

Effect of Team Leadership on the Growth of Pentecostal Churches in Kenya

Samwel Muguna Henry, Nguchie Gathogo, Solomon Mbula Munyao

Department of Leadership, Pan Africa Christian University

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.9010392>

Received: 21 January 2025; Accepted: 25 January 2025; Published: 24 February 2025

ABSTRACT

Team leadership represents a departure from traditional hierarchical structures, which are increasingly viewed as ineffective in modern organizations across both secular and private sectors. The study aimed to explore how the selected team leadership dimensions differentially fostered growth in Pentecostal churches in Kenya. The investigation proceeded through the lenses of The Hill Model for Team Leadership. The study employed correlation research design. The target population for this study comprises 42,209 clergy members, specifically 2,828 bishops, 11,633 reverends, and 27,748 pastors, from Pentecostal churches across Kenya. A simple random sample of 380 participants was drawn. Structured questionnaire was administered using drop-and-pick method. Data was summarised using mean and standard deviation while inferences were drawn using correlation and regression analysis techniques. Results showed that team leadership dimensions collectively explained 19.4% of the variance in church growth, with a significant F-value (15.144, $p < 0.01$). Among the individual predictors, humility and collaborative climate had significant positive effects on church growth, while shared values, team competence, and integrity were not significant. Conclusions were drawn that collaborative climate is the most crucial factor in promoting church growth. Further, church leaders who demonstrate humility are better positioned to build strong relationships and inspire growth within their congregations. In light of the outcome of this study, bishops should prioritize the cultivation of a collaborative climate within their regions. Pastors should also focus on developing their humility as a core leadership trait.

Keywords: Collaborative Climate, Integrity, Humility, Shared Values, Team Competence.

INTRODUCTION

Team leadership represents a departure from traditional hierarchical structures, which are increasingly viewed as ineffective in modern organizations across both secular and private sectors (Whitelaw et al., 2020; Arar & Taysum, 2020; Sommerschuh, 2022). As a result, many organizations, particularly those aiming for long-term success, are shifting towards team leadership models (Billinger & Workiewicz, 2019; Burton & Obel, 2018). In this context, team leadership means the collaboration of different Pentecostal denominations, pooling their skills and resources to achieve common goals of growth of Pentecostal churches in various dimensions—numerical, spiritual, physical, and financial. This concept emphasizes unity and cooperation among churches, enabling them to work together toward fulfilling the Great Commission (Hamalainen, 2020), consistent with Brechter's (2022) perspective on partnering and teaming to achieve greater outcomes.

The growing adoption of team leadership models highlights their effectiveness in addressing complex tasks that exceed the capacity of an individual or a single organization (Schmutz et al., 2019; Mokgwane & Omobonike, 2021). In particular, team leadership enables optimal resource utilization and quality service delivery, fostering problem-solving and innovative thinking (McEwan et al., 2017). Furthermore, team leadership is essential because no individual or organization possesses all the necessary knowledge, skills, and creativity to tackle multifaceted challenges (Middleton, 2022; Damazio, 2021; Shuffler et al., 2018). This leadership style also complements other leadership theories—such as trait theory, skills theory, and servant leadership – by encouraging collaboration among diverse individuals or organizations with different talents and approaches (Northouse, 2016). Given these advantages, this study explored how the principles of team

leadership could be applied to the growth of Pentecostal churches, hypothesizing that collaboration will lead to success in church growth.

To investigate this further, the study focused on key elements of team leadership, including shared values, competence of team members, integrity, humility, and collaborative climate (Satell & Windschitl, 2021; Rego et al., 2018; Lei et al., 2022). Shared values – such as truth, respect, responsibility, and compassion – serve as the guiding principles that shape a group's behavior and contribute to the creation of high-performing teams. These values are integral to an organization's identity, performance, and aspirations. Without shared values, team leadership struggles to thrive, making it difficult to solve problems or maintain high performance (Vanourek & Vanourek, 2014). In support of this, research by Mapolisa and Ncube (2012) demonstrates that team leadership enhances the likelihood of achieving desired outcomes by reinforcing shared values.

Another crucial element of team leadership is the competence of team members. Research emphasizes its importance for successful teamwork, as competence entails possessing the necessary knowledge and skills to perform tasks effectively through communication, coordination, and cooperation (Lotrecchiano et al., 2020; Hasbiyadi, 2017). Team competence is also reflected in the ability of members to collaborate and work together to achieve common goals (Northouse, 2016). This leads naturally into the importance of integrity, which is another vital component of team leadership. Studies by Choi et al. (2020) show a positive relationship between integrity and role performance. Karthikeyan (2019) further emphasizes that effective leaders must demonstrate honesty and strong moral principles to ensure balanced operations and ethical decision-making. Additionally, Engelbrecht et al. (2015) found that integrity is positively related to both ethical leadership and trust in leaders, underlining its significance in fostering a successful team environment.

Humility is equally important in team leadership. Research by Rego et al. (2016) suggests that leaders who demonstrate a low view of their own importance positively influence a team's ability to achieve desired results. Humble leadership fosters effective teamwork, supports the achievement of collective goals, and promotes the development of innovative ideas (Lei et al., 2022). Moreover, Yang et al. (2022) found that both humility and integrity in leadership contribute to improved job performance. This combination of humility and integrity is also essential in church leadership, where both qualities are expected to drive church growth (Tamunomiebi et al., 2018).

In addition, the success of team leadership is closely tied to the creation of a collaborative climate, where trust among members is paramount. A collaborative climate enables the team to work cohesively, leading to improved performance (Assbeihat, 2016; Njenga & Maian, 2018). Hamalainen (2020) further emphasizes that for Pentecostal teams to fulfill the Great Commission, collaboration – characterized by interaction and information exchange – is essential. Collaboration will only be successful if team members trust each other, as highlighted by Northouse (2016).

Given the growing recognition of the ineffectiveness of traditional leadership models, it is evident that urgent action is required. Team leadership offers a promising alternative by fostering an environment in which diverse opinions, skills, and experiences can be shared (Northouse, 2016). This leadership style has gained popularity in both secular and private sectors as a more collaborative alternative to hierarchical models (Martin et al., 2018). However, several studies, such as those by Hayat et al. (2022) and Gadirajurrett et al. (2018), have explored organizational structure and team performance but have not addressed team leadership or the growth of Pentecostal churches. Similarly, Paolucci et al. (2018) focused on transformational leadership and team effectiveness, without considering the differential effect of team leadership dimensions on church growth. This article aimed to explore how the selected team leadership dimensions differentially fostered growth in Pentecostal churches in Kenya.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Review

The Hill Model for Team Leadership, developed by Susan Kogler Hill, provided the theoretical framework for this study. The model emphasizes the role of the team leader as crucial in overseeing the team and taking

timely actions to ensure its effectiveness (Northouse, 2016). By simplifying and clarifying team leadership theory, the model supports leaders in making decisions that guide the team towards success. The leader is responsible for monitoring the team's progress and intervening when necessary to prevent failure, ensuring that the team maintains high standards of excellence. These interventions, which can be either internal or external, are aimed at supporting both the team and the organization. Interventions by the leader lead to several positive outcomes, including a cohesive team engaged in high-quality operations. The team will benefit from healthy, qualified members and a unified commitment, resulting in effective decision-making, focus on common goals, and the successful accomplishment of tasks (Coleman et al., 2021). Mukua-Marua et al. (2022) applied Hill's model to study the influence of empowering team leadership on team effectiveness in collaborative partnerships within international research organizations in Kenya. Their study, using a positivist research philosophy and correlational design, revealed a positive and significant relationship between empowering team leadership and team effectiveness.

However, Hill's Model has faced criticism for certain limitations. One criticism is its tendency to place the leader as the sole decision-maker, which may limit team members' ability to fully exercise their thinking skills. Critics argue that a shared leadership model, where multiple team members are involved in decision-making, is more effective. Additionally, the model has been critiqued for not addressing important skills related to the environment, coaching, training, timing, and preplanning. It also lacks provisions for providing on-the-spot solutions to specific problems. Another weakness is the model's assumption that leaders are always capable of making decisions, leading the team, facilitating communication, and resolving conflicts, without considering the varying maturity levels of team leaders (Northouse, 2016). Despite these criticisms, the Hill Model for Team Leadership includes considerations of the leader's strengths and weaknesses, as well as the abilities of team members.

Conceptual Review

To understand the multifaceted nature of team leadership, it is important to first explore its historical roots. Team leadership, as we know it today, has deep historical foundations. Sun Tzu's *The Art of War* outlined principles of leadership over 2,500 years ago, emphasizing the importance of collaboration for shared goals. Furthermore, throughout history, groups have united for collective purposes such as hunting, family life, or community defense (Kozlowski & Ilgen, 2016). Modern team leadership thinking pioneered by McGregor in the 1950s, shifted the focus to how a leader's beliefs shape team dynamics, marking the evolution of team leadership into a contemporary approach.

In contrast to traditional leadership models, team leadership is grounded in equality and collective contribution. Leaders who embrace team leadership value each member's input, fostering strengths such as creativity, strategic thinking, and communication (Northouse, 2016). This approach contrasts with hierarchical models, where authority and knowledge are concentrated in a single leader (Fernandopulle, 2021). By prioritizing team effectiveness, team leadership has become a vital strategy for addressing both local and global challenges. As argued by Sanyal and Hisam (2018), this collaborative approach enables organizations to respond more quickly to change by drawing on diverse perspectives and expertise. This adaptability is valuable not only in business contexts but also in nonprofit and religious organizations that require innovation.

Despite its benefits, there is ongoing debate about the dimensions of team leadership. Scholars differ in their conceptualizations, with Kirkman (2020) identifying three core dimensions: the team as a whole, individual team members, and sub-teams, with the leader's focus shifting based on interdependence. Other scholars, such as Bartleby (2023), expand the model to include six dimensions, including adaptability and communication, while Sudhakar (2013) highlights the distinction between quantitative and qualitative dimensions, covering performance, innovation, and cooperation. Caviglia-Harris et al. (2021) introduce six dimensions of collective leadership aimed at sustainability. This divergence in perspectives emphasizes the need for further research to establish a unified framework for team leadership.

As we delve deeper into team leadership, it becomes clear that key concepts such as team effectiveness, leadership decisions, shared leadership, and leadership actions play a central role in team success. Team effectiveness, which encompasses both performance and development, is shaped by factors like team

dynamics, motivation, and the organizational environment (Grossman et al., 2017; Cooke, 2015). Leadership decisions, characterized by unity and participation, are critical in driving progress, as decisions made collectively are more likely to benefit both the team and the organization (Reader, 2017; Landry, 2020). Additionally, shared leadership, as defined by Billinger and Workiewicz (2019), fosters a participatory and supportive environment, enhancing team resilience and enabling teams to capitalize on unforeseen opportunities (By et al., 2018; Stewart, 2019). Leadership actions, both internal and external, are also vital for team effectiveness, promoting effective communication and addressing internal team issues (Koeslag-Kreunen et al., 2018; Liu et al., 2021). In examining the factors that influence team leadership, it is important to consider shared values, team competence, integrity, humility, and collaborative climate. Shared values serve as the moral and operational compass that guides decision-making and relationships within teams. As emphasized by Vanourek and Vanourek (2014), shared values align an organization's culture and enhance its competitiveness and social responsibility (Grimsley, 2021).

Similarly, competence is an essential component of team leadership. Defined as the ability to meet social demands and perform tasks to expected standards, competence encompasses both knowledge and personal traits (Schneider, 2019). Lotrecchiano et al. (2021) argue that competence includes measurable qualities crucial for job performance, while Zdonek et al. (2017) broaden this definition to encompass attitudes, values, and personality. The historical context of competence, from the Chinese selection of employees based on abilities (Salman et al., 2019) to the biblical reference in Exodus (18:17-23), highlights its enduring importance in leadership.

Integral to effective team leadership is integrity, which fosters trust and strong character. Rooted in the 15th century, integrity signifies moral soundness and fairness in dealings. Modern definitions, such as Huberts' (2017) view of integrity as coherence between principles and values, highlight its role in aligning actions with ethical standards. Fuerst and Luetge (2021) extend this definition to organizational integrity, emphasizing the need for consistency between values and actions. Integrity is essential not only in organizational settings but also in research and leadership (Brailer, 2020; Reichheld, 2021), where it is linked to honesty, success, and innovation.

Humility is another critical leadership trait, facilitating self-awareness and an appreciation for others' contributions. As Nielsen and Marrone (2018) note, humility encourages leaders to acknowledge their limitations alongside their strengths. Humble leaders are honest with themselves and their situations (Brailer, 2020), promoting interdependence and collaboration (Nielsen & Marrone, 2018; Wu, 2022). Research has shown that humility enhances team effectiveness and ethical behavior, fostering trust between leaders and followers (Yang et al., 2019; Johnson et al., 2011).

Finally, a collaborative climate is essential for team success. Defined by Sveiby and Simons (2002) as the willingness to share knowledge and ideas, collaborative climate fosters flexibility and adaptability in achieving common goals (Cook & Macaulay, 2020). Collaboration goes beyond organizational boundaries, enabling larger collective efforts such as the Great Commission (Hamalainen, 2013). The importance of virtues like honesty, integrity, humility, and trust is evident in both organizational and cross-cultural contexts (Thamhain, 2013; Roberts et al., 2016). Haas and Mortensen (2016) argue that the most critical elements for collaboration are enabling conditions, including a compelling direction, strong structure, and supportive context. These findings highlight that successful collaboration depends not only on the virtues of team members but also on the conditions created to support collective efforts.

METHODOLOGY

The study employed a correlation research design. This design was suitable for examining the relationships between team leadership and growth of Pentecostal churches in Kenya. Asenahabi (2019) emphasized that a well-chosen research design was crucial for collecting and analyzing data in a structured way to achieve valid conclusions. In this study, correlation techniques were used to measure the strength and direction of the relationship between the independent variable (team leadership) and the dependent variable (growth of Pentecostal churches in Kenya) (Wasti et al., 2022). The use of a correlation design allowed the researcher to statistically assess how changes in team leadership practices were associated with variations in the growth of

Pentecostal churches, providing valuable insights into the dynamics of church leadership and development (Molina-Azorin, 2016; Bryman, 2016).

The target population for this study comprises 42,209 clergy members, specifically 2,828 bishops, 11,633 reverends, and 27,748 pastors, from Pentecostal churches across Kenya. This group, selected for their shared characteristics, represented the broader population to which the study results were generalized (Creswell, 2022). The study focused on clergy from various denominations, including East Africa Pentecostal Churches, Kenya Assemblies of God, Full Gospel Churches of Kenya, and Redeemed Gospel Church, among others, ensuring broad representation across the 47 counties (Joshua, 2019; Kilioba, 2017). These participants were chosen based on their tenure of at least ten years in service, as they are expected to provide valuable insights into the phenomenon under investigation (Gathogo, 2022). A simple random sample of 380 participants was drawn using Yamane formula.

Closed-ended questionnaires using a five-point Likert Scale were administered to the 380 respondents, including bishops, reverends, and pastors. Developed by Rensis Likert in 1932 (Edmondson, 2020; Jamieson, 2023), the Likert Scale has since been widely utilized across various disciplines such as education, psychology, and social sciences (Sullivan & Artino, 2013; Joshi et al., 2015). The scale ranges from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5), indicating a spectrum from unfavorable to favorable perceptions (Munyao, 2021). This tool is effective in gauging the extent of agreement or disagreement with specific statements, thereby measuring attitudes, opinions, or perceptions (Batterton & Hale, 2017; Jamieson, 2023).

Inferences were drawn using correlation analysis which is a statistical method used to measure the strength and direction of the relationship between two or more variables. In this study, correlation analysis was applied to examine the relationship between team leadership and the growth of Pentecostal churches in Kenya. Descriptive statistics, including frequency tables and percentage distribution, were used to present the data, allowing the researcher to understand how respondents rated each item in the study (Fisher & Marshall, 2008; Leedy & Omrod, 2014). The correlation analysis utilized bivariate techniques to calculate the relationship between variables, leveraging sample means and standard deviations (Taherdoost, 2022). Additionally, inferential statistics were employed to draw conclusions about the population based on sample results, enabling the researcher to make generalizations about the influence of team leadership on growth Pentecostal churches (Bryman, 2016).

Further, multiple linear regression analysis was conducted. This is a statistical technique that models the relationship between a dependent variable and multiple independent variables. Unlike correlation analysis, which measures the strength and direction of the relationship between two variables, multiple linear regression allows for the analysis of how several independent variables collectively influence a dependent variable. In this study, multiple linear regression was used to examine the effect of various dimensions of team leadership on the growth of Pentecostal churches in Kenya. While correlation analysis provided an initial understanding of the relationships between individual variables, multiple linear regression offered a more comprehensive analysis by accounting for the simultaneous impact of multiple leadership factors on church growth. This approach enabled the identification of which factors were the most significant predictors of church growth, thereby offering deeper insights into the complex dynamics of leadership within the churches (Taherdoost, 2022). Using multiple linear regression helped to control for potential confounding variables, providing a clearer picture of the unique contributions of each leadership dimension (Bryman, 2016).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Analysis of the demographic profile showed that in terms of gender distribution, the majority were male, comprising 67.3% of the respondents. Regarding marital status, most respondents were married (79.1%). Age-wise, the majority were between 41-50 years (34.3%), indicating that middle-aged clergy, likely blending experience and vitality, dominated leadership roles. Educationally, most respondents had a diploma (49.7%), suggesting mid-level qualifications among clergy. In terms of years served in church, the majority had 6-15 years of service (51.7%), indicating significant experience within this range. Finally, in terms of designation, the majority were pastors (51.7%).

Table 1 presents the descriptive summary for the team leadership dimensions. These descriptive statistics highlight the key team leadership dimensions viewed as crucial for the growth of Pentecostal churches. The dimension "Team Competence" had the highest mean score of 4.40 (SD = 0.563), indicating strong agreement among respondents. The dimensions of "Humility" and "Integrity" both had mean scores of 4.38 (SD = 0.545 and 0.540, respectively), reflecting strong agreement. The dimension "Collaborative Climate" had a mean of 4.31 (SD = 0.600), indicating strong support for the collaborative climate's role in team leadership. The dimension "Shared Values" had the lowest mean score of 3.95 (SD = 0.461), yet still indicated moderate agreement. The results suggest that team competence, humility, and integrity were the most highly rated.

Table 1 Descriptive Summary for Team Leadership Dimensions

Team leadership	Mean	Std. Deviation
Team Competence	4.40	.563
Humility	4.38	.545
Integrity	4.38	.540
Collaborative Climate	4.31	.600
Shared Values	3.95	.461

A comparison of the correlation between the five different dimensions of team leadership on church growth is presented in table 2. The strongest positive correlation was found between collaborative climate and church growth ($r = .410$, $p < .01$), indicating a significant relationship. This was followed by humility ($r = .367$, $p < .01$), team competence ($r = .279$, $p < .01$), and integrity ($r = .270$, $p < .01$), all demonstrating significant positive correlations. Lastly, shared values also showed a significant positive correlation with church growth ($r = .216$, $p < .01$). These results suggest that all five dimensions of team leadership are positively associated with church growth. However, collaborative climate had the strongest positive correlation with growth of Pentecostal churches, which aligns with the perspectives of Sveiby and Simons (2002) and Cook and Macaulay (2020) who emphasize the importance of collaboration in achieving shared goals. This suggests that fostering a collaborative environment significantly contributes to organizational success, supporting the findings of this study. Humility also showed a significant positive correlation with growth of Pentecostal churches, consistent with the views of Nielsen and Marrone (2018) and Wu (2022) who argue that humility enhances team effectiveness by fostering self-awareness and interdependence. This finding reinforces the role of humility in promoting growth and trust within organizations.

Table 2 Correlation between Team Leadership Dimensions and Growth of Pentecostal Churches

		Church Growth
Church Growth	Pearson Correlation	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	
	N	320
Shared Values	Pearson Correlation	.216**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	320
Team Competence	Pearson Correlation	.279**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	320
Integrity	Pearson Correlation	.270**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	320
Humility	Pearson Correlation	.367**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	320
Collaborative Climate	Pearson Correlation	.410**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	320

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Growth of Pentecostal churches was regressed on the dimensions of team leadership as displayed in table 3. The model summary revealed that the predictors explained 19.4% of the variance in growth of Pentecostal churches ($R = 0.441$, $R^2 = 0.194$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.181$, Std. Error of the Estimate = 0.52861). The ANOVA results confirmed the model's statistical significance, with an F-value of 15.144 and a p-value less than 0.001, indicating that the collective predictors significantly influenced growth of Pentecostal churches ($F(5, 314) = 15.144$, $p < 0.01$). In terms of individual predictors, humility ($\beta = 0.148$, $p = 0.041$) and collaborative climate ($\beta = 0.293$, $p < 0.001$) were statistically significant, suggesting their positive contribution to growth of Pentecostal churches. However, shared values ($\beta = 0.007$, $p = 0.911$), team competence ($\beta = -0.028$, $p = 0.702$), and integrity ($\beta = 0.097$, $p = 0.144$) were not significant predictors of church growth in this model. The model summary revealed that the predictors explained 19.4% of the variance in church growth ($R = 0.441$, $R^2 = 0.194$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.181$, Std. Error of the Estimate = 0.52861). The ANOVA results confirmed the model's statistical significance, with an F-value of 15.144 and a p-value less than 0.001, indicating that the collective predictors significantly influenced church growth ($F(5, 314) = 15.144$, $p < 0.01$). In terms of individual predictors, humility ($\beta = 0.148$, $p = 0.041$) and collaborative climate ($\beta = 0.293$, $p < 0.001$) were statistically significant, suggesting their positive contribution to church growth. However, shared values ($\beta = 0.007$, $p = 0.911$), team competence ($\beta = -0.028$, $p = 0.702$), and integrity ($\beta = 0.097$, $p = 0.144$) were not significant predictors of church growth in this model.

Table 3 Regression of Growth of Pentecostal churches on Team Leadership Dimensions

Model Summary						
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate		
1	.441 ^a	.194	.181	.52861		
a. Predictors: (Constant), Collaborative Climate, Integrity, Shared Values, Humility, Team Competence						
ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	21.158	5	4.232	15.144	.000 ^b
	Residual	87.739	314	.279		
	Total	108.897	319			
a. Dependent Variable: Growth of Pentecostal churches						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Collaborative Climate, Integrity, Shared Values, Humility, Team Competence						
Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.808	.312		5.796	.000
	Shared Values	.009	.076	.007	.112	.911
	Team Competence	-.029	.075	-.028	-.383	.702
	Integrity	.104	.071	.097	1.466	.144
	Humility	.158	.077	.148	2.051	.041
	Collaborative Climate	.287	.067	.293	4.285	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Church Growth						

The regression results reveal that team competence and integrity were not significant predictors of church growth in contrast to the perspectives of Schneider (2019) and Huberts (2017) who position these dimensions as central to team leadership success. While these traits correlate positively with church growth, their individual predictive power appears limited in this study's context. Similarly, shared values were also not a significant predictor of church growth, which diverges from the arguments of Vanourek and Vanourek (2014) and Grimsley (2021) that emphasize the role of shared values in shaping organizational culture and trust. This suggests that while shared values are important, their direct impact on the growth of Pentecostal churches may be less pronounced when compared to other factors.

Collaborative climate, having the strongest positive correlation with growth of Pentecostal churches, underscores the theoretical emphasis on the significance of collaboration in team leadership, as articulated in

the Hill Model for Team Leadership (Northouse, 2016). This reinforces the model's premise that effective leadership involves creating a supportive environment where team members work cohesively towards shared goals. The positive correlation suggests that fostering a collaborative climate enhances team effectiveness and organizational success, aligning with Sveiby and Simons (2002) and Cook and Macaulay (2020), who highlight the importance of knowledge sharing and collective effort. This strengthens the argument for prioritizing collaborative practices within team leadership frameworks to drive growth and performance.

The significant positive correlation between humility and growth of Pentecostal churches validates the theoretical proposition that humility is a vital component of effective team leadership, as discussed in the Hill Model (Northouse, 2016). Humility in leadership fosters self-awareness, mutual respect, and interdependence, which are crucial for team cohesion and success (Nielsen & Marrone, 2018; Wu, 2022). This finding supports the notion that leaders who acknowledge their limitations and value the contributions of others can cultivate a more inclusive and effective team environment, thereby enhancing organizational outcomes. It emphasizes the need for leadership models to incorporate humility as a core attribute that contributes to team and organizational growth.

The lack of significance for team competence and integrity as individual predictors of growth of Pentecostal churches challenges the theoretical expectations set by the Hill Model and related literature (Schneider, 2019; Huberts, 2017). While these dimensions are traditionally seen as foundational to team leadership success, their limited predictive power in this study suggests a need to reconsider how these traits are integrated into leadership models. This divergence invites further theoretical exploration into the contextual factors that may influence the impact of competence and integrity on organizational outcomes. It also highlights the potential necessity for adaptive leadership models that account for varying organizational dynamics and the interplay of different leadership dimensions.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Collaborative climate is the most crucial factor in promoting growth of Pentecostal churches. This aligns with theoretical perspectives that emphasize the importance of teamwork and collective effort in achieving organizational success. By prioritizing a collaborative environment, Pentecostal church leaders can enhance group cohesion and effectiveness, driving growth and development within the church. Humility also emerges as a significant contributor to growth of Pentecostal churches, reinforcing its importance in leadership. Theoretical frameworks suggest that humility fosters trust, self-awareness, and a culture of interdependence, all of which are essential for effective leadership. Church leaders who demonstrate humility are better positioned to build strong relationships and inspire growth within their congregations. However, while team competence, integrity, and shared values are traditionally viewed as essential for leadership success, the findings suggest their direct impact on church growth may be less significant. This challenges existing theories and indicates that these attributes, though important for overall team functionality, may not be the primary drivers of growth of Pentecostal churches.

In light of the outcome of this study, bishops should prioritize the cultivation of a collaborative climate within their regions. By fostering environments where teamwork and collective decision-making are emphasized, bishops can enhance growth of Pentecostal churches. This can be achieved through regular team-building activities, open forums for discussion, and encouraging cross-departmental collaborations. Additionally, bishops should model humility in their leadership, setting an example for other leaders and demonstrating the importance of servant leadership. Going down the organizational hierarchy, pastors should also focus on developing their humility as a core leadership trait. By engaging in continuous self-reflection, seeking feedback from their congregants, and acknowledging their limitations, pastors can build trust and inspire their congregations. Pastors should also encourage collaborative efforts within their churches by promoting shared leadership roles and involving congregants in decision-making processes. This approach not only empowers the congregation but also enhances the overall effectiveness and growth of Pentecostal churches. Finally, members of the church should actively participate in fostering a collaborative climate within their churches. By engaging in church activities, volunteering for various roles, and supporting their leaders, congregants contribute to a more dynamic and unified church environment.

The study acknowledges limitations that provide incentives for further knowledge extension. While it identified a significant connection between team leadership and growth of Pentecostal churches, it did not examine the mediating factors underlying this relationship. Future research could explore potential mediators, such as community engagement, to better understand how team leadership influences growth of Pentecostal churches. Identifying these mediators would offer valuable insights into the mechanisms at play and help refine leadership strategies for church leaders. Also, the study's focus on Pentecostal churches limits the ability to generalize the findings to other Christian denominations. Future research should expand this investigation to include different denominations to determine what the relationships between team leadership dimensions and church growth hold across various religious contexts.

REFERENCES

1. Akosua, A. S., Yang, X. Y., Clement, M., Zalia, A.-H., & Fathia, B. V. (2021). City logistics measures and environmental sustainability: An evidence from Ghana. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*, 11, 582-597. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ajib.2021.11.5037>
2. Arar, K., & Taysum, A. (2020). From hierarchical leadership to a mark of distributed leadership by whole school inquiry in partnership with higher education institutions: Comparing the Arab education system in England. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 23(6), 755-774. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2019.159151>
3. Asenahabi, B. M. (2019). Basics of research design: A guide to selecting appropriate research design. *International Journal of Contemporary Applied Researches*, 6(5), 76-89. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342354309>
4. Assbeihat, J. M. (2016). The impact of collaboration among members on team's performance. *Management and Administrative Science Review*, 5(5), 248-259. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311811209>
5. Bartleby. (2023). The six dimensions of team teamwork. <https://www.bartley.com>
6. Billinger, S., & Workiewicz, M. (2019). Fading hierarchies and the emergence of new forms of organization. *Journal of Organization Design*, 8(17), 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41469-0190057-6>
7. Brailer, D. (2020). Lessons from the COVID crisis: How leaders with humility, integrity, and compassion matter now more than ever. <https://www.healthevolution.com/insider/>
8. Brechter, S. (2022). Leadership essentials: Partnering and teaming. <https://www.graystoneadvisors.com/>
9. Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods (International Edition)*. Oxford University Press Inc.
10. Bullen, P. B. (2022). How to choose a sample size (for statistically challenged): Tools4dev <https://tools4dev.org/resources/>
11. Burton, R. M., & Obel, B. (2018). The science of organizational design: Fit between structure and coordination. *Journal of Organizational Design*, 7(5), 1-13 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41469-018-0029-2>
12. By, R. T., Kuipers, B. & Procter, S. (2018). Understanding teams in order to understand organizational change: The OTIC Model of organizational change. *Journal of Change Management*, 18(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2018.14>
13. Caviglia-Harris, J., Hodges, K. E., Helmuth, B., Bennett, E. M., Calvin, K., Krebs, M., Lips, K., Lowman, M., Schulte, L. A., & Schuur, E. A. (2021). The six dimensions of collective leadership that advance sustainability objectives: Rethinking what it means to be an academic leadership. *Ecology and Society*, 26(3), 1-15.
14. Choi, Y., Yoon, D. J., & Kim, D. (2020). Leader behavior integrity and employee in-role performance: The roles of coworker support and job autonomy. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(12), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17124303>
15. Coleman, B. M., Orsini, J., Bunch, J. C., & Greenhaw, L. L. (2021). Students' team leadership skills in an undergraduate agricultural leadership course when learning experientially. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 20(2), 28-42. <https://doi.org/10.12806/v20/I2/R3>
16. Cook, S., & Macaulay, S. (2020). From the archive: Collaboration within teams. *Training Journal*. <https://www.trainingjournal.com/articles/feature/>

17. Cooke, N. J. (2015). Overview of the research on team effectiveness – Enhancing the effectiveness of team's science – NCBI Bookshelf. The National Academy of Sciences. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.gov/books/NBK310384>
18. Creswell, J. D. (2022). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches, (6th Ed.) SAGE Publications.
19. Damazio, F. (2021). 7 Purposes and advantages of team leadership. <https://www.churchstaffing.com>
20. Edmonds, W. A., & Kennedy, T. D. (2017). Convergent-Parallel approach mixed methods. In *An applied Guide to Research Designs: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methods*, 181-188. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781071802779>
21. Engelbrecht, A. S., Heine, G., & Mahembe, B. (2015). The influence of integrity and ethical leadership on trust in the leader. *Management Dynamics: Journal of the Southern African Institute for management Scientists*, 24(1). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/280877476_
22. Fernandopulle, N. (2021). To what extent does hierarchy leadership affect health care outcomes? *Medical Journal of the Islamic Republic of Iran*, 35(1), 880-883 <https://doi.org/10.47176/mjiri.35.117>
23. Fisher, M. J., & Marshall RN, A. P. (2008). Understanding descriptive statistics. *Journal of Australia Critical Care*, 22, 93-97. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aucc.2008.11.003>
24. Fuerst, M. J., & Luetge, C. (2021). The concept of organizational integrity: A derivation from the individual level using a virtue-based approach. *Business Ethics, the Environment & Responsibility*, 00, 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1111/beer.12401>
25. Gathogo, J. M. (2022). The shifting landscape of African-Pentecostalism in Kenya. *Theologia Viatorum*, 46(1), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.4102/tvi1.121> or
26. Grimsley, S. (2021). Shared values in an organization: Definition & explanation. <https://study.com/academy/lesson/>
27. Grossman, R., Friedman, S. B., & Kalra, S. (2017). Teamwork process and emergent states. *Wiley Online Library*, 243-259. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118909997.ch11>
28. Haas, M., & Mortensen, M. (2016). Collaboration and teams: The secrets of great teamwork. *Harvard Business Review*, 94(6). 70-76.
29. Hasbiyadi. (2017). Effects of teamwork competency and leadership competence through organizational commitment on the performance of the state owned enterprises in Makassar City, South Sulawesi. *Scientific Research Journal (SCRJ)*, 5(11). 84-92. <https://www.scrij.org/papers-1117/scrj-P1117465.pdf>
30. Hayat, K., Hafeez, M., Bilal, K. & Shbbir, M. S. (2022). Interactive effects of organizational structure and team work quality on project success in project based profit organizations. *iRASD Journal of Management*, 4(1), 68-87. <https://doi.org/10.52131/jom.2022.0401>
31. Huberts, L. W. J. C. (2018). Integrity: What it is and why it is important. *Public Integrity*, 20(1), 18-32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2018.147740>
32. Jamieson, S. (2023). Likert Scale. *Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/>
33. Johnson, M. K., Rowatt, W., & Petrini L. (2011). Honesty-humility as a unique predictor of job performance ratings. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 50(6), 857-862. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.01.011>
34. Joshi, A., Kale, S., Chandel, S., & Pal, D. K. (2015). Likert Scale: Explored and explained. *British Journal of Applied Science and Technology*, 7(4), 396-403. <https://doi.org/10.9734/BJAST/2015/14975>
35. Joshua, S. M. (2019). The Norwegian Pentecostal Mission's work in Kenya between 1955 and 1984: A Historical perspective. *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies*, 75(1), 1-10 <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v75i1.5275>
36. Karthikeyan, C. (2017). A Meta analytical study on leadership integrity: A Leadership ethics perspective. *International Journal of Management, IT & Engineering*, 7(4), 2249-2496. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332934035>
37. Kilioba, J. M. (2017). PEFA Syokimau: Here is our small history. *PefaDobholm Media*.
38. Kirkman, B. L. (2020). What is 3-dimensional team leadership? Integration and implementation insights. [A community blog and repository of resources for improving impact on complex real-world problems]. <https://i2insights.org/2020/12/01/3d-team-Leadership>

39. Koeslag-Kreunen, M., Bossche, P. V. D., Hoven, M., Klink, M. V.D., & Gijsselaers, W. (2018). When team leadership powers team learning: A meta-analysis. *SAGE Journals*, 49(4), 475-513. <https://doi.org/10.1177/104649641876482>
40. Kozlowski, S. W. L., & Ilgen, D. R. (2006). Enhancing the effectiveness of work groups and teams. *SAGE Journals, Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 7(3), 77-124. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1529-1006.2006.00030.x>
41. Kramer, M. R., & Plitzer, M. W. (2016). Business and society: The ecosystem of shared value. *Harvard Business Review*, 1-19. <https://hbr.org/2016/10/>
42. Landry, L. (2020). Why managers should involve their team in the decision-making process. *Harvard Business School Online*, 1-4. <https://online.hbs/blog/>
43. Leedy, P., & Ormrod, J. (2014). Practical research planning and design: Pearson New International Edition (10th ed.). Pearson Education Limited.
44. Lei, X., Liu, W., Su, T., & Shan, Z. (2022). Humble leadership and team innovation: The mediating role of team reflexivity and the moderating role of expertise diversity in teams. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13(726708), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.726708>
45. Liu, Z., Liu, X., & Zhang, X. (2021). How to solve the timer dilemma? The influence of team temporal leadership on team innovation Performance. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12(634133), 1-9. <https://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.634133>
46. Lotrecchiano, G. R., DiazGranados, D., Sprecher, J., McCormack, W. T., Ranwala, D., Wooten, K., Lackland, D., Billings, H., & Brasier, A. R. (2021). Individual and team competencies in translational teams. *Journal of Clinical and Translation Science*, 5(1), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cts.2020.551>
47. Mapolisa, T., & Ncube, A. C. (2012). Team leadership: The engine for quality performance and output in open and distance learning programmes. *Zimbabwe International Journal of Open Distance Learning International Research Conference-Special Edition*. 101-110. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/302871423>
48. McEwan, D., Ruissen, G. R., Eys, M. A., Beauchamp, M. R. (2017). The effectiveness of teamwork training on teamwork behaviors and team performance: A Systematic review and meta-analysis of controlled interventions. *PLoS One*, 12(1), 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0169604>
49. Middleton, T. (2022). The importance of teamwork (as proven by science). <https://www.atlassian.com/blog/>
50. Mokgwane, P., & Omobonike, A. S. (2021). The significance of team leadership on increasingly complex tasks, globalization, and the flattening of organizational structures. *Journal of Education and Society*, 4(1), 76-83. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5556157> or <https://www.inu.edu.ph/injournals/index.php/jes/article/view/35>
51. Molina-Azorin, J. F. (2016). Mixed methods research: An opportunity to improve our studies and our research skills. *European Journal of Management and Business Economics*, 25(2), 37-38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.redeen.2016.05.001>
52. Mukua-Maru, J., Linge, T. K., & Ouma, C. (2023). Influence of empowerment of team leadership on team effectiveness of collaborative partnerships in international research organizations in Kenya. *Journal of Human Resource & Leadership*, 7(2), 86-105. <https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t5208>
53. Munyao, S. M. (2021). Effects of strategic leadership and external environment on the performance of Africa Inland Theological Training Institutes in Kenya. [Doctoral Degree: Pan Africa Christian University].
54. Nielsen, R., & Marrone, J. A. (2018). Humility: Our current understanding of the construct and its role in organizations. *International Journal of Management Reviews (IJMR)*, 20(4), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12160>
55. Njenga, N. M., & Maina, S. (2018). The influence of collaborative leadership on team's performance (A case study of kingdom SACCO). *Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, 20(12), 54-58. <https://doi.org/10.9790/487X-2012065458>
56. Northouse, P. (2016). Leadership: Theory and practice. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications
57. Paolucci, N., Dimas, I. D., Zappala, S., Lourenco, P. R., & Rebelo, T. (2018). Transformational Leadership and team effectiveness: The mediating role of affective team commitment. *Journal of work and organizational Psychology*, 34(3), 135-144. <https://doi.org/10.5093/jwop2018a16>

58. Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2011). Corporate social responsibility: Creating shared value. *Harvard Business Review*, 1-2. <https://hbr.org/2011/01/>
59. Reader, T. W. (2017). Team decision-making. *Wiley Online Library*, 271-296. <https://doi.org/10.1002/978111890997.ch12>
60. Rego, A., Cunha, M. P., & Simpson, A. V. (2018). The perceived impact of leaders' humility on team effectiveness: An empirical study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 148, 205-218. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-3008-3>
61. Reichheld, F. (2021). The role of humility and integrity in times of turmoil. 1-2. <https://www.netpromotersystem.com/insights>
62. Roberts, D., Wyk, R. V., & Dhanpat, N. (2016). Exploring practices for effective collaboration. <https://www.researchgate.net/>
63. Salman, M., Ganie, S., & Saleem, I. (2020). The concept of competence: A thematic review and discussion. *The European Journal of Training and Development Ahead-of-print* (ahead-of-print), 1-27. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-10-2019-0171>
64. Sanyal, S., & Hisam, M. W. (2018). Teamwork on work performance of employees: A study of faculty members in Dhofar University. *IOSR Journal of business and Management*, 20(3), 15-22. <https://doi.org/10.9790/487X-2003011522>
65. Satell, G. & Winschitl, C. (2021). High-performing teams start with a culture of shared values. *Harvard Business Review*, 1-7. <https://hbr.org/2021/05/>
66. Schmutz, J. B., Meier, L. L., & Manser, T. (2019). How effective is teamwork really? The relationship between teamwork and performance in healthcare teams: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Open*, 9(9), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-028280>
67. Schneider, K. (2019). What does competence mean? *Psychology*, 10(14), 1938-1958. <https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2019.1014125>
68. Shuffler, M. L., Diazgranados, D., Maynard, m. t., & Salas E. (2018). Developing, sustaining, and maximizing team effectiveness: An integrative, dynamic perspective of team development interventions. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 12(2), 688-724. <https://doi.org/10.5485/annals.2016.0045>
69. Sommerschuh, J. (2022). The grace in hierarchy: Seniors, God, and the sources of life in Southern Ethiopia. *The Cambridge Journal of Anthropology*, 40(1), 18-33. <https://doi.org/10.3167/cja.2022.400103>
70. Stewart, B. (2019). How team leadership benefits the health of pastors: Springs. *Great Commission Research Journal*, 10(2), 147-159. <https://digitalarchives.apu.edu/gcrj/vol10/iss2/8>
71. Sudhakar, G. P. (2013). Different dimensions of teams. *Ecoforum Journal*, 2(2), 29-35. <https://www.ecoforumjournal.ro/index.php/eco/article/download/33/35>
72. Sullivan, G. M., & Artino, Jr. A. R. (2013). Analyzing and interpreting data from Likert-type Scales. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education (JGME)*, 5(4), 541-542. <https://doi.org/10.4300/JGME-5-4-18>
73. Sveiby, K. E., & Simons, R. (2002). Collaborative climate and effectiveness of knowledge work— An empirical study. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 6(5), 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13673270210450388>
74. Taherdoost, H. (2022). Different types of data analysis; data analysis methods and techniques in research projects. *International Journal of Academic Research in Management (IJARM)*, 9(1), 1-9. <http://elvedit.com/journals/IJARM/wp-content/uploads>
75. Tainen, A. (2020). Pentecostal collaboration: A Pragmatic necessity or a spiritual principle? *Spiritus*, 5(1), 53-73. <http://digitalshowcase.org.edu/>
76. Tamunomiebi, M. D., Omosioni, I. O., & Odunayo, A. (2018). Church leadership and congregational growth: A Review of literature. *British Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 21(2), 48-59. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329642903>
77. Thamhain, H. (2013). Building a collaborative climate for multinational projects. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 74, 316-328. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.03.006>
78. Thomas, L. (2020). Simple random sampling/definition, steps & examples. *Scribbr*, 1-8 <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/>
79. Vanourek, B., & Vanourek, G. (2014). Developing your team's shared values. <https://www.td.org/>

-
80. Wasti, S. P., Simkhada, P., Teijlingen, E. R. V., Sathian, B., & Banerjee, I. (2022). The growing importance of mixed-methods research in health. *Nepal Journal of Epidemiology*, 12(1), 1175-1178. <https://doi.org/10.3126/nje.v12i1.43633>
 81. Whitelaw, S., Kalra, A., & Spall, H. G. C.V. (2020). Flattening the hierarchies in academic medicine: The importance of diversity in leadership, contribution, and thought: The authors present a rationale for team-based leadership in medicine, shifting away from traditional hierarchical leadership models of today. *European Heart Journal*, 41(1), 9-10. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehz886>
 82. Wu, J. (2022). The Influence mechanism of humble leadership on employee helping behavior: A Moderated meditation model. Atlantis Press. <https://www.atlantis-press.com/article/125981693.pdf>
 83. Yang, J., Zhang, W., & Chen, X. (2019). Why do leaders express humility and how does this matter: A rational choice perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01925>
 84. Zdonek, I., Podgorska, M., & Hysa, B. (2017). The competence of project team members in the conditions of remote working. *Foundations of Management*, 9(1), 213-224. <https://doi.org/10.1515/fman-2017-0017>