A Phenomenological Study of the Experiences and Meaning of Participating in a Syndicate for Completing an Action Learning Project on a Short Study Programme at a Business School

Moreoagae Bertha Randa [i]
Sefako Makgatho Health Sciences University

Mirose Muhlarhi [ii]
Sefako Makgatho Health Sciences University

Marlize E. Cochrane [iii]
Sefako Makgatho Health Sciences University

Pearl Lentsoane [iv]
Sefako Makgatho Health Sciences University

Solly M. Seeletse [v]
Sefako Makgatho Health Sciences University

Abstract

The paper is based on a study of the experiences of a syndicate consisting of five members forced by the course management in a nine month Future Leaders in Digital Business study programme at the Wits Business School in Johannesburg, South Africa. Syndicates were formed to complete the research component when the other modules were done at individual level. The Action Learning Project component, required syndicates to undertake a study that would be implemented to improve some real work problem. Qualitative study design was followed to uncover the meanings from the experiences narrated, using phenomenology to reveal the meanings and implications of these experiences. Purposive sampling required the participation of the five students from the syndicate. The findings revealed synergistic gains that came through the activities, and showed the possibility of teams functioning at optimal levels that can lead to no one underperforming while everybody over-performs and benefits plentifully.

----
[i] **Moreoagae Bertha Randa,** Dr., Nursing Science, Sefako Makgatho Health Sciences University, ORCID: 0000-0002-0067-289X

Email: moreoagae.randa@smu.ac.za

[ii] **Mirose Muhlarhi,** Dr., Department of Oral Health, Sefako Makgatho Health Sciences University

[iii] **Marlize E. Cochrane,** Dr., Department of Physiotherapy, Sefako Makgatho Health Sciences University

[iv] **Pearl Lentsoane,** Dr., Department of Pharmacy, Sefako Makgatho Health Sciences University

[i] **Solly M. Seeletse,** Dr., Department of Statistics & Operations Research, Sefako Makgatho Health Sciences University

INTRODUCTION

Group exercises done by students are used to train students on teamwork and its elements in the application of the concepts they learn in lectures. Sometimes facilitators use the group-approach to save time, as they may have massive numbers of students that they cannot handle when they participate at individual levels. Students often group themselves as they know one another, and as they relate from the past, knowing that they can work together. When students undertake group exercises at school to complete assignments, the default aim is to reinforce the actual concepts being taught, as well as gain passes to obtain credits. It is not too often that the students are forced into groups, as the blame would be on the faculty if students do not perform as expected or required. In the usual groups, where students make their own choices to form groups, students usually also know the benefits they stand to gain. In fact, they form groups already knowing the prospects and anticipated benefits. In the case of groups formed where members have no clue about their fellow members, it is often difficult to know in advance what would transpire. This paper explored the lived experiences that befell a syndicate formed by faculty at Wits Business School on Future Leaders in a Digital Business programme in order to understand the meaning of the experiences, frustrations, success stories, lessons learnt, outcomes of the activities as well as the results from the syndicate in question.

This paper reflects on the benefits and any challenges experienced in the research activities of a syndicate formed through member imposition by short-programme students of the WBS of the University of Witwatersrand (WITS) in Johannesburg, South Africa. The students were attending a nine month intensive course at the WBS, the Future Leaders in Digital Business (FLDB) programme. Among the modules taken was a group research assignment, the Action Learning Project (ALP). The syndicate of focus had five members, identified as Dynamic 5. They had not met before, except for two who had once worked on oral examinations of undergraduate students before. They were duty-bound to complete the ALP if they wanted to graduate and, as a group, they had to brainstorm to sketch a way forward. These pertinent concepts are discussed in the literature.

CONTEXT

Duty-Bound Membership in Groups

When people participate in groups where they are compelled because some work/job has to be done, anxiety is one of the results in the minds of participants. Members tend to doubt if they can be respected in the same way as they are by people who know them (Manges, Scott-Cawiezell & Ward, 2017; Tuckman, 2001). They also do not know if other members will/can contribute positively in the way those that they know would do. Motivation can be positive or negative, depending on people's perceptions and personalities, and they can be extreme. In extreme lack of motivation, the case of dismal performance or underperformance is likely to occur. The '20/60/20 Rule' describes how misaligned members can emerge (Annunzio, 2001). The 20/60/20 is based on 100% where one 20% are the best performers, another 20% are the worst performers and 60% can be swayed to either side. More on the rule follows.

20-60-20 Theory

Effective leadership, in any organisation, involves being able to efficiently use the leader's time and involve subordinates to perform best. The *20-60-20 rule is* a helpful way to view organisational change and help team leaders to manage their teams (Annunzio, 2001). Briefly, the 20-60-20 framework postulates that 20% of employees in most organisations are great team players and generally work hard to serve the mission of the organisation and to achieve the organisational goals. These are considered to be the 'positives', or those with a positive attitude. The rule also postulates that another 20% are the 'negatives', which implies that they have a negative attitude in relation to best organisational performance. This group disrupts high performance, as they are low performers themselves. Then, the 60% middle, known as the 'takeaway', stand in the middle of 'positives' and 'negatives'. They can go either side, to either the top 20% or bottom 20%. Leadership can influence

them to the top 20% side, and effective leadership often does so. A great risk is that if this group is ignored or left unattended, they may join the bottom 20%.

The 20-60-20 rule suggests that the allocation is an arbitrary percentage of distribution of employees (Jaworski & Pitera, 2016) as in reality the percentages may be different from the numbers. The actual meaning is that there is a general tendency that organisations have minorities of high performers and minorities of low performers, and then a big majority of those who cannot be classified as high or low performers, but could become high performers. The risk with this group is that they can switch to low performers and increase the negatives. There is a belief that in some organisations there could be 30% or even 40% of the employees who fit any of the categories. There is also a belief that the negative 20% has already decided to oppose leadership, and that they are unmovable from the negative stand. It is thought that these employees can never be made positive no matter what leadership does.

Brainstorming

Brainstorming refers to a session or meeting that teams use to generate ideas to address well-defined design problems (Forsyth, 2014). It usually takes place in organised and free-thinking settings. The team members use the question 'how'. Team members generate ideas to find potential solutions. Creativity is expected from members (Hicks, 2004) and, according to Parker and Begnaud (2004), creative leadership is required to generate substantially creative ideas. Osborn (1963) presents two values contributing to effectiveness in generating ideas which are to defer judgment and to reach for quantity. Based on these two values, three broad rules of brainstorming are to reduce social impediments among group members, to excite idea generation, and to increase overall group creativity.

A syndicate should involve several members. This is to enhance divergent production of quality from different minds (Kerzner, 2013; Trott, Hartmann, van der Duin *et al*., 2016). Participants in a team should also withhold criticism during brainstorming. They should rather extend ideas and shelve criticism in order to encourage participation and members to generate rare ideas for radical and effective solutions. Further, wild ideas are encouraged, new perspectives are searched, and new ways of thinking are generated for better solutions. Furthermore, when combining ideas and improving them, synergies are formed to produce results that exceed the total number of separate individuals.

Synergy

Synergy refers to an interaction that gives rise to a total that exceeds the simple sum of its components (Corning, 2005). It can happen in any situation. The synergistic action of the economy is based on the economic phenomenon's wisdom (Laura-Melinda, 2011). It provides diverse dimensions to competitiveness, strategy and network identity serving as an eccentric instrument for those developing the economic system's potential in depth. Human synergy relates to human interaction and teamwork. Synergy usually arises when two people with different complementary skills and experiences cooperate. Collaboration of individuals with organisational and technical skills occurs quite often. The individuals involved would work positively and in a helpful environment for the company to reap the benefits. In general, synergy expresses that in any activity, person A can produce benefit a, and person B can benefit b, but if A and B partner as a team/syndicate they can produce $a + b + x$, where x is some beneficial portion that could not have been accomplished if these two people were working separately. Many definitions write synergy as $1 + 1 = 3$ $(2 + 1)$ to imply that the extra portion is 1 or at the same level as the individual contributions. Thus, this study examines if the x should be thought as being limited to that upper band, or if there are possibilities beyond this notion.

METHOD

Study Design

A qualitative study design (Bhattacherjee, 2012) was used to make coherent analyses about a phenomenon by linking experiential observations with logical reasoning.Thus, phenomena are the source of reality. In research, phenomenology ensures focus on the respondents' views, rather than the researcher's, reduce the possibility of researcher bias.

Phenomenology In Brief

According to Haslam and McGarty (2003), phenomenology is a qualitative research method entailing responses of non-numeric form based on the idea of a phenomenon. Hergenhahn (2005) views a phenomenon as something that appears, or that is presented or given. Reber and Reber (2001) define a phenomenon as any manifestation that is observable. Phenomenology provides a rich and complete description of human lived experiences and the meanings attributed to these lived experiences.

Research Question

The question they were answering was:

- *'What were your experiences in the syndicate activities'?*

The unpacking of this question was understood to indicate the challenges, methods used to get out of problems that transpired, how the group interacted during the ALP era and other group activities of the syndicates, and the failures, successes, and any benefits that were realised. These included individual and syndicate issues.

Study Sample

The study respondents were members of one syndicate in the programme. The interest that emerged in studying this syndicate was that consistently the syndicate outperformed other syndicates in terms of meeting timelines set by WBS and the ALP coordinator; in the group activities they always seemed to show in-depth understanding; and in cases where WBS faculty set up competitions of the syndicates, this syndicate won those competitions, including even where members were not all available. It was therefore interesting to find out about this particular syndicate and hence this study was undertaken.

Data Collection

The study participants were requested to give details from beginning to end, including their lived experiences, frustrations, gains, and any others they wished to share. Four members out of five, which is 80% response rate, provided responses. In qualitative research, the sample size does not have to be largein order to understand the depth of the phenomenon (Fusch & Ness, 2015). The analysis consisted of considering the units of meaning in each little word that appeared using a phenomenological approach (Landes & Cruz-Pierre, 2013). The approach took care of every little comment made by each respondent.

Data Analysis

Data analysis, which is an intense unpacking process to make data useful towards interpretations, was an inductive approach. Inductive analysis is a method of reasoning that attempts to discover order, structure and meaning from data. The respondents' statements were written down and their statements reduced or broken down into units of meaning called Natural Meaning Units

(NMUs), which, according to Gubrium and Hostein (2000), are the smallest segments of text that are meaningful by themselves.

RESULTS

Four participants participated in the study and told their stories. Without going into details of the individual profiles, it suffices to indicate that the respondents were all highly qualified professionals and academics in university lecturing and clinical fields. Pseudonyms were used in the presentations of the participants' stories in order to conceal their identities. The pseudonyms were A, B, C and D. The respondents were all academics of Sefako Makgatho Health Sciences University (SMU). Themes were created from the discussions. These themes are indicated by numbers in the narration (e.g. A1, A2, etc.). The presentation format is firstly the participants' narrations of their lived experiences, meaning ascribed to the syndicate activities and lived experiences, followed by discussions to clarify the essential establishment of the various lived experiences.

A's story

Overall, the experience was positive (A1). At the onset of the process, I was sceptical (A2) about the amount of work (A3) the project required compared to the time (A4) available. However, at the end of the project, the team pulled through (A5) and managed (A6) to successfully complete (A7) a meaningful project (A8) that will not only enhance staff experience (A9) at SMU, but that is also implementable (A10). I enjoyed working (A11) with the team and (although I found it cumbersome (A12) during completion of the course) the additional group assignments (A13) that fell out of the ALP definitely assisted (A14) to achieve (A15) cohesion in the team (A16).

B's story

When we started the journey (B1), I was not sure (B2) if I understood (B3) what was expected of us. Much as I panicked (B4), the group members (B5) had it all wrapped up (B6) and we set up our first meeting (B7). We brainstormed (B8) a lot of topics (B9) to choose from (B10), until we decided to flow (B11) with the chosen one (B12) which is a serious challenge (B13) and concern for the newly appointed staff members. The experience of the journey-map was quite a pleasant one (B14). We started by setting specific, attainable and measurable objectives which were time bound (B15). The group interactions (B16) helped me to develop (B17) both personally and professionally (B18). I was encouraged (B19) to think creatively (B20) and build strong communication skills (B21) which also helped (B22) in refining (B23) and understanding (B24) the journey. As members we were committed (B25) and encouraged each other (B26) to be motivated (B27) towards the goal (B28). Listening (B29) and discussing (B30) added a strong auditory dimension (B31) to my learning experience (B32). Our sessions or meetings (B33) were never too long (B34).They lasted for 30 minutes to an hour (B35) and this increased productivity (B36) as we never lost focus (B37). Very important, we only met when there was a need (B38).

C's story

When ALP was first introduced (C1), it felt like a lot of work (which it was) (C2), exhaustion (C3) took its toll (C4). Work/responsibilities were distributed (C5) amongst members and sometimes members volunteered (C6) to take certain responsibilities (C7). Feedback (C8) was always (C9) given upon completion of a task. This eased up the project (10) as teamwork (C11) boosted the morale (C12). Each chapter's completion felt like a milestone (C13). Sometimes urgent meetings (C14) had to be held under unfavourable conditions (C15), which would not permit one to attend a meeting or two. Regardless, the goal was achieved (C16) and the presentation of an ALP project was worth (C17) all the hard efforts.

D's story

I guess I was lucky (D1) to be part of the group. The selfless members (D2) who shared (D3) and participated (D4) without hesitation (D5). What I enjoyed (D6) was that from the beginning (D7) of our journey, there were open (D8) dialogues (D9). There was never (D10) a time when we were idle (D11) when we were required to engage or do a task (D12). Members covered one another (D13) when we were not able to participate (D14). The scribe (D15) we had, and the leader (D16), as well as the co-leader (D17), were amazing (D18). Young (D19) as they are, they were able (D20) to hold their best (D21) to produce (D22) amazing results (D23). It is henceforth not an easy thought to know that we have reached the end of our coerced relationship (D24). The journey was relatively easy (D25) on the ALP requirements, due to the way the coach managed (D26) the tasks as well as the way leadership carried us (D27). There was also a special scribe (D28) who made sure we never lost (D29) a single piece of information. She kept minutes, she drew sketches and experimented on every single piece of work we needed to do.

DISCUSSION OF THE IDENTIFIED THEMES IN THE NARRATIVES

Challenges at Inception

Probably if there was a choice, group members in this syndicate group would not have chosen to be in the same syndicate (D18). They became fellow group members because membership was imposed on them. The start was stressful (A2, B1, B2, C1) with delegates not sure (A2) as to what was required, or what they needed to do. Skepticism (A2) and doubt (B1) seemed to prevail earlier among members who mostly were seeing each other for the first time. Members were panicking (B4) at the start, and also unclear (B2). The ALP added to an already full workload (A3, C2), but each one opened up to it. Also, members were exhausted (C3).

Unlocking the Barriers

The meetings were held to loosen the challenges that prevailed at the beginning. The inception meeting for dialogue (B7, B29, C15, and D3) 'broke the ice'. Special urgent meeting took place when needed (C15, D8). In the brainstorming meeting the path of progress was unlocked (A11, B11, B27). Meetings were never long or overbearing (B33). Meetings were generally short (B33), never exceeding one hour, but most lasted for less than 30 minutes (B34) as they were straight to the point (B36). The positive aspects of the syndicate meetings also included that each meeting that was convened was prompted by the fact that there was a need for it (B37). Urgent meeting were also held (C14) when necessary as members were sacrificing for the syndicate's progress and success.

Respondents' Experiences

The syndicate members indicated that even though they started on a low due to challenges and with doubts (A2, B2) they were able to achieve as a group (A5, A6, A7, A15, B6, B27, C14, C15, C16). As a result, they celebrate a shared achievement. The victory was realised as a result of members making sacrifices for the syndicate to progress and produce useful results (C6, C14, C15, C24, B11; D5), the energy or electrification due to boosted morale (C12), commitment from each one of the members (B25, D9), exchange of ideas (or dialogues) that took place among members (B11, B21), and the encouragement that members extended to one another (B19, B27).

The participants reiterated that their lived experiences were fraught with challenges (B13). However, among the determinants that made the work easier to complete (C10, D24, D25) were shared decision-making (B11, D3), assistance extended to each other (A14, B17, B22), continual work (D10, D11), and the democratic nature of the team conduct (B11). There was also feedback on the work completed (C8), listening to one another (B11, B28), unselfishness or selflessness of team members (B11, D2), team cohesion (A16; B11, D9), teamwork (A16, B11, C11, D13–D17), and

fellow members' understanding one another (B24) which enabled completion of the project. The group leadership was remarkably resilient (B11, D15 – D17, D26, D33).

Voluntarism (C6, D13, D14) of members was amazing. The scribe's (C28) creative work with the computer for the group was distinctive, very special. The group leader's sketches of the journey maps and others' pictorials to complement the scribe's creativity made the group shine in the eyes of the faculty and peers. As milestones were reached (C13), member morale was also boosted (C12), and members were energised for more achievements (C12). Creative thinking seems to have been the order of the group (B20). The motivation of members (B27) was also high. The group demonstrated a high level of shared responsibilities (C8).

Other factors that contributed to the success of the syndicate were creative thinking that the members demonstrated (B20), dynamism of the members (B11, D19), communication (B11, B21), ability or proficiency in their trade (D29), SMART objectives (B15) and holding meetings when necessary (B38) while making sure they were short (B33, B34, B35) and straight to the point to save time (D7). The work distribution was also done to benefit the syndicate goal (C6). Despite not having a choice on being a member (B9, B10, B11), there were choices and also plenty of freedom with regards to the syndicate activities.

These blends of attitudes and practices led to increased productivity from the activities (B36, D22). The syndicate members greeted these lived experiences as life enrichment (A9), enhanced team experiences (A1, B11, B30), learning (A9, B30), conquering over excessive workload(A3, A4, C1, D22), success after struggle(A5, A6, A7, D16, B11, D22), development (D17), positive experiences(A1, B11, B30), an improvement in their professional and personal attributes (B23), a pleasant journey(A11, B14, D5), and shared victory(A6, A16, D22, B11), among others. The result, which was the ALP submission, was expressed as value adding (B36, D22, D26) as well as implementable (A8, A10, B36).

Concepts from the participants' meaning of their syndicates' lived experiences

The following 49 concepts emerged from the analysis as synergistic gains that benefited the participants' collective or shared engagements. They are presented in Table1 below for saving space, and are in alphabetical order.

Table 1. Syndicate synergy table

1.Achievement	13.Democracy	26.Membership dynamism	38.Short meetings
2.Animated/electrified	14.Development	27.Milestones	39.SMART objectives
3.Assistance (give & use)	15.Dialogues	28.Morale boost	40.(Enhanced) staff experiences
4.Brainstorm skills	16.Simplification	29.Motivation	41.Successful after struggle
5.Challenge cracking	17.Encouragement	30.Need	42.Team cohesion
6.Choice evaluation	18.Enrichment	31.Pleasant journey	43.Teamwork
7.Commitment	19.Feedback	32.Positive experiences	44.Time saving
8.Communication skill	20.Implementable product	33.Proficiency	45.Understanding
9.(Collective) decision-making	21.Improvement	34.(Increased) productivity	46.Unselfish or selflessness
10.Conquer excessive workload	22.Initial doubts	35.Responsibility	47.Voluntarism
11.Continuous engagement	23.Members learning	36.Sacrifice	48.Value-adding product
12.Creative thinking	24.(Group) leadership	37.Shared victory	49.Work distribution
	25.Listening		

DISCUSSION

The minimum gains for the syndicate members emerged to be the attributes that relate to attributes or qualities in the table presented in the above section. These are earth-shattering 49 synergy gains by members, or fortification for members who possessed the attributes prior to the syndicate.

Fortification is the upgrading or enhancement on the attribute gained for individual participants who already possessed them (Oxford, 2017).

The individual members seem to have had skills and knowledge related to most of the concepts appearing as benefits for the synergistic relationship. However, all of the members had some limitations in most (if not all!) of them. The members' contributions assisted each other to polish the concepts to enhanced levels. That is, the practice brought them closer to perfection. Though a numeric measure does not exist to calculate the increase in the individual gain on what they already knew, it was confirmed that it was invaluably significant. Moreover, the listed concepts serve only as the minimum gains realised. Hence, the synergist relationship provided gains for the team members that are unlimited in the number of attributes coupled with massive increases in the individual attributes that the members already possessed.

The members in some instances did not realise the great potential they had, as well as the ample capacity they had in matters of research practice. The syndicate opportunity enabled them to realise that they could do much more than they thought. The confidence in these attributes, as well as in general, was amplified in each one of the members.

The individual members seem to have connected without force at inception, without doubting the other members. They discussed what was needed, and individuals volunteered on the tasks that were to be completed. Others were already scribing when the ALP was first introduced, and this served as a strong base from which to function. Without members formally indicating or disclosing their background, it became clear as members interacted where each one was skilled. When the members got closer as 'friends', when each one disclosed their divisions, it was mostly confirming what fellow members had already figured out. This demonstrated the unselfish nature in which members applied their knowledge to their best for everyone to gain and reach the goal.

The exercise gave the participants another perspective during group formation. Usually they were allowing their subordinates to choose fellow members. As work was of importance, it makes sense that members should be chosen for teams according to their strengths. In the way that the syndicate worked in relation to the 20-60-20 rule, there were generally neither the 'negative' nor the 'takeaways'. The syndicate seemed to have operated very close to 0-0-100 pattern.

CONCLUSION

The paper shares/reveals that teams can have benefits despite membership being imposed on the participants, provided they end up accepting the membership in a positive spirit and open mind. The fact that this syndicate or team consisted of diverse participants seems to have been a revelation in terms of the abundance of the generated benefits/gains for the members. Moreover, as the members started to expand their personal attributes by gaining from those they differed widely with, they became closer. Moreover, as skills and knowledge are gained in the direction of those new fields of expertise, people become multi-skilled and multi-talented as new talents and aptitudes are gained or developed in the process. There is an opportunity for further research to determine how, in general, the 20-60-20 pattern can be shifted towards 0-0-100. Otherwise, a study could be undertaken to determine optimum issues regarding the rule. Another research opportunity arises in the identification of determinants of synergy maximisation in teams. Such a study can be categorised into a case of coerced teams or where members chose or volunteer their membership.

Ethical Statement: The study adhered to the ethics of research, and the researchers undertook the following: the respondents, who were the syndicate members, knew of their right to participate in the study or to withdraw from the study at any time. They participated by choice or voluntarily, and their rights were respected. Confidentiality was attempted by not asking for the respondents' names. They knew about the purpose of the study as an interest to determine the diverse meanings and experiences of the syndicate members. Anonymity in report writing was adhered to. The respondents also had the right not to respond to sensitive and highly personal issues. There was the undertaking that the information derived from the interviews could be used for research purposes and for manuscripts of academic journals, as well as by any practitioner provided that the participants were not indicated by names.

Availability of data

Data is available on request.

REFERENCES:

Annunzio, S. (2001). e-Leadership – Proven techniques for creating an environment of speed and flexibility in the digital economy. Geometry and topology in physical models co-financed by the EU European Regional Development Fund, Operational Program Economic Innovative Economy 2007 – 2013.

Bhattacherjee, A. (2012). *Social science research: principles, methods, and practices*(2nd ed). University of South Florida: Global Text Project.

Corning, P.A. (2005). *Holistic Darwinism: synergy, cybernetics and the bioeconomics of evolution.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fusch, P.I., & Ness, L.R. (2015). Are we there yet? Data saturation in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*, 20(9),1408-1416.

Forsyth, D. (2014). *Group dynamics* (6th ed.). Belmont, California: Wadsworth Engage Learning.

Gubrium, J.F., & Hostein, J.A. (2000). Analyzing interpretive practice. In Denzin, N.Y. & Lincoln, Y. (Eds.).*Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 487-508). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Haslam, S.A., & McGarty, C. (2003). *Research methods and statistics in psychology (*SAGE Foundations of Psychology Series). London: SAGE Publications.

Hergenhahn, B. R. (2005). *An introduction to the history of psychology* (5th ed.). Australia: Thomson/Wadsworth.

Hicks, Mi. (2004). *Problem solving and decision making: hard, soft and creative approaches*. Cengage Learning. London: Thomson.

Jaworski, P., & Pitera, M. (2016). The 20-60-20 rule. *Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems –,* 21 (4), 1149-1166.

Kerzner, H. (2013). *Project management: A systems approach to planning, scheduling, and controlling* (11th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Landes, D.A., & Cruz-Pierre, A. (2013). *Exploring the work of Edward S. Casey: giving voice to place, memory, and imagination*, Bloomsbury Studies in American Philosophy.

Laura-Melinda, S. (2011). *The necessity to exploit the economic network's synergistic potential*. Saarbrücken, Germany: LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing.

Manges, K., Scott-Cawiezell, J., & Ward, M.M. (2017). Maximizing team performance: the critical role of the nurse leader. *Nursing Forum*, 52 (1), 21-29.

Oxford. (2017). Oxford living dictionary. Oxford University Press.

Osborn, A.F. (1963). *Applied imagination: principles and procedures of creative problem solving* (3rd ed.).New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Parker, J., & Begnaud, L. (2004). *Developing creative leadership*. Portsmouth, NH: Teacher Ideas Press.

Reber, A.S., & Reber, S. (2001). The Penguin dictionary of Psychology. London: Penguin Books.

Trott, P., Hartmann, D., van der Duin, P., Scholten, V., & Ortt, R. (2016). *Managing technology entrepreneurship and innovation*. Oxon: Routledge.

Tuckman, B. (2001). Developmental sequence in small groups. *Group Facilitation: A Research and Applications Journal*, 63(6), 71-72.