The International Conference on Economics and Administration*, University of Bucharest, Romania, 502-509.
- Sun, W., Xu, A. and Shang, Y. (2014). "Transformational leadership, team climate, and team performance within the NPD team: Evidence from China", *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 31(1), 127-147.
- Sümer, C.H. (2000). "Performans değerlendirmesine tarihsel bir bakış ve kültürel bir yaklaşım", *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 57-90.
- Tabassi, A.A., Abdullah, A. and Bryde, D.J. (2018). "Conflict Management, Team Coordination, and Performance Within Multicultural Temporary Projects: Evidence From the Construction Industry", *Project Management Journal* Vol. 50 (1), 101-114
- Tschannen, M. (2001). "The effects of a state-wide conflict management initiative in organization", *American Secondary Education*, 29, 3.
- Turkalj, Z., Fasic, I. and Dujak, D. (2008). "Conflict management in organization", *Interdisciplinary Management Research*, 4, 505-515.
- Zehir, C. ve Özşahin, M. (2008). "Takım yönetimi ve takım etkinliğini belirleyen faktörler: savunma sanayinde Ar-Ge yapan takımlar üzerinde bir saha araştırması", *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 9(2), 266-279.