

Volume 3

Work and Workers

SAGE Library in Business & Management



REFERENCE

 NORMA SMURFIT LIBRARY
NATIONAL COLLEGE
OF IRELAND



Work and Workers

VOLUME 3

edited by
**Cary L. Cooper and
William H. Starbuck**

Barcode No: 39006010242784
Dewey No : 331 (1111)
Date Input : 18/3/08
Price : 616.45 (as part of
3 vol. set)

Editorial Advisory Board

Ramon Aldag, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Mats Alvesson, Lund University
Timothy Clark, University of Durham
Stewart Clegg, University of Technology, Sydney
Robert C. Ford, University of Central Florida
Raghu Garud, New York University
Gerard P. Hodgkinson, University of Leeds
Raymond Loveridge, Oxford University
Fred Luthans, University of Nebraska, Lincoln
Donald Palmer, University of California, Davis
P. Narayan Pant, INSEAD, Singapore
Flemming Poulfelt, Copenhagen Business School
Jacques Rojot, Université Panthéon-Assas Paris II
Denise M. Rousseau, Carnegie-Mellon University
Paul R. Sparrow, University of Manchester
Anne S. Tsui, Arizona State University
Malcolm Warner, Cambridge University
Mike Wright, University of Nottingham



SAGE Publications
London • Thousand Oaks • New Delhi

Introduction © Linda M. Dunn-Jensen, Cary L. Cooper and William H. Starbuck 2005
Editorial arrangement © Cary L. Cooper and William H. Starbuck 2005

First published 2005

Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of research or private study, or criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, this publication may be reproduced, stored or transmitted in any form, or by any means, only with the prior permission in writing of the publishers, or in the case of reprographic reproduction, in accordance with the terms of licences issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside those terms should be sent to the publishers.

Every effort has been made to trace and acknowledge all the copyright owners of the material reprinted herein. However, if any copyright owners have not been located and contacted at the time of publication, the publishers will be pleased to make the necessary arrangements at the first opportunity.



SAGE Publications Ltd
1 Oliver's Yard
55 City Road
London EC1Y 1SP

SAGE Publications Inc.
2455 Teller Road
Thousand Oaks, California 91320

SAGE Publications India Pvt Ltd
B-42, Panchsheel Enclave
Post Box 4109
New Delhi 110 017

British Library Cataloguing in Publication data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 1-4129-0882-5 (set of three volumes)

Library of Congress Control Number: 2004096672

Production by Deer Park Productions, Tavistock, Devon
Typeset by TW Typesetting, Plymouth, Devon
Printed and bound in Great Britain by TJ International Ltd,
Padstow, Cornwall
Printed on paper from sustainable resources

Contents

VOLUME 3

PART EIGHT PERSONAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL IDENTITY

44. Keeping an Eye on the Mirror: Image and Identity in Organizational Adaptation *Jane E. Dutton and Janet M. Dukerich* 3
45. Organizational Images and Member Identification *Jane E. Dutton, Janet M. Dukerich and Celia V. Harquail* 40
46. Social Identity and Self-Categorization Processes in Organizational Contexts *Michael A. Hogg and Deborah J. Terry* 67
47. Maintaining Masculinity: Men Who Do 'Women's Work' *Ben Lupton* 95
48. The ASPIRe Model: Actualizing Social and Personal Identity Resources to Enhance Organizational Outcomes *S. Alexander Haslam, Rachael A. Egghins and Katherine J. Reynolds* 117

PART NINE TEAMWORK

49. Time and Transition in Work Teams: Toward a New Model of Group Development *Connie J.G. Gersick* 153
50. Relations Between Work Group Characteristics and Effectiveness: Implications for Designing Effective Work Groups *Michael A. Campion, Gina J. Medsker and A. Catherine Higgs* 185
51. Collective Mind in Organizations: Heedful Interrelating on Flight Decks *Karl E. Weick and Karlene H. Roberts* 211
52. Why Differences Make a Difference: A Field Study of Diversity, Conflict, and Performance in Workgroups *Karen A. Jehn, Gregory B. Northcraft and Margaret A. Neale* 236
53. Exploring the Black Box: An Analysis of Work Group Diversity, Conflict, and Performance *Lisa Hope Pelled, Kathleen M. Eisenhardt and Katherine R. Xin* 261
54. Psychological Safety and Learning Behavior in Work Teams *Amy Edmondson* 291

- Alderfer, Clayton P. 1987 "An intergroup perspective on organizational behavior." In J. W. Lorsch (ed.), *Handbook of Organizational Behavior*: 190-222. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Alderfer, Clayton P., and D. L. Brown 1972 "Designing an empathic questionnaire for organizational research." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 56: 456-468.
- Ancona, Deborah G., and David F. Caldwell 1992 "Bridging the boundary: External activity and performance in organizational teams." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37: 634-655.
- Argote, Linda, Deborah Gruenfeld, and Charles Naquin 1999 "Group learning in organizations." In M. E. Turner (ed.), *Groups at Work: Advances in Theory and Research*. New York: Erlbaum (forthcoming).
- Argyris, Chris 1982 *Reasoning, Learning and Action: Individual and Organizational*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Argyris, Chris 1993 *Knowledge for Action: A Guide to Overcoming Barriers to Organizational Change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Argyris, Chris, and Donald Schön 1978 *Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Ashford, Susan J., and Anne S. Tsui 1991 "Self regulation for managerial effectiveness: The role of active feedback seeking." *Academy of Management Journal*, 34: 251-280.
- Bandura, Albert 1982 "Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency." *American Psychologist*, 37: 22-47.
- Baron, Reuben M., and David A. Kenny 1986 "The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic and statistical considerations." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51: 1173-1183.
- Brown, Roger 1990 "Politeness theory: Exemplar and exemplary." In I. Rock (ed.), *The Legacy of Solomon Asch: Essays in Cognition and Social Psychology*: 23-37. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Campbell, D. T., and D. W. Fiske 1959 "Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix." In D. N. Jackson and S. Messick (eds.), *Problems in Human Assessment*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Campion, Michael A., Gina J. Medsker, and A. Catherine Higgs 1993 "Relations between work group characteristics and effectiveness: Implications for designing effective work groups." *Personnel Psychology*, 46: 823-850.
- Cohen, Susan G., and Gerald E. Ledford 1994 "The effectiveness of self-managing teams: A quasi-experiment." *Human Relations*, 47: 13-43.
- Dewey, John 1922 *Human Nature and Conduct*. New York: Holt.
- Dewey, John 1938 *Logic: The Theory of Inquiry*. New York: Holt.
- Dutton, Jane 1993 "The making of organizational opportunities: An interpretive pathway to organizational change." In L. L. Cummings and B. M. Staw (eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 15: 195-226. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

- Edmondson, Amy C. 1996 "Learning from mistakes is easier said than done: Group and organizational influences on the detection and correction of human error." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 32: 5-32.
- Edmondson, Amy C., and Bertrand Moingeon 1998 "From organizational learning to the learning organization." *Management Learning*, 29: 499-517.
- Gibson, Christina B. 1996 "They do what they believe they can: Group-efficacy beliefs and group performance across tasks and cultures." *Academy of Management Journal*, 42: 138-152.
- Goffman, Erving 1955 "On face-work: An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction." *Psychiatry*, 18: 213-231.
- Golembiewski, Robert T., and Mark McConkie 1975 "The centrality of interpersonal trust in group process." In Cary L. Cooper (ed.), *Theories of Group Process*: 131-181. London: Wiley.
- Goodman, Paul, S. Devadas, and T. L. Hughson 1988 "Groups and productivity: Analyzing the effectiveness of self-managing teams." In J. P. Campbell, R. J. Campbell, and Associates (eds.), *Designing Effective Work Groups*: 295-327. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Goodman, Paul, E. Ravlin, and M. Schminke 1987 "Understanding groups in organizations." In L. L. Cummings and B. M. Staw (eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 9: 121-173. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Guzzo, R. A., P. R. Yost, R. J. Campbell, and G. P. Shea 1993 "Potency in groups: Articulating a construct." *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 32: 87-106.
- Hackman, J. Richard 1987 "The design of work teams." In J. Lorsch (ed.), *Handbook of Organizational Behavior*: 315-342. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hackman, J. Richard (ed.) 1990 *Groups that Work (and Those That Don't)*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Henderson, Rebecca H., and Kim B. Clark 1990 "Architectural innovation: The reconfiguration of existing product technology and the failure of existing firms." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 35: 9-30.
- Janis, Irving L. 1982 *Groupthink*, 2d ed. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Kenny, David A., and Lawrence La Voie 1985 "Separating individual and group effects." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48: 339-348.
- Klimoski, Richard, and S. Mohammed 1994 "Team mental model: Construct or metaphor?" *Journal of Management*, 20: 403-437.
- Kolb, David A. 1984 *Experiential Learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kramer, Roderick M. 1999 "Trust and distrust in organizations: Emerging perspectives, enduring questions." *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50: 569-598. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.
- Lee, Fiona 1997 "When the going gets tough, do the tough ask for help? Help seeking and power motivation in organizations." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 72: 336-363.
- Leonard-Barton, Dorothy 1995 *Wellsprings of Knowledge: Building and Sustaining the Sources of Innovation*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Levine, John M., and Richard L. Moreland 1991 "Culture and socialization in work groups." In L. B. Resnick, J. M. Levine, and S. D. Teasley (eds.), *Perspectives on Socially Shared Cognition*: 257-279. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Levitt, Barbara, and James G. March 1988 "Organizational learning." *Annual Review of Sociology*, 14: 319-340. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.
- Lindsley, Dana H., Daniel J. Brass, and James B. Thomas 1995 "Efficacy-performance spirals: A multi-level perspective." *Academy of Management Review*, 20: 645-678.
- MacDuffie, John Paul 1997 "The road to 'root cause': Shop-floor problem-solving at three auto assembly plants." *Management Science*, 43: 479-502.
- Mayer, Roger C., James H. Davis, and F. David Schoorman 1995 "An integrative model of organizational trust." *Academy of Management Review*, 20: 709-734.
- Michael, Donald N. 1976 *On Learning to Plan and Planning to Learn*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Robinson, Sandra L. 1996 "Trust and breach of the psychological contract." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41: 574-599.
- Sanna, Lawrence J., and R. Lance Shotland 1990 "Valence of anticipated evaluation and social facilitation." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 26: 82-92.
- Schein, Edgar H. 1993 "How can organizations learn faster? The challenge of entering the green room." *Sloan Management Review*, 34: 85-92.
- Schein, Edgar H., and Warren Bennis 1965 *Personal and Organizational Change via Group Methods*. New York: Wiley.
- Schön, Donald 1983 *The Reflective Practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.
- Senge, Peter M. 1990 *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. New York: Doubleday.
- Sitkin, Sim B. 1992 "Learning through failure: The strategy of small losses." In L. L. Cummings and B. M. Staw (eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 14: 231-266. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Stasser, Garold, and William Titus 1987 "Effects of information load and percentage of shared information on the dissemination of unshared information during group discussion." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53: 81-93.
- Staw, Barry M., Lance E. Sandelands, and Jane E. Dutton 1981 "Threat-rigidity effects in organizational behavior: A multi-level analysis." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26: 501-524.
- Tyler, Tom R., and E. Allan Lind 1992 "A relational model of authority in groups." In *Advances in Experimental Psychology*, 25: 115-191. New York: Academic Press.
- Wageman, Ruth 1998 "The effects of team design and leader behavior on self-managing teams: A field study." Working paper, School of Business, Columbia University.
- Walsh, James 1995 "Managerial and organizational cognition: Notes from a trip down memory lane." *Organization Science*, 6: 280-321.
- Watkins, Victoria J., and Karen E. Marsick 1993 *Sculpting the Learning Organization: Lessons in the Art of Systemic Change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Appendix: Survey Scales and Item Correlations

Team survey item*	Pearson R correlations			
Supportiveness of organization context	2	3	4	5
1. This team gets all the information it needs to do our work and plan our schedule.	.43	.29	.26	.22
2. It is easy for this team to obtain expert assistance when something comes up that we don't know how to handle.		.26	.30	.24
3. This team is kept in the dark about current developments and future plans that may affect its work.			.26	.29
4. This team lacks access to useful training on the job.				.15
5. Excellent work pays off in this company.				
Task design	2		3	
1. The work that this team does makes a difference for the people who receive or use it.			.23	
2. The work we do on this team itself provides us with plenty of feedback about how well the team is performing.				
3. Those who receive or use this team's output rarely give us feedback about how well our work meets their needs.			.25	
Clear direction	2		3	
1. It is clear what this team is supposed to accomplish.			.41	
2. This team spent time making sure every team member understands the team objectives.				
3. The team has invested plenty of time to clarify our goals.			.65	

Appendix: Continued

Team survey item*	Pearson <i>R</i> correlations					
Team composition	2		3			
1. Most people in this team have the ability to solve the problems that come up in our work.	.26		.34			
2. All members of this team have more than enough training and experience for the kind of work they have to do.			.27			
3. Certain individuals in this team lack the special skills needed for good team work.						
Team efficacy	2		3			
1. Achieving this team's goals is well within our reach.	.37		.43			
2. This team can achieve its task without requiring us to put in unreasonable time or effort.			.28			
3. With focus and effort, this team can do anything we set out to accomplish.						
Team psychological safety*	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. If you make a mistake on this team, it is often held against you.	.36	.38	.49	.41	.34	.43
2. Members of this team are able to bring up problems and tough issues.		.28	.56	.35	.34	.37
3. People on this team sometimes reject others for being different.			.32	.45	.45	.33
4. It is safe to take a risk on this team.				.37	.37	.48
5. It is difficult to ask other members of this team for help.					.42	.41
6. No one on this team would deliberately act in a way that undermines my efforts.						.39
7. Working with members of this team, my unique skills and talents are valued and utilized.						
Team leader coaching†	2		3			
<i>The team leader . . .</i>						
1. . . initiates meetings to discuss the team's progress.			.38 .47			
2. . . is available for consultation on problems.			.70			
3. . . is an ongoing "presence" in this team—someone who is readily available.						
Team learning behavior*	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. We regularly take time to figure out ways to improve our team's work processes.	.23	.28	.35	.41	.30	.23
2. This team tends to handle differences of opinion privately or off-line, rather than addressing them directly as a group.		.26	.31	.27	.29	.22
3. Team members go out and get all the information they possibly can from others — such as customers, or other parts of the organization.			.38	.35	.37	.37
4. This team frequently seeks new information that leads us to make important changes. . . .				.41	.47	.37
5. In this team, someone always makes sure that we stop to reflect on the team's work process.					.47	.25
6. People in this team often speak up to test assumptions about issues under discussion.						.43
7. We invite people from outside the team to present information or have discussions with us.						

Appendix: Continued

Team survey item*	Pearson <i>R</i> correlations					
Team performance*	2	3	4	5		
1. Recently, this team seems to be "slipping" a bit in its level of performance and accomplishments.	.38	.41	.44	.40		
2. Those who receive or use the work this team does often have complaints about our work.		.26	.42	.47		
3. The quality of work provided by this team is improving over time.			.36	.26		
4. Critical quality errors occur frequently in this team.				.51		
5. Others in the company who interact with this team often complain about how it functions.						
Internal motivation*		2	3			
1. My opinion of myself goes up when I do my job well.		.33	.48			
2. I feel bad and unhappy when I discover that I have performed less well than I should have in my job.			.30			
3. I feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when I do my job well.						
Job Involvement*						
1. I live, eat, and breathe my job.						
Observer Survey Items						
Team learning behaviors†	2	3	4	5	6	7
<i>This team . . .</i>						
1. . . asks its internal customers (those who receive or use its work) for feedback on its performance.	.24	.55	.39	.52	.37	.30
2. . . relies on outdated information or ideas. (Reverse scored)		.46	.37	.36	.47	.36
3. . . actively reviews its own progress and performance.			.47	.61	.38	.51
4. . . does its work without stopping to consider all the information team members have. (Reverse scored)				.36	.44	.22
5. . . regularly takes time to figure out ways to improve its work performance.					.49	.44
6. . . ignores feedback from others in the company. (Reverse scored)						.30
7. . . asks for help from others in the company when something comes up that team members don't know how to handle.						
Team performance*		2	3	4		
1. This team meets or exceeds its customers' expectations.		.77	.62	.64		
2. This team does superb work.			.57	.71		
3. Critical quality errors occur frequently in this team's work. (Reverse scored)						.53
4. This team keeps getting better and better.						

*7-point scale from "very inaccurate" to "very accurate."

†5-point scale from "never" to "always."

