Introduction

Why important?

- see (Leavitt, 1977 #5642) about why should take groups seriously
  - why groups important
    - groups have not been taken seriously
    - often, groups are artificially added to individualistic culture
    - 1) Small groups seem to be good for people;
    - 2) Groups seem to be good problem finding tools;
    - 3) They often make better decisions than individuals;
    - 4) Great tools for implementation because they get buy-in from their members and then act as a group;
    - 5) They self-police their groups;
    - 6) Small groups may be able to effectively fend of the isolation felt in large organizations;
    - 7) Even if not planned, groups will exist within organizations, therefore you might as well formalize them.

Definition

- Defining a group has been troublesome.
  - must exclude some sets of people (who belong to nongroups) from further analysis, despite their potential behavior for influencing and understanding groups.
  - A better approach is "groupiness" or social integration (Moreland, 1987).
    - As social integration rises, people feel, think, and act more like group members. Many researchers (Durkheim 1938/1966; LeBon 1895/1960; McDougall, 1920) observed how people act differently when together;
    - groups possess "emergent qualities" that cannot be fully understood by studying members.
- Definition
  - Example definition
    - +(Levine, 1998 #319)
      - "several people who interact on a regular basis, have affective ties with one, share a common frame of reference, and are behaviorally interdependent"
    - formal
      - Formal groups in organizations are known as work groups
      - +(Hackman, 1987 #224)
        - 1. intact social systems complete with boundaries and differentiated roles among members,
        - 2. having one or more tasks to perform, resulting in discernible and potentially measurable group products;
        - 3. operating within an organizational context.
      - Too restrictive?
        - excludes many sets of individuals commonly referred to as groups: social groups, reference groups, freestanding groups
        - but if more general, lack of agreement of boundaries and characteristics
        - For instance, "affective" in "+(Levine, 1998 #319) is not necessary in an org. context

Historical

- • first significant research on groups is found around WWII:
  - o group norms: (Sherif, 1937 #4616)
  - o Bennington College: (Newcomb, 1943 #4610)
  - o leadership styles and groups: (Lewin, 1939 #4617)
  - o neighborhood youth gangs: "(Whyte, 1943 [1981] #568)
- 1950's
  - The group research momentum continued into the 1950s with research on group behavior : +(Festinger, 1954 #2643), (Thibaut, 1959 #4621)
  - conformity : (Asch, 1951 #25), (Schachter, 1959 #4619)
- Balance Theory (Not so important)
  - (Heider, 1958 #2849) – Basic theory
  - (Newcomb, 1961 #5661) common attitudes as the basis for group formation
- Exchange Theory (Homans, 1950 #2883)
  - outputs of group effort:
    - Tasks are accomplished,
    - Intrinsic satisfactions are received
    - Personal growth is experienced
  - Variables
    - Activities - the things people do e.g. running, sitting, talking, calculating
    - Sentiments - the positive and negative feelings groups have for each other
    - Required behaviour - the activities, interactions and sentiments that are defined by the group's formal leaders and assigned to members as their specified roles
    - Emergent behaviour - behaviour which occurs which is additional to what is required.
  - Thibaut and Kelly (1959) >>
    - Explicit costs and rewards from group membership as the basis of group formation
- Group Dynamics
  - Lewin
    - field theory B=f(P, E)
      - (Lewin, 1951 #4618)
    - Influenced by Gestalt
    - Leadership style: authoritarian/Democratic/laissez-faire
      - (Lewin, 1939 #4617)
    - Use of group decision making to induce more robust decision change in consumers
      - +(Lewin, 1952 #323)
      - Pajama factory: +(Coch, 1948 #112)
    - After his death, group dynamics split in three
      - applied T-groups
      - social influence
      - discrepancy-resolution model
  - Non-Lewinian
    - Psychology of affiliation/Schachter
      - If anxious (because of flu shot), want to be with other anxious
      - Influence by birth order !
      - +(Schachter, 1959 #4619)
    - Subtopic
    - Social loafing (see...)
    - Social Facilitation
    - Asch Conformity
    - Sherif Social norm
    - robber's cave (see ...)
    - Milgram compliance and conformity
    - Ingroup-Outgroup
      - (Tajfel, 1970 #3635)
      - People prefer their group, and wand more allocation to it
  - +(Cartwright, 1968 #90)
    - Groups are inevitable and ubiquitous
    - Groups mobilize powerful forces that produce effects of utmost importance to individuals
    - Groups may produce both good and bad consequences
    - A correct understanding of group dynamics permits the possibility that desirable consequences from groups can be deliberately enhanced
  - (Weick, 1979 #553))
    - Exact group size matters till the size of 8 as the dynamics changes with each extra-members leading to the new possibilities of alignments.
- Group research fell off in the late 1950s:
  - no clear reasons
  - to the symbolic of not being mentioned in major social psychological text such as Katz and Kahn +1978 #284).
  - trend since has been toward intergroup relations,
  - intragroup relations moving to other disciplines, such as organizational psychology.

Issues to studying groups

- General issues
  - delimiting the phenomena to "work" group issues vs. general group issues:
  - focusing on group vs. individual level concepts;
  - measuring the constructs at the group level.
  - No general theory guides social psychological research on groups
    - various mid range theories
  - Fashions
    - social exchange theory and social comparison theory had their heyday in the past.
      - see exchange theory
    - Self-categorization theory is used today to explain many phenomena,
    - Sociobiological theories are starting to grow in importance
  - Based mainly on laboratory experiments
    - main disadvantage : questionable external validity
      - most experiments employ groups of strangers, usually undergraduate students, to perform a particular task for a brief period in an artificial environment.
      - Many of the most interesting phenomena that occur in real work groups cannot be captured in these settings
    - Nevertheless, laboratory experiments results might be reasonable proxies for field studies, (somewhat weaker in experimental settings?)
      - "(Mullen, 1994 #373)
  - requires collecting lots of data
    - analysis poses special difficulties: when people interact in groups, their behavior is interdependent, so most usual statistical tools are inadequate to apply.
- Specific to organizational setting ?
  - task coordination and control,
  - productivity and performance,
  - learning and creativity.
- Common to other social settings
  - leadership,
  - majority-minority relations,
  - status and role differentiation,
  - socialization.
- General issue hiding behind specific?
  - "(Edmondson, 1999 #153)
    - psychological safety in work group: is it work specific or not?
- Micro-Macro pb?
  - (Durkheim, 1915 #4099)
  - is there a group mind?

Groups Composition (physical structure)

Composition as a Consequence

- A. The size of natural groups.
  - most contain 2 or 3 members, are few more than 5 or 6
  - People confused by large groups? (James 1951)
- B. The characteristics of members group.
  - Homogeneity
  - C. Entry into and exit from small groups.
    - more likely to form and sustain if homogeneous
  - D. Socialization and resocialization.
  - homophilous preferences +(O'Reilly, 1989 #3306).

Composition as a Cause

- influence the structure, dynamics, or performance of a group
- A. The effects of group size.
  - does smaller mean more easily aligned?
    - conformity lower in larger group "+(Levine, 1998 #319), p422 c1
    - performance of larger is hampered by coordination losses, motivation losses (loafing), beyond diversity effect? "+(Levine, 1998 #319), p442 c1
- B. The demographic characteristics of group members (age, sex, etc.)
  - diversity has a largely negative effect
    - for effect on decision making, see below
  - the composition of a small group as a moderator of psychological phenomena.
    - The opinion composition of work groups shapes the impact of job characteristics on workers' job satisfaction
      - +(O'Reilly, 1989 #3306)
    - +(O'Reilly, 1989 #3306)
  - Research on the behavior of minorities in groups.
    - The sexual composition of work groups also shapes the impact of sex on workers' behavior
      - +(Kanter, 1977 #4751)
    - +(Allmendinger, 1995 #4769)
      - proportion of women degrade motivation and satisfaction
      - negative effects disappear and reverse when reaching 50%
  - but sometimes positive
  - +(Gruenfeld, 1996 #4855)
    - Higher interpersonal knowledge leads to less stress and higher capacity to share information
- B. The abilities/opinions of group members.
  - groups with more capable members perform better
  - Heterogeneity vs. homogeneity
    - depends on : if disjunctive, hetero is better, if conjunctive, homo is better
    - homogeneous tends to create a non linear amplification (Tziner Eden 1985)
    - (Ancona, 1992 #4752)
- C. The personalities of group members.
  - homogeneity of personality increase cohesion
  - homogeneity improves group performance, but compatibility should be taken into account
- Generic Model
  - Resolve the following questions (Levine and Moreland 1994)
    - which characteristics of group members will matter in a given situation?
    - How much impact will each member have on the group?
    - What kind of composition effects will occur?
  - Concepts (Moreland, Levine and Wingert 1994)
    - salience,
    - visibility and

Social Structure

&Status Stratification

Definition
- Concepts (Moreland, Levine and Wingert 1996) — social integration to these issues
- "status is the position of a social entity in a social system on set of relevant dimensions" (Nicholson, 1995 #5664)
- "The status system of a group reflects the distribution of power among its members" *+{Levine, 1998 #319}
  - see Power (macro) ?
  - see Power and Influence (micro)

A. Measures: Verbal and non-verbal behavior of group members.
- higher status more likely to stand erect, maintain eye contact, speak more, are more likely to criticize and to interrupt, and are spoken to more often than others
  - but correlational or causal?

B. How status systems are produced within small groups.
- can develop very quickly, minutes after some groups form
- Recent studies suggest that status seems to be ascribed rather than earned: sex, race and attractiveness might play a role in determining who has higher or lower status (Ridgeway 1991).
- Status as a shared cooperative process, based on shared performance expectations about group members
  - gives preferences to expectations vs. ethological approaches
  - task (performance) better predictor than threat (dominance) — *+{Ridgeway, 1987 #4754}
- status could be distinguished from reputation
  - reputation: perceived past performance
  - status: add an associational dimension
- Demographic effect: minority — negative effect of token — *+{Kanter, 1977 #4751}
- *{Ridgeway, 1987 #4754}

C. The effects of status systems.
- People of higher status are evaluated more positively — People of low status have difficulty to challenge the system
- status as an alternative to economic/rational market system — *+{Podolny, 1993 #3376}
- organizations have irrational recruitment and demographic division of labor — *+{Bielby, 1986 #4794}
- Minority get paid less individually, and position marked by minority are also discounted — *+{Baron, 1990 #4782}
- minority status have difficulty to convert human capital and positional advantage — *+{Ibarra, 1992 #4882}
- minority need a different network, which would reinforce their org identy, to progress — *+{Burt, 1992 #79}

critique
- overly functional, does not assume that status develop for domination (see *{Eagly, 1992 #4473})

see "Stratification and Mobility within Organizations" papers in Mortensen/GSB/Intra

&Roles

Definitions
- "Roles are shared expectations about how a particular person in a group ought to behave" *+{Levine, 1998 #319}
- "roles are standardized patterns of behavior required of all persons playing a part in a given functional relationship, regardless of the personal wish or interpersonal obligations irrelevant to the functional relationship" *+{Katz, 1978 #284}, p. 43
- members tend to play specific roles in group interaction.

A. formal and informal roles on groups.
- Roles in organizations develop originally from task requirements.
- Very little is known about the process of role development in informal groups
- task roles emerge first, and socioemotional roles second (Burke, 1967, 1968)
- roles depend on technology — *{Barley, 1990 #32}

B. Role conflicts.
- Role are rather beneficial to groups, but much research focus on role conflicts — {Merton, 1936 [1957, 1968] #3200}
- Role assignments
- Role strains (difficulty to cope)
- behaviors for enacting one role may be inconsistent with
  - the appropriate behaviors for enacting another role (inter-role conflict)
  - other requirements of the same role (intra-role conflict).
- Role dissensus (how to play the role)
- Role innovation (different way to play the role), to avoid the conflict
- in negotiation, difficult to enact both gatekeeper and representative — *+{Friedman, 1992 #2669}

C. Role transitions
- depend on {Brett 1984, Nicholson 1984}
  - self-confidence of the person playing the role,
  - the level of group consensus about how the role should be played,
  - the importance of the role for the group.
- technology changes can create role changes — *{Barley, 1986 #31}

D. Psychological processes that produce roles within small groups.

D. The impact of role-playing on mental health.

*{Katz, 1978 #285}
- see roles in inter personal (W)
- on the taking of organizational roles
- role expectations are evaluative standards applied to the behavior of any person who occupies a given organizational office or position
- sent-role consists of communications stemming from role expectations and sent by members of the role-set as attempts to influence the focel person
- received role is the focal person's perception of the role-sending so addressed, including the reflexive role expectations that the focal person "sends" to himself or herself
- role behavior is the response of the focal person to the complex of information and influence thus received.
- Role sending and role behavior are ongoing and interdependent cyclical process

Norms

Definitions — see def in influence

A. Allocation norms (laboratory groups) ???

B. How are norms produced within small groups.
- Norms development has generated much research.
- Large research on conformity and deviance — see also Social Influence
- {Sherif, 1937 #4616} — Autokinetic experiments
- Model of emergent norms
  - social construction *{Berger, 1966 #54} — Norms are valid only in the context of a culture which validate and carries it
  - Evolutionary {Campbell, 1969 [1998] #4569} — Norms develop the behavior that aid in survival of group or individual
  - functional {Sherif, 1967 #5301} — norms emerge because they are functional for the group
- Best known model is Feldmans (1984). Bases to group norms development:
  - precedents set over time,
  - carryovers from other situations,
  - explicit statements from others,
  - critical events in group history.
- Group norm emergence does not follow a linear path — *+{Bettenhausen, 1985 #4792} on norms formation in a decision making experiment

Perpetuation of norms
- {Sherif, 1937 #4616}
  - Norms tend to be stable over time.
  - Norm can be Transmitted
  - Uncertainty push individual to seek information out of the group
- culture as substrate of norms — *{Schein, 1985 #459}
- institutionalization of consensus — *{Zucker, 1977 #587}

C. The effects of norms on groups and their members (conformity, deviance and performance).
- performance enhanced when group norms regarding effort, efficiency, quality control etc. are positive (Seashore 1954), but even positive norms cannot guarantee performance
- Normative consensus and cohesion may be important co-factors — {Argote, 1989 #21} *+{O'Reilly, 1989 #3306}

Critique
- perception of norms may be problematic — see *+{Prentice, #5662} about difficulty to perceive alcohol consumption norms on campus

Cohesion

A. Conceptions and measurement of cohesion.
- Difficult to narrow
- We can define cohesiveness as the pressures group members face to remain part of their groups (Baron and Greenberg 1990)
- many angles, many sub-constructs ?
  - Cohesion is studied under many guises, including solidarity, morale, and climate
  - distinguishing cohesion based on feelings of personal attraction among group members from cohesion based on feelings of social attraction (Hogg 1993)

B. How is cohesion produced in small groups?
- see attraction
- *+{Festinger, 1950 #4838} — seminal formulation: cohesiveness results from
  - interpersonal attraction,
  - liking for or commitment to the group task,
  - group prestige or pride.
- Factors
  - The severity of initiation into the group
  - high external threat or competition
    - "Robbers cave's boy camp"
      - *+{Sherif, 1966 #4424}
      - Cohesive group with intergroup conflict
      - Friendships ship to ingroup
      - Overestimation of leaders, and underestimation of followers
      - Intergroup: overestimate own performance
      - Reduction of hostility with through mutual cooperation
      - Mere proximity increase teasing
  - Affiliative tendencies influenced by anxiety and hunger
    - for social comparison, or support? — *+{Schachter, 1959 #4619}

C. The effects of cohesion on a group and its members
- effects on conformity
  - Increase compliance to group norms — *{O'Reilly III, 1985 #4753}
  - helpful when deviance endangers the group — *+{Festinger, 1950 #4838}
  - harmful when innovation is required {Janis, 1971 #267}
- effects on performance
  - rather positive — *{Mullen, 1994 #373}
    - cohesion improves performance
    - stronger if task commitment, rather than personal attraction or group pride
    - stronger effect from performance to cohesiveness (causality directions?)
    - field and lab produce the same results

Critique
- see *{Murnighan, 1991 #4747} with paradox that should not be resolved on: leadership, follower, confrontations

Culture

see social control issues

A. "collective traps" or "collective fences."
- Game theory
- see Social coordination / Commons

G Perf

Conflicts Within Small Groups

Social Dilemmas
- B. Individual and structural solutions to social dilemmas.
- see "Murnighan, J. K. (1994). Game theory and organizational behavior. In B. M. Staw and L. L. Cummings (Eds.), Research in Organizational Behavior, 16: 83-123. Greenwich, Conn. : JAI Press. "
- see social conflicts in {Pruitt, 1998 #4661}

Negotiation
- A. Dyadic bargaining and the effects of third parties on participants behavior.
- B. Bargaining in group settings.

Coalition Formation
- Test of descriptive theories that predict which coalitions will form and how coalition members will divide rewards.

Majority and Minority Influence.
- majority usually wins
  - ✔Conformity to majority
    - {Asch, 1951 #25}
    - see my research on polarization for an even stronger effect
    - Informational: Persuasive Argument
      - {Isenberg, 1986 #264}
      - {Myers, 1976 #375}
    - Normative: Social Comparison — ✔+{Festinger, 1954 #2643}
- but minority may prevail
  - type of decision task
  - status
  - {Moscovici, 1972 #370} — Moscovici – Minority influence: Minority can influence majority if minority disrupts established norm and produces doubt and uncertainty for the majority.
  - Principles {Turner, 1991 #5698}
    - Disruption of norm & uncertainty in the mind of majority
    - Visibility and attention
    - Alternative, coherent point of view
    - Certainty, confidence & commitment
    - Refusal to compromise
  - Hollander - early compliance by minorities positively correlated with the shift of majority towards minority opinion (is Cialdini working here?)
  - >>>{Nemeth, 1986 #4957}
    - adopt a particular behavioral style
      - present a consistent and consensual message,
      - seen as acting out of principle,
      - seen by majority as being ingroup members to some extent.
      - Consistency in particular creates cognitive conflict in the minds of majority.
    - Consistent minorities have a latent, deep-seated influence over majorities that produces a sudden and enduring conversion effect

Self-Identification/ Self-categorization
- ✔{Turner, 1987 #527} — ✔Social influence happens only if...
  - disagreement is perceived
  - source and target both of the same group
  - source position is prototypical of the group norm

Power
- A. Tactics that group members use in attempting to influence one another.
- B. The distribution of power. — ✔see power and dependence

Other Specific approaches
- ✔+{Jehn, 1995 #273}
  - Task type, task interdependence and group norms as factors
  - Task conflict has an inverted U effect
  - Relational conflict is always detrimental
  - beware "causes of performance" as attribution
    - {Staw, 1975 #5757}
    - relational conflict related to bad perf!
    - task conflict related to good perf!
- ✔+{Murnighan, 1991 #4747} — Three paradox that are better unresolved explicitly
  - leadership versus democracy
  - status of the second violinist,
  - confrontation versus compromise

Decision- Making

A. Description of the process of group decision- making. — ✔see majority/minority above
- Information Exchange mechanisms
  - Stasser shared information studies — ✔{Stasser, 1985 #4756}; {Stasser, 1992 #4758}
- Groupthink
  - {Janis, 1971 #267}
  - ✔+{Kramer, 1998 #5644}
    - criticize the evidence
    - most likely power and politics dynamics
- Risky groups and polarization
  - Origin
    - {Stoner, 1961 #499}
    - {Moscovici, 1972 #370}
    - {Cartwright, 1971 #91}
  - Informational: Persuasive Argument
    - {Isenberg, 1986 #264}
    - {Myers, 1976 #375}
  - Normative: Social Comparison — ✔{Isenberg, 1986 #264}
  - Conformity theory: group norm is beyond average — ✔{Hogg, 1990 #4760}

B. The quality of group decision-making.
- Effect of diversity of performance
  - see CTST
  - see conflict above
  - see other effects of diversity on group above in composition
  - ✔{Miller, 1998 #360} — ✔cognitive diversity degrades decision comprehensiveness
  - TMT literature
    - diversity degrades process (integration-communication, which impact performance — ✔+{Smith, 1994 #4997}
    - effect is curvilinear — ✔+{Williams, 1998 #4260}
  - ✔{Gibson, 2003 #200} — ✔diversity should take into account subgroup strengths, which have an inv-U impact on perf
- Is dissent good? — ✔{Nemeth, 1989 #379}
  - Consensus breeds rigidity — ✔{Janis, 1977 #270}
  - Consensus triggers escalation — ✔*{Staw, 1987 #496}
  - Advantages of dissent: promotes independent thinking, more cognitive effort, and stimulates originality — ✔{O'Reilly, 1986 #3305}
  - varied point of view is adaptative
    - {Campbell, 1969 [1998] #4569}
    - ✔{Aldrich, 1999 #4224}
    - ✔+{Hannan, 1989 #5058}
  - result: very ambiguous
    - needs both dissent and uniformity
    - eq. to differentiation and integration — ✔{Lawrence, 1967 #315}

C. Techniques for helping group make better decisions. — ✔see brainstorming (in learning intra?)

Perf

C. Strategies and techniques for helping groups to function more effectively.
- Team Development
- Quality Circles
- Autonomous workgroup
  - emerged in longwall study {Trist, 1951 #524}
  - match social and technological system
- plus classic motivational techniques (see)

Productivity

A. Work groups in organizational settings.
- Objectives? — ✔*{Hackman, 1987 #224}
  - (1) The productive output of the work group should meet or exceed the performance standards of the people who receive and/or review the output:
  - (2) the social processes used in carrying out the work should maintain or enhance the capability of members to work together on subsequent team tasks
  - (3) the group experience should, on balance, satisfy rather than frustrate the personal needs of group members.
- Model? — Empowerment: ✔*{Hackman, 1987 #224}
  - a design around work groups, defined as " intact (if small) social systems whose members have the authority to handle internal processes as they see fit in order to generate a specific group product, service, or decision" {Hackman, 1980 #222}.
  - Effectiveness depends on…
    - (1) the level of effort expended collectively by its members
    - (2) the amount of knowledge and skill members bring to bear on the task
    - (3) the fit to the task of the performance strategies used by the group in dealing with that task.
  - three levers
    - the design of the group (the structure of the task, the composition of the group, and the group norms),
    - the organizational context (the reward, education, and information systems that influence the group, the material resources that are put at the group's disposal),
    - the group synergy.
  - Conditions that support effort:
    - (1) Developing the group task such that it's engaging and motivating (structure of the task) — ✔*{Hackman, 1976 #221}
    - (2) a reward system that provides challenging and specific performance objectives, positive consequences for excellent performance, and objectives and reward at the group, not the individual, level:
    - (3) minimizing coordination and motivation losses (overhead costs, e.g., of coordination) while creating shared commitment to the team and its work, as when individuals value their membership to the group in itself.
  - Critique:
    - process derives from setup
    - action oriented
    - but complex to implement, requires a lot of ex ante information

B. *loafing and facilitation
- many analysts of performance have focused on process losses {Levine, 1998 #319}.
- &Social Loafing
  - People do less work in group than in the presence of others — ✔+{Latane, 1979 #4919}
  - Possible Causes of social loafing:
    - 1) misattributions of other's effort
    - 2) submaximal goal setting - standardized global output to reach, more people less effort
    - 3) lessened contingency between input and outcome (hide in the crowd)
  - Social Impact Theory — "If a person is a target of social forces, increasing the number of other persons diminishes the relative social pressure on each person. If the individual inputs are not identifiable, the person may work less hard." {Latane, 1979 #4919}
  - see Diffusion of responsibility / Bystander apathy in Interpersonal / Exchange
- &Social Facilitation
  - {Triplett, 1897 #111} — ✔People perform better in contact of others (ex: bicycle races)
  - {Zajonc, 1965 #4422} — ✔state of arousal by mere presence of others: better for task, worse for learning
- ✔*{Harkins, 1987 #233}
  - Loafing and Facilitation are not exclusory
  - Loafing: evaluation effect
- Critique — ✔could loafing be culture dependent? (less in collectivist culture) — ✔+{Early, 1989 #2606}

D. Attributions that members make for a group's success or failure.
- people take the praise…
- performance creates identification
- beware: causality could be inverted: performance -> factor — ✔+{March, 1997 #339}

E. Causes and consequences of allocation decisions in groups. — ✔social comparisons

The Ecology of Small Groups

Synthesis

Meta Analysis +{Cohen, 1997 #5643}

- review of the research on teams and groups in organization settings published from January 1990 to April 1996
- The type of team matters for the determinants of effectiveness.
  - e.g., studies of project teams examine external processes and have found that they matter for performance effectiveness. This is not the case for all types of teams.
- The performance and attitudinal benefits from self-directed work teams are superior to those from parallel teams.
- Substantive participation is a superior predictor of outcomes than consultative participation.
- Group cohesiveness is positively related to performance.
- Diversity in demographic variables is related to performance in complex ways. In general, diversity is associated with poor team performance.
- Autonomy is associated with higher performance for work teams, but not for project teams.
- factors associated with success vary on who is rating performance.
  - Team members tend to rate the team's performance high is the team has engaged in healthy internal processes.
  - Managers, tend to rate teams based on external factors, like amount of communication the group has with external agents.

- linkage: Leadership
- linkage: coordination and control

Physical Environment—

- A. crowding.
- B. Groups that work in "exotic" environments (outer space, underground, underwater and combat).
  - Groups who interact in harsh environments tend to have strong leadership, cohesion, and strong conformity pressure (Harrison & Connors, 1984).
- C. Groups that work in factories or offices.
  - Lighting, temperature and, noise also affect performance.
  - Computer-mediated technology tends to weaken communication, equalize groups, weaken power of status systems, reduces inhibition against violating norms. {Straus, 1994 #3953}

Social Environments—

- A. Intergroup relations - the most popular research area (not discussed in details in this article).
- B. Groups that embedded within large organizations.
- C. Groups that share one or more members.
- D. Groups that influenced by people who are not group members.

Temporal environment—

- A. Group development - why and how small groups change overtime.
- B. Group formation and termination.
- C. The effects of time limits or deadlines on work groups.

>>*+{Gersick, 1988 #195}

- Previous Literature: Two traditions with Linear phases approach
  - 1. Group dynamics - based on psychosocial and emotional aspects
  - 2. Group problem solving - based on ability of group members to handle work involving issues such as orientation evaluation and control.
- teams progress through "punctuated equilibrium" through inertia and revolution of behaviour {Eldredge, 1972 #160}
  - inertia in each phase,
  - a midpoint transition at a predictable moment influenced by team members' awareness of time limits.
    - Midpoint itself is not as important a finding that groups use temporal milestones to pace their work.
  - completion (final part of phase 2) similar among groups - attention to outside context and requirements,
- Groups pace themselves toward the deadline, and the midpoint appears to work like an alarm clock, characterized by 5 indicators
  - abandonment of phase 1 agendas,
  - urgency about finishing on time,
  - midpoints of their official calendars,
  - new contact b/t team and organizational context
  - specific new agreement regarding the ultimate direction of the team.
- Main aspects
  - there is a predictable time in groups' life cycles when members are particularly influenceable by communication with outsiders.
    - the design of the group
    - Initial meeting and transition are these two points.
    - transition occurs because of problemistic search (not working) and pacing (deadline approaching) needs;
  - pattern are chosen and established in very early stages of the group work, and persist through long periods of inertia.
    - patterns rely on material established before the group convenes (expectations, the context, repertories of behavioral routines and performance strategies).
    - Implicit frameworks are developed for themes & topics of discussion, interaction patterns, performance strategies, contexts, overall standing on the task.
- Contribution
  - critique group dynamic and group problem solving models because sequential and assumes all start with the same approach;
  - The contrast between this model and traditional models of group development parallel Simon's (1976) contrast between bounded and perfect rationality.
    - Relates to March & Simon (1976) problemistic search and pacing.
    - Innovation is the result of search and that people do not initiate search unelss they believe they have a problem.
- Critique
  - ignores power, politics, and resource dependence issues in groups, interdependence

- Group norm emergence does not follow a linear path
  - +{Bettenhausen, 1985 #4792} on norms formation in a decision making experiment
- Alternative models
  - Group Dynamics Tuckman (1965)
    - Forming
    - storming
    - norming
    - performing.
  - decision-making development (Bales and Strodtbeck 1951)
    - orientation
    - evaluation
    - control

Future directions (P)

- conflict
  - {Jehn, 2003 #5656} Comprehensive review of conflict literature and contingencies categorized into amplifiers, suppressors, ameliorators and exacerbators.
  - relational vs task *+{Jehn, 1995 #273}; +{Jehn, 1999 #4888};
  - conflict as dependent on performance feedback {Peterson, 2003 #403},
  - conflict in virtual teams {Griffith, 2003 #217}
  - conflict and diversity {Polzer, 2002 #5659}
- Diversity
  - Demographic (Review +{Williams, 1998 #4260}) – 40 years of work
  - Cognitive ({Kilduff, 2000 #293}) – interpretive ambiguity and not demographic diversity has positive effect on performance
  - Affective {Barsade, 2000 #5658} – diversity in trait PA inversely related to group performance while group NA not
  - A nice recent piece on the mechanism by which group diversity leads to positive performance outcomes -
    - {Polzer, 2002 #5659} – interpersonal congruence as the moderator of diversity performance relationship.
- distributed teams ({Hinds, 1995 #3952}; {Armstrong, 2002 #3937}; {Walther, 2002 #3940})
- cognitive
  - see Transactive memory
  - Agreement over team composition {Mortensen, 2004 #5125}
- Workgroups different than other human groups – bringing task contingencies into group studies
  - Hackman & has students
  - *+{Gersick, 1988 #195} – timepacing
  - {Wageman, 1995 #5657} – task-interdependence >>
- Direction of theory Development –
  - Classical approach – developing universal theory of small human groups to adding more and more contingencies
- Status recognition by team-members (Anderson & Spataro, forthcoming)
  - Again, Prash had asked a question to Cameron Anderson whether high-performing groups tend to preserve status quo in status hierarchy more than low performing groups. Many members of the audience found merit in that argument.

Conclusion

- contributions
- Debates
  - Should groups be the focal unit for organization (vs indiv)
    - see {Leavitt, 1977 #5642} (discussed above)
    - see brainstorming Stroebe vs. Sutton debate
    - assumption that group phenomena can be explained in terms of individual thoughts and feelings
- Open questions
  - fragmentation of the field
  - lack of research on intragroup processes
  - conflict and performance are studied more than composition, structure, and ecology
  - basic research dominates instead of action research (intergroup relations, jury decision making, team performance)

15. Group Intra

- 18. Power Influence
  - Status related to influence/social start/network
- 19. Leadership
  - Leadership from Groups: three major theoretical threads
    - leader-oriented approaches,
    - transactional and exchange approaches
      - see exchange theory
    - cognitive approaches.

Sources

- To Scan micro
  - Handbook: *+{Levine, 1998 #319}
  - {Barbulescu, 2004 #4604}
  - {Bae, 2001 #4525}
  - OB Classics Otts summaries?
  - OBM Micro articles?
  - Chong articles summaries ?
  - Mortensen articles summaries ?
  - Krollag Notes on key articles
- adapted from Levine, John M. and Moreland Richard L.(1990) - "Progress in small group research"
- modified on the outline of "+{Levine, 1998 #319}, coming from Mortensen
- enriched by SCB memo

Seminal Papers

- Intra
  - *{Harkins, 1987 #233}
  - *+{Gersick, 1988 #195}
  - {Edmondson, 1999 #153}
  - {Janis, 1971 #267}
- Perf
  - *{Hackman, 1987 #224}
  - *{Mullen, 1994 #373}
  - {Nemeth, 1989 #379}