NASA has a goal of sending humans to an asteroid by 2025 and to Mars by 2030. For the Mars mission a crew of six astronauts will train for years and travel for more than a year and a half roundtrip in a cramped space hurtling toward the red planet, logging about 32 months together. Communications transmissions from NASA on Earth will take 20 minutes to travel to the Mars station and replies will take another 20 minutes to travel home. NASA researchers are studying the factors that will allow the team to be effective under these highly challenging conditions. With training environments and qualified test subjects limited, NASA teamed up with engineers to create an unobtrusive, wearable sensor that measures team interactions. By capturing the physical, physiological and behavioral experiences and interactions of the space team, dynamic data from the team can be quantified, studied, and most important, shared with the other members of the space crew who also are wearing the sensors.¹

A key factor that predicts team success on such a mission is team resilience, or the ability to bounce back from problems and challenges with energy, effectiveness, and positive action. The resilient employee is one who can take action and stay focused when things get tough; they can handle uncertainty and react in a positive way to change.² Most of us will not travel to Mars with a team and depend on our teammates for our very lives, yet we deeply care about our teams, we make work–family sacrifices, and our teams define who we are. This chapter focuses on cohesion, trust, and team development. These dynamics form the personality of a team. We first examine the factors that lead people to feel that they are part of a team, then we examine team cohesion and trust.


TEAM IDENTITY

Just because senior management decides to create a team, it does not mean that the team members feel like a team. When members don’t feel like a team, they don’t act like a team.

GROUP ENTITATIVITY

Group entitativity refers to the degree to which people perceive themselves (and others) to be a unified, single team or collective. The greater the level of entitativity, the more people feel that the group fills their needs, and the more identification people have with their group. When people identify with their team, they think and behave in terms of “we” instead of “I.” When people think about their team, they assume that they should act in accordance with the principles of the team. When group members agree about which principle is most fundamental to them, their perceived entitativity is greater than when they do not agree about that principle, regardless of how many other principles they might agree about. In the face of a group transgression, outsiders recommend more severe punishments for high-entitativity groups than for low-entitativity groups.

GROUP IDENTITY

Group identity is the extent to which people feel their group membership is an important part of who they are. Membership in teams provides people with a sense of belonging. People with a greater sense of group identity judge their own group to have higher status. In addition, people who have been rejected from groups judge their own groups to be more meaningful and cohesive. People who are strongly identified with their groups feel particularly stressed when their attitudes differ from those of their group, and they avoid attempting to change the behavior of their group. People are

more likely to identify strongly with their groups if they feel uncertain and value their group. When people feel uncertain about themselves, they are more likely to identify with radical groups. Teams are most effective when members have high team identification coupled with a high learning orientation.

**IDENTITY FUSION**

Identity fusion refers to a blurring of the self–other barrier in a group, and group membership is intensely personal. When group members’ personal identities become fused with their social identities, their sense of self becomes nearly indistinct from their view of themselves as a group member. Fused people are more likely to endorse extreme behaviors on behalf of their group, and they are more willing to fight or die for their groups than a nonfused person, especially when their personal or social identities are activated.

**COMMON IDENTITY AND COMMON BOND GROUPS**

The attachment people feel for their groups is rooted in one of two bonds: bonds based on the group as a whole (common identity) and bonds felt for particular group members (common bond). For example, in an investigation of selective and nonselective university eating clubs, the people in common–identity groups were more attached to the group than to any particular member of the group, whereas people in common-bond groups were attached to particular members and to the group itself.

**RELATIONAL AND COLLECTIVE IDENTITY**

Relational identity is based on important relationships to particular people; collective identity is based on group memberships. In teams with low collective identification, diversity in expertise is negatively related to team learning and performance; however, in teams with high collective identification, diversity in expertise promotes team learning and performance.
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Men and women differ in terms of their attachment styles, with women’s attachments being primarily relational (based on one-on-one relationships) and men’s attachments being strongly collective (based on team and group memberships) as well as a relational\(^{20}\) (see Exhibit 4-1). Attachment style and strength predicts how important teams are for employees.\(^{21}\)

**Self-verification vs. Group-verification**

Once a person has formed a particular identity, experiences might either reinforce or fail to reinforce that identity. **Self-verification** is the process by which a person seeks confirmation of his or her personal self-views. For example, people who are sensitive might want others to see them as caring. Indeed, people prefer to interact with people who verify their in-group identities more than people who enhance their identities.\(^{22}\)

Sometimes people are threatened, such as when they are a member of a stigmatized group. However, by affirming either themselves or their group, they can increase their motivation to perform. People who are highly identified with their group are more motivated when they engage in group affirmation; conversely, people who are less identified with their group are motivated by self-affirmation.\(^{23}\)

**Team-member exchange**

**Team-member exchange (TMX)** refers to the quality of reciprocal exchange between coworkers in the workplace.\(^{24}\) TMX affects job performance, commitment to the company, job satisfaction, and turnover.\(^{25}\) TMX relationships influence group identification and organizational citizenship behavior toward coworkers. A study of 236 bank managers and subordinates revealed that team members identify more with their coworkers when they have high TMX quality. In addition, the study found that identification with coworkers was positively related to team members helping coworkers.\(^{26}\) Furthermore, high levels of TMX can help the team neutralize the adverse effects of negative relationships on team cohesion and also team performance.\(^{27}\)

---

\(^{20}\)Gabriel & Gardner, “Are there ‘his’ and ‘hers’ types of interdependence?”


Part 1: Using the scale below, indicate the extent to which you agree with each statement. In the space next to each statement, please write the number that best indicates how you feel about the statement.

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. My close relationships are an important reflection of who I am.  
2. I usually feel a strong sense of pride when someone close to me has an important accomplishment.  
3. When I think of myself, I often think of my close friends or family as well.  
4. My sense of pride comes from knowing I have close friends.  
5. My close relationships are important to my sense of what kind of person I am.

Part 2: We are all members of different groups, some of which we choose (such as sports teams and community groups) and some of which we do not (such as racial and ethnic groups). Consider your various group memberships and respond to the following statements, using the scale below.

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. When I am in a group, it often feels to me like that group is an important part of who I am.  
2. When I join a group, I usually develop a strong sense of identification with that group.  
3. I think one of the most important parts of who I am can be captured by looking at groups I belong to and understanding who they are.  
4. In general, groups I belong to are an important part of my self-image.  
5. If a person insults a group I belong to, I feel personally insulted myself.

Exhibit 4-1 Relational and Collective Attachment Styles

**GROUP-SERVING ATTRIBUTIONS**

When a person’s identity is fused with that of a group, experiences and outcomes that affect the group also affect the team member. **Group-serving judgments** offer a self-protective function for the team member by enhancing the ego. For example, in a study of 81 simulated top management teams, superior firm performance was attributed to excellent teamwork, whereas inferior firm performance was attributed to external factors. The more cohesive the teams were, the more likely they were to make internal attributions, regardless of firm performance. When people make positive self-affirmations, they are less likely to show a group-serving judgment. Another form of group-serving attributions is **retroactive pessimism**, which occurs when people lower their evaluations of a group’s chances for success after a failed competition. Indeed, when supporters of two college basketball teams evaluated the chances for victory for each team, the most avid supporters of the losing team were the most likely to engage in retroactive pessimism.

**GROUP POTENCY AND COLLECTIVE EFFICACY**

**Group potency** is “the collective belief of group members that the group can be effective.” Similarly, **team efficacy** or **collective efficacy** refers to an individual’s belief that a team can perform successfully.

**TEAM EFFICACY AND PERFORMANCE**

The results of a meta-analysis of 6,128 groups revealed that groups with higher collective efficacy performed better than groups with lower collective efficacy. However, subsequent research indicates that the performance benefits of team efficacy are not linear, meaning excessive amounts of efficacy are not beneficial to the team and that goal monitoring behavior is important. Group potency might be a more important predictor of group performance than actual ability. In one investigation, 143 officer cadets working in 51 groups participated in a team simulation. The groups’ performance was measured and the study found that
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group potency predicted group performance over and above actual ability.\textsuperscript{36} Similarly, in an investigation of 648 military officers working in 50 self-managed teams over a 5-week period, team performance was assessed via two objective criteria (mental task performance and physical task performance) and one subjective criterion (commander team performance ratings).\textsuperscript{37} This study found that group potency had more predictive power in explaining team performance than did group cohesion. Thus, thinking “we can” is often more important than actual ability.

Groups with a strong sense of collective efficacy set more challenging goals, persist in the face of difficulty, and are more likely to succeed than groups with lower self-efficacy. Group efficacy leads to increased group identification.\textsuperscript{38} Moreover, as members spend time together, they develop more homogeneous (similar) perceptions of their efficacy.\textsuperscript{39} However, it is important for teams to not have an inflated sense of efficacy. When groups are confident at the beginning of their task, they are less likely to engage in process conflict, a form of conflict that might ward off groupthink.\textsuperscript{40}

People can hold positive or negative beliefs about groups. The beliefs about groups (BAG) scale (Exhibit 4-2) identifies four factors that collectively form a person’s beliefs about groups: group preference, positive performance beliefs, negative performance beliefs, and effort beliefs.\textsuperscript{41}

**GROUP MOOD AND EMOTION**

**Group emotion** is a group’s affective state that arises from the combination of its bottom–up components (e.g., the moods of particular team members) and its top–down components (e.g., the overall mood of the company).\textsuperscript{42} Team members bring their individual-level emotional experiences, such as their chronic moods, emotions, and emotional intelligence to the team interaction. This emotional information is communicated to other group members. According to motivational systems theory of group involvement, group interaction sustains positive moods and diminishes negative moods.\textsuperscript{43} Similarly, the organization’s norms and group’s emotional history set the stage for the
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Group Preferences
Preferences for working in a group rather than alone

- I’d rather work alone than work with others. (R)
- I’m more comfortable working by myself rather than as part of a group. (R)
- I generally prefer to work toward group goals rather than individual goals.
- I prefer group work to individual work.
- Whenever possible, I like to work with others rather than by myself.

Positive Performance Beliefs
Beliefs that groups are generally more effective than individuals

- Groups usually outperform individuals.
- Groups often produce much higher quality work than individuals.
- Generally speaking, groups are highly effective.

Negative Performance Beliefs
Beliefs that group performance outcomes are generally low in quality

- Assigning work to a group is a recipe for disaster. (R)
- Group projects usually fail to match the quality of those done by individuals. (R)
- It would be foolish to expect a group to outperform the same number of individuals working alone. (R)

Effort Beliefs
Degree to which a person believes that other group members can be counted on to work hard in group tasks

- I trust other people to work hard on group tasks.
- I am always reluctant to put my fate in the hands of other group members. (R)
- Most people can be trusted to do their fair share of the work.
- Most people loaf when working on a group task. (R)
- It is naive to think that other group members will live up to their promises. (R)

(R) = reverse scored

Exhibit 4-2 BAG: Beliefs About Groups Scale

Expression and feeling of emotion. For example, following a downsizing or restructuring, the overall mood of the organization or industry might be severely dampened.

Group emotion serves an important role in promoting group survival. The emotions that are felt and displayed in groups coordinate the group’s behaviors, particularly in response to threat or stress. In particular, expressed emotion in groups provides the group with information about the environment (e.g., “a layoff has been announced”). Shared emotions in groups foster group bonds and group loyalty. For example, the happiness a person feels about one’s own group (or collective anger about a rival group) increases the identification that person holds with their group.
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GROUP AFFECT AND PERFORMANCE

Group positive affect positively influences task performance: groups whose members express positive affect perform better than those with negative affect. Shared negative feelings can positively influence task performance when they stem from an exogenous source (outside of the team) or in a one-shot group; but shared negative feelings hinder performance when they stem from an endogenous source (inside the team) and in on-going groups.46

EMOTIONAL CONTAGION

Individual emotions get shared and spread among group members, much like a cold or flu spreads among people who live or work together. There are implicit methods by which this happens, such as emotional contagion, vicarious affect, and behavioral entrainment, as well as conscious, deliberate processes, such as affective influence and affective impression management.47 Group emotion can be reliably recognized by group members and outsiders, both on-site and through video ratings.48

**Emotional contagion** is the process whereby moods and emotions of people around us influence our emotional state. It is the process by which we “catch” other people’s emotions. Because people automatically mimic the facial movement and vocal rhythms of others, the physiological feedback from such movements often leads them to feel the accompanying emotions. The mere manipulation of facial muscles involved in a particular expression (e.g., a smile or frown) stimulates emotional feelings.49 For example, people in conversation converge on a conversational rhythm,50 nonverbal behaviors,51 and facial movements.52

Some people however, are more susceptible to “catching” the emotions of others in their groups. Similarly, some people are better at “spreading” emotions than are others. For example, people who are high in feelings of interrelatedness are good decoders of emotional expressions, and people who score higher on emotional contagion scales
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are more likely to catch the emotions of those around them.\textsuperscript{53} People who categorize themselves as “group members” are more likely to converge toward what they believe is their group’s emotional experience.\textsuperscript{54} When people are explicitly asked about the emotions they experience as members of a particular group, their reported emotions converge toward a profile typical for that group.\textsuperscript{55} Identifying with a group produces convergence for emotions as well as attitudes and behaviors.\textsuperscript{56} The process of emotional contagion implies that group members will converge in their emotional states over time, leading to a homogeneous group composition.\textsuperscript{57} The average affective state of team members is related to a given team member’s affect over time, even after controlling for team performance.\textsuperscript{58} Group leaders, especially those who are high in expressiveness, might be particularly likely to influence the emotional state of the group.\textsuperscript{59}

A group’s overall emotional tone or group affective tone can affect a variety of team behaviors and performance.\textsuperscript{60} For example in a study of sales teams, group affective tone predicted absenteeism (groups with chronically worse moods were absent more often) and customer-directed prosocial behavior (groups with chronically worse moods were less helpful to customers).\textsuperscript{61} Similarly, a field sample of 61 work teams revealed that negative affective tone in teams served a critical link between dysfunctional team behavior and performance when nonverbal negative expressivity was high.\textsuperscript{62} Just as group members influence one another to form an overall affective tone, people can be drawn to groups that have members with similar emotions as their own.\textsuperscript{63} And, to the extent a group displays homogeneity of affect, they are more effective.\textsuperscript{64}

**Behavioral Entrainment**

**Behavioral entrainment** refers to the processes whereby one person’s behavior is adjusted or modified to coordinate or synchronize with another person’s behavior.

\textsuperscript{53}Hatfield, Cacioppo, & Rapson, *Emotional contagion.*
\textsuperscript{59}Barsade & Gibson, “Group emotion.”
\textsuperscript{64}Ibid.
Synchrony often happens with both micro (small) and macro (large) body movements. Usually, the outcome of synchronizing movement is positive affect, which can take the form of liking the other person, satisfaction with the interaction, and greater group rapport.

**EMOTIONAL NONCONFORMITY**

Emotional nonconformity occurs when a group member experiences an emotion in the name of his or her group that is inconsistent with what the collective feels. Emotional nonconformity results in an emotional burden (feeling responsible for carrying the emotion in the name of the group) and emotional transfer (transferring negative feelings for the in-group toward the event itself).

**EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE**

Emotional intelligence is the ability to recognize emotions in ourselves and others and to use emotional knowledge in a productive fashion. Emotional intelligence is positively linked to team performance. For example in one investigation, 139 respondents were administered the Workgroup Emotional Intelligence Profile, a measure of group members’ emotional intelligence when working in teams (see Exhibit 4-3 for the Workgroup Emotional Intelligence Profile). People with high emotional intelligence preferred to seek collaborative solutions when confronted with conflict. Studies of professionals across various organizations and industries reveal that employees with higher emotional intelligence are more effective team players and have higher job performance.

**LEADERSHIP AND GROUP EMOTION**

Leaders’ emotions strongly influence group emotion and performance. Harsh, negative leaders create demoralizing work environments. For example, Didier Lombard, former CEO of France Telecom was placed under criminal investigation for creating a toxic work environment that drove more than 30 employees to take their lives and dozens
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68Hecht, Allen, Klammer, & Kelly, “Group beliefs, ability and performance.”


The questions on the Work Group Emotional Intelligence Profile (WEIP) ask you about your feelings when working in your team. When thinking about your team, please think of your immediate work unit. Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements using a 1–7 scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

**Awareness of Own Emotions (Own Aware)**
1. I can explain the emotions I feel to team members.
2. I can discuss the emotions I feel with other team members.
3. If I feel down, I can tell team members what will make me feel better.
4. I can talk to other members of the team about the emotions I experience.

**Management of Own Emotions (Own Manage)**
5. I respect the opinion of team members, even if I think they are wrong.
6. When I am frustrated with fellow team members, I can overcome my frustration.
7. When deciding on a dispute, I try to see all sides of the disagreement before I come to a conclusion.
8. I give a fair hearing to fellow team members’ ideas.

**Awareness of Others’ Emotions (Other Aware)**
9. I can read fellow team members “true” feelings, even if they try to hide them.
10. I am able to describe accurately the way others in the team are feeling.
11. When I talk to team members I can gauge their true feelings from their body language.
12. I can tell when team members don’t mean what they say.

**Management of Others’ Emotions (Other Manage)**
13. My enthusiasm can be contagious for members of a team.
14. I am able to cheer up team members when they are feeling down.
15. I can get fellow team members to share my keenness for a project.
16. I can provide the “spark” to get fellow team members enthusiastic.

**Exhibit 4-3 Workgroup Emotional Intelligence Profile**


more to attempt suicide in a two-year period. One man stabbed himself during a team meeting and a woman jumped out of a window. Employees were given impossible performance goals and severely chastised when they did not meet their goals.

In addition, leaders’ ability to recognize emotions in their team members determines the effectiveness of their leadership. Emotional aperture is the ability to recognize diverse emotions in a team. The leaders who are the most likely to be effective at transformational leadership are those who can recognize emotions accurately, exude positive emotions, and are agreeable in nature. Empathic leaders have employees with
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73CEO charged with harassment after employee suicides (2012, July 5). *The Week.* theweek.co.uk
fewer complaints and daily goal progress is strongly related to a manager’s emotional aperture.\textsuperscript{76}

**GROUP COHESION**

**Group cohesiveness** refers to emotional attraction among group members, and the ties that bind the group together.\textsuperscript{77}

**COHESION AND TEAM BEHAVIOR**

Members of cohesive teams sit closer together, focus more attention on one another, show signs of mutual affection, display coordinated patterns of behavior, and are more likely to give due credit to their partners. In contrast, those who do not have a close relationship are more likely to take credit for successes and blame others for failure.\textsuperscript{78} Cohesive groups are easier to maintain. Members of cohesive teams are more likely to participate in team activities, stay on the team, convince others to join, and resist attempts to disrupt the team.\textsuperscript{79} Cohesion increases conformity to team norms.\textsuperscript{80} This can be helpful when deviance endangers the team or harmful when innovation is required. Cohesive teams are more likely to serve team, rather than individual interests.\textsuperscript{81}

**COHESION AND PERFORMANCE**

Cohesive teams are more productive with a variety of tasks than are noncohesive groups.\textsuperscript{82} In a study of 81 simulated teams of competing airlines, top management cohesion was associated with superior returns.\textsuperscript{83} Team cohesion and performance are related.


reciprocally; however, the cohesion \( \rightarrow \) performance relationship is significantly greater than the performance \( \rightarrow \) cohesion relationship.\(^8^4\) Moreover, in a longitudinal study of 205 members of 57 teams, the cohesion \( \rightarrow \) performance relationship grew stronger over time; whereas the performance \( \rightarrow \) cohesion relationship remained steady.

**BUILDING COHESION IN GROUPS**

There are many ways to promote cohesion (see Exhibit 4-4).

**BUILD IDENTITY** Simply assembling people into a team is enough to produce some cohesion,\(^8^5\) and the more time people spend together (in a face-to-face fashion), the more cohesive they become.\(^8^6\) When team members think about their identity (i.e., what they stand for) and what they have in common, they become more cohesive.\(^8^7\)

- **Aetna CEO Mark Bertolini** raised wages significantly, improved health benefits, and introduced yoga and mindfulness training to improve retention and work culture. More than a quarter of the company’s 50,000 employees participate in a meditation or yoga class, and employees who do so report a 28 percent reduction in stress levels while gaining an extra 62 minutes of productivity each week. Profits increased and employee turnover was reduced following Bertolini’s first year as CEO.
- **At Acuity**, annual turnover for full-time employees is less than 2 percent. Employees are offered limitless tuition reimbursements, no cap on paid sick days, and a 401(k) plan with a 10 percent company contribution. But it’s more than great benefits that fosters cohesion at the Wisconsin insurance company: employees have a say in the strategic planning of the company. Quarterly town hall meetings keep employees informed, and a “lunch with an officer” program matches every employee with an executive for a face-to-face meeting. On one occasion, forty employees dressed as zombies and filmed a YouTube video on work time, called *Acuity Zombie Apocalypse* in which they explained why they love their jobs.
- **Boston Consulting Group** employees can take a social impact leave of absence for 3 to 12 months. Past employees worked for the World Food Programme, the Clinton Health Access Initiative, the Gates Foundation, and the Ethiopian Agricultural Agency.

---


\(^{8^7}\)Prentice, Miller, & Lightdale, “Asymmetries in attachments to groups and to their members.”
PHYSICAL PROXIMITY Physical proximity and real or perceived similarity strengthen team cohesion.88

PERSON–TEAM FIT Teams in which members share perceptions of supplementary and complementary fit are more cohesive and perform better than teams with lower perceived fit.89

CHALLENGE OR HARDSHIP External pressure and rewards for team performance also increase team cohesion.90 Sharing painful experiences promotes bonding and trust among team members.91 When teams operate in a low supervisor-focused interpersonal justice climate (characterized by low dignity and respect from superiors), they develop more cohesion.92

FEAR OF SOCIAL EXCLUSION

Some members believe that they are at risk of exclusion from their group. Members who fear exclusion seek to improve their inclusionary status by engaging in unethical behaviors that benefit the group. A study of employee workgroups revealed that perceived risk of exclusion leads to pro-group, unethical behaviors when employees had a high need for inclusion.93

GROUP TRUST

Among the characteristics of “ideal members” of teams and relationships is trustworthiness, which is the most important attribute for all interdependent relationships.94

TRUST VS. RESPECT

Trust and respect are both important for teams, but they are not the same thing. Respect is the level of esteem a person has for another, whereas trust is the willingness of a
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person to rely on another person in the absence of monitoring (see Exhibit 4-5). Teams high in both trust and respect are desirable, as team members begin with the belief that their fellow teammates have something valuable to add to the team. Teams high in respect but low in trust might appear as collections of individualists, afraid of exposing their vulnerabilities for fear they might be exploited. Conversely, teams high in trust but low in respect are safe but ineffective, such that members don’t see much value in the contributions of their teammates, even if they are well intentioned. In a simulation study of top management teams, higher respect increased task conflict and decreased relationship conflict. Trust decreased process conflict.

Trust & Monitoring

Trust leads to higher performance in teams, but a high level of trust among team members can make members of self-managing work teams reluctant to monitor one another. In a study of 71 self-managing teams, when low monitoring was combined with

Exhibit 4-5 Trust and Respect in Teams


Note: (R) Reverse-scaled item.
high individual autonomy, team performance suffered.\textsuperscript{99} Autonomy, in a team context, is defined as the amount of freedom and discretion that a person has in carrying out assigned tasks.\textsuperscript{100} It was only when high trust in the team was combined with low individual autonomy that performance improved. The deleterious combination was high trust combined with high individual autonomy.

In addition to considering the level of trust that exists within a team, it is equally important to consider the dispersion of trust and monitoring that exists within teams. Trust asymmetry and monitoring dissensus both predict team performance.\textsuperscript{101} Trust asymmetry is the overall degree of asymmetry that exists across all dyads that comprise the team. Monitoring dissensus refers to the extent to which team members hold diverging perceptions about the level of monitoring that occurs within the team.

**Trust Congruence**

Trust congruence refers to the degree to which the leader’s trust in their group is matched by the group’s trust in the leader. Higher levels of trust congruence enhance motivation and improve team performance.\textsuperscript{102}

**Propensity to Trust**

When people have differing levels of trust in their group, this diversity increases frustration, resulting in a downward trust spiral. An investigation of MBA student groups at three time periods over four months revealed that diversity in propensity to trust triggered a downward trust spiral, resulting in poor performance.\textsuperscript{103}

**Types of Trust**

There are many different types of trust in teams and, for that matter, in any human relationship. We consider five: incentive-based trust, familiarity-based trust, similarity-based trust, social network trust, and implicit trust.

**Incentive-Based Trust**

Incentive-based or calculated trust involves designing incentives to minimize breaches of trust. When an arrangement, such as a contract, is made on favorable terms for the other party, it is easier to trust that they will fulfill their end of the deal. Companies often pay bonuses in fact, to ensure just this kind of outcome.

**Trust Based on Familiarity**

As people become more familiar with one another, they are more likely to trust one another. For example, distrust of new members places extra

\textsuperscript{99}Langfred, “Too much of a good thing?”


burdens on full members, who must work harder to make sure that the team’s expectations are clear and that new members’ behaviors are monitored.104

**TRUST BASED ON SIMILARITY** Oftentimes, trust can develop based on commonalities, such as being alumni of the same school, belonging to the same religious institution, or having children who play on the same Little League team. People who are similar to one another in beliefs, attitudes, and interests tend to like one another more.

**TRUST BASED ON SOCIAL NETWORKS** Trusting relationships in organizations often are based upon social networks. **Social embeddedness** refers to the idea that transactions and opportunities take place as a result of social relationships that exist between organizational actors.105 This is conducive to organizational teamwork in that trust and shared norms of reciprocal compliance have beneficial governance properties for the people involved. In short, embedding commercial exchange in social attachments creates a basis for trust that, if accepted and returned, crystallizes through reciprocal co-investment and self-enforcement for use in future transactions. Trust based on social networks offers several advantages.106 **Embedded ties** reduce the time needed to reach and enforce agreements. Second, the expectations and trust associated with embedded ties increases risk taking and coinvestments in advanced technology. Third, the transfer of proprietary information through embedded ties leads to more win–win types of arrangements. Finally, embedded ties promote cooperation, even when groups will not work together very long.

**IMPLICIT TRUST** People might not be consciously aware of the cues that lead them to trust others.

**Mood** People in a positive mood tend to trust others more when they are exposed to cues that promote trust, but distrust when cues promote distrust.107

**Status** People with high status trust others more primarily because they believe others have positive intentions.108

**Mere Exposure** The more we see someone, the more we like them.109 This even applies to people that we initially do not like. However, most people do not realize that their
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106 Ibid.


liking for people is driven by how often they see them. **Mere belonging** refers to having a minimal social connection to another person, such as a shared birthday.110

**Mirroring**  People involved in a face-to-face interaction tend to mirror one another in posture, facial expression, tone of voice, and mannerisms. Mirroring helps people to develop rapport.111 On the surface, it might seem that mimicking others would be extremely annoying—almost like a form of mockery. However, the type of mimicry that is involved in everyday social encounters is quite subtle. When two people are mimicking each other, their movements are like a choreographed dance; their behavior becomes synchronized. To the extent that our behaviors are synchronized with those of others, we feel more rapport, and this increases our trust in them.

**Flattery**  We like people who appreciate us and admire us. Even if people suspect that the flatterer has ulterior motives, this still can increase liking and trust under some conditions.112

**Face-to-Face Contact**  We are more likely to trust other people in a face-to-face encounter than when communicating via another medium, such as phone or email. Perhaps this is why people often choose to travel thousands of miles for a face-to-face meeting when it would be more efficient to communicate via phone, email, or videoconference.

**Pupil Dilation**  People trust others with dilating pupils and withhold trust from others with constricting pupils; moreover, people’s own pupils mimic changes in their partners’ pupils.113

**Repairing Broken Trust**

Repairing trust is more difficult with groups than with individuals. Both groups and individuals are less trusting when the perpetrator denied wrongdoing and more trusting when the other party apologized for a competence-based violation or an integrity-based violation.114

**Psychological Safety**

People in teams size up how “safe” they feel bringing up certain subjects and seeking assistance from the team.115 **Psychological safety (PS)** reflects the extent to which people feel they can raise issues and questions without fear of being rebuffed.

Psychological safety is important in teams that need to communicate knowledge about new technological procedures to one another and learn from one another. Team members in one hospital intensive care unit were asked three questions: (1) How comfortable do you feel checking with others if you have a question about the right way to do something? (2) How much do people in your unit value others’ unique skills and talents? (3) To what extent can people bring up problems and tough issues? When combined, these questions were used to create a measure of psychological safety. Team members who expressed greater psychological safety were more likely to engage in learning about how to use new technological procedures, which in turn predicted the success of implementation in the neonatal intensive care units.

**PS MICROCLIMATES** Within a given team, distinct PS microclimates might exist that are vitally important for team behavior, yet not readily apparent. The mPSi scale measures four key metrics associated with PS microclimate: team PS density, member-only PS density, subteam PS density, and leader PS centrality. Team PS density refers to the total number of existing PS ties in the team network divided by the total number of possible ties in the network. Member-only PS density is the number of existing PS ties in the member-only network divided by the total number of possible ties. Subteam PS density is the total number of existing PS ties in the subteam network divided by the total number of possible ties. Subteams with greater density of PS ties are characterized by authentic interactions. Leader PS centrality is the proportion of existing incoming PS ties that the leader has out of all possible incoming ties.

**FOUR DIFFERENT PS MICROCLIMATES** Consider four examples of PS microclimates: irreverent clique teams, potential mutiny teams, controlled conflict teams, and competitive advisory teams. Irreverent clique teams are characterized by low safety and high conflict among the leader and subteams. Potential mutiny teams are characterized by restricted communication and risk taking because of the leader’s low PS position in the team; subteam work is facilitated by higher member-to-member PS. Controlled conflict teams are characterized by member-to-member PS tension; intact teamwork is facilitated by the highly central leader’s PS brokerage influence. Competitive advisory teams are characterized by a highly central leader who can potentially increase PS among members.

**GROUP SOCIALIZATION & TURNOVER**

Teams are not permanent entities. In fact, the average lifespan of a team is approximately 24 months.
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**Part 1 • Building the Team**

**GROUP SOCIALIZATION**

**Group socialization** is the process of how people enter and then (at some point) leave teams. The process is disruptive, yet it need not be traumatic or ill advised. When people begin to work together as a team, they begin a process of socialization, such that members of the team mutually shape each other’s behavior. More often, teams might undergo changes in membership such that some members might leave and new ones might enter. The process of socialization is essential for team members to be able to work together and coordinate their efforts.

Most people think of socialization as a one-way process, wherein the team socializes the individual member—usually a newcomer—in the norms and roles of the team. However as any leader can attest, the introduction of a new team member is a process of joint socialization. Facilitating newcomer effectiveness in teams is particularly important in high-technology industries into which knowledgeable workers transition frequently and there is a high cost of integrating new employees.121 Three key predictors of newcomer performance are: newcomer empowerment, team expectations, and team performance.122 In an investigation of 65 project teams, newcomer performance improved over time, particularly early in socialization.123 Newcomer empowerment and the team’s expectations of the newcomer positively predicted the newcomer’s performance. Moreover, newcomers who were empowered and performed well were less likely to express intentions to leave the team.

**PHASES OF GROUP SOCIALIZATION**

Think about a time when you joined an existing team. Perhaps you joined a study group that had been previously formed, accepted a summer internship with a company that had ongoing teams already in place, or moved to a different unit within your organization. In all of these instances, you went through a process of group socialization.124 Three critical things go on during group socialization that can affect the productivity of teams: evaluation, commitment, and role transition.

**EVALUATION** Teams evaluate individual members, and individual members evaluate teams. In short, the individuals on the team “size each other up.” People conduct a cost-benefit analysis when it comes to evaluating team members. If team members receive (or expect to receive) relatively high returns from team membership while enduring few costs, they probably like their team. Teams, too, evaluate a member positively who makes many contributions to the collective while exacting few costs.125 People with either little experience or
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negative experiences in teams often avoid working in groups.126 In a study of new, full, and marginal team members, people supported in-group full members who advocated a normative position and derogated full members who espoused a deviant position.127

**COMMITMENT** Commitment is a person’s “enduring adherence” to the team and the team’s adherence to its members.128 Key factors that affect commitment are the alternatives that are available to the individual and the team. For example, if a team has its choice of several highly qualified candidates, its level of commitment to any one candidate is less than if a team does not have as many alternatives.

**ROLE TRANSITION** A person usually moves through a progression of membership in the team, going from nonmember to quasi-member to full member (see Exhibit 4-6). One key to gaining full member status is to be evaluated positively by the team and to gain the team’s commitment. This can often (but not always) be achieved by learning through direct experience with the team and also through observations of others in the team. Indeed, newcomers in teams feel a strong need to obtain information about what is expected of them;129 simultaneously, teams communicate this knowledge through formal and informal indoctrination sessions.130 However, newcomers might not learn crucial information they need to perform their jobs, such as information about the preferences of supervisors or administrative procedures, until they are trusted by their coworkers.131

People who join groups can engage in either self-verification or appraisal effects.132 Self-verification occurs when group members persuade others on the team to see them as they see themselves. In contrast, appraisal occurs when groups persuade members to see
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themselves as the group sees them. Of the two, self-verification is more prevalent than appraisal. When team members encourage their group to see them the way they see themselves, this heightens the feelings of connection to the team, lessens unhealthy relationship conflict, and improves performance on creative tasks. In contrast, when groups beseech individuals to see themselves as the group sees them, performance on computational tasks (e.g., tasks that have a single correct answer) improves.

**INTEGRATING NEW MEMBERS** The following strategies are especially useful for integrating new members into teams:

*Upper management and leaders: Make it clear why the new member is joining the team* Many times, the introduction of a new team member is threatening for individuals, when it does not need not be. The manager should not assume that everyone is fully aware of why the newcomer is joining the team.

*Existing team members: Reduce prototype ambiguity* When the attributes, attitudes, and actions that define the typical group member of a team are not clear, the group suffers from
prototype ambiguity. Group members can reduce prototype ambiguity through social negotiation processes.

**New members: Understand the team’s goals and processes** Existing members often expect newcomers to be anxious, passive, dependent, and conforming. Further, new members who take on those characteristics are more likely to be accepted by old-timers. What newcomers might not realize is that they inevitably pose some threat to the team. This is often because newcomers have a fresh and relatively objective view of the team, which causes them to ask questions or express opinions that are unsettling. New members can take initiative by demonstrating an interest in learning about the team. Remember that the team might be hypersensitive about past failures, therefore, it is often a good idea to deflect defensive reactions by noting the team’s positive qualities. If newcomers are kept out of the information loop, they suffer psychologically; their sense of trust diminishes and they don’t like their team members, particularly when their exclusion seems preventable. Peripheral members also react more negatively when an authority favors a prototypical group member over them because peripheral members are highly insecure about their inclusion in the group.

**Old-timers’ Reactions to Newcomers**

Existing group members (old-timers) are less accepting of “temporary” newcomers than “permanent” newcomers because they expect temporary newcomers to be different from their group. Paradoxically, temporary newcomers share more unique knowledge in groups than permanent newcomers and thus enhance their group’s decision quality. However, temporary newcomers cause teams to experience more conflict and less group identification. When newcomers criticize their workplace, their profession, or the community, they arouse more resistance in old-timers. Newcomers reduce old-timer resistance when newcomers distance themselves from their previous group. Groups with out-group (i.e., diverse) newcomers are less confident about their performance, yet perform better than groups with in-group (homogeneous) newcomers.

---


DEVIANT OPINIONS

When people strongly identify with their group, they evaluate deviants more negatively.\textsuperscript{141} Moreover, when a group member expresses a deviating opinion, angry or happy responses signal rejection or acceptance. The availability of alternative groups determines whether deviants conform to the current group or leave the group after an angry reaction.\textsuperscript{142} Peripheral group members conform more after an angry reaction, but prototypical members do not.

NEWCOMER INNOVATION

Contrary to popular opinion, turnover might benefit a group—through the exit of “old-timers” who lack the skills or motivation to help the group attain its goals and the entry of newcomers who possess needed skills.\textsuperscript{143} Three factors determine the extent to which newcomers can introduce change: (1) their commitment to the team; (2) their belief that they can develop good ideas for solving team problems; and (3) their belief that they will be rewarded. For turnover to have positive effects, it must outweigh the substantial benefits that group members derive from working together.\textsuperscript{144} In one investigation of turnover, teams worked on an air surveillance task for two days.\textsuperscript{145} On both days, specialists monitored changes in plane information (e.g., airspeed and altitude) and transmitted it to the commander, who integrated this information and assigned threat values to the planes. At the beginning of Day 2, there was turnover: in some teams, one of the specialists was replaced with a specialist from another team; in other teams, the commander was replaced with a commander from another team. Teams performed better when newcomers had high rather than low ability; this was particularly pronounced when newcomers had high status (commander) rather than low status (specialist).

In a study of high-tech joint ventures in information technology and manufacturing industries, newcomers were more likely to help the team and perform better when supervisors offered developmental feedback.\textsuperscript{146}

There are several “newcomer” roles: visitors, transfers, replacements, and consultants. Visitors are people who are expected to remain on the team for a short time and not viewed as instrumental to attaining long-term goals. Because they are viewed as lacking in commitment, their ability to change the team is muted. Transfers have recently belonged to a similar team and have expertise. Replacements take the place of former members. Consultants join the team to observe its work practices and suggest improvements.

**Turnover and Reorganizations**

One of the most frequently occurring but daunting challenges for teams is personnel turnover, defined as the entry of new members and/or the exit of old members. Turnover represents a change in team composition that can have profound consequences for team performance because it alters the technical knowledge of the team, as well as the interpersonal dynamics. As might be expected, turnover disrupts group performance, especially when group members are reciprocally interdependent, when the group has low, rather than high, structure; and when the task is complex rather than simple.

The decision to leave a group depends on opportunities that exist outside the group as well as threats that occur in one’s current group. In short, a group member might ask himself or herself, would it be easier to simply leave this group or should I stay with the team but argue about our differences? When people place a high level of esteem in their group, they are more likely to stay with the group and argue about their differences, but when they place a low level of esteem in their group, they are more likely to leave.
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Chapter Capstone

We examined how people develop a group or team identity and the nature of how group and individual identities interact. Members of teams differ in terms of how attached they feel to one another, and these attachment styles can affect the behavior and performance of the team. Teams feel and express emotions, and over time, team members develop similar chronic emotions because of the process of contagion. We’ve focused on how to build cohesion in teams, and examined the types of trust that characterize relationships. Finally, we explored the socialization process by which teams admit newcomers.