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Organizational Groups: Teams, Mutliteam Systems, Units, Functional Groups, Organizations, Alliances, Industry Groups, Nations
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- Individuals work in teams, in systems of teams, and in organizations
- Social identity is the mechanism through which individuals see themselves as a part of these collectives and contribute to their success
- Three important identity foci: team, MTS, organization
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How Organizational Identity Affects Team Functioning: The Identity Instrumentality Hypothesis
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Research Question:

How does organizational identity affect team functioning?
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Hypothesis 1: The effect of organizational identity on team affect is fully mediated by team identity
Hypothesis 2: Accounting for team identity, organizational identity directly affects (a) cooperative team behavior and (b) team performance.
Study 1: Method

• Primary Study Search
  – Keywords (e.g. identity AND team, group, collective, organization)
  – Multifaceted Approach:
    • Databases (PsycInfo, Business Source Premier, etc.)
    • Reference Lists
    • Unpublished Manuscripts
    • Reverse Citation Search of Seminal Articles

• Database: 132 studies (total N = 28,024)
  – 57 studies: Organizational Identity (total N = 15,030)
  – 110 studies: Team Identity (total N = 21,645)
  – (34 studies link Organizational & Team Identity)
## Analysis: Step 1

- **Artifact Distribution Meta-Analysis** *(Hunter & Schmidt, 2004)*
  - Corrections: Measure Reliability & Sampling Error

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meta-Analysis</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>SD_r</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>SD_p</th>
<th>80%CV</th>
<th>90%CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Team Identity</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8020</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.22/.80</td>
<td>.44/.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Team Affect</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6627</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.04/.55</td>
<td>.21/.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Cooperative Team Behavior</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2559</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.32/.38</td>
<td>.30/.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Team Performance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.01/.59</td>
<td>.15/.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Team Affect</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9473</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.24/.74</td>
<td>.44/.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Cooperative Team Behavior</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8347</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.11/.50</td>
<td>.25/.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Team Performance</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5618</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.10/.52</td>
<td>.26/.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis: Step 2

- Meta-Analytic Path Analysis
  - Examine impact of team and organizational identity on focal constructs
  - Utilized correlations from prior published metas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Identity</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Identity</td>
<td>.51^a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8020)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Affect</td>
<td>.49^a</td>
<td>.29^a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9473)</td>
<td>(6627)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Team Behavior</td>
<td>.30^a</td>
<td>.35^a</td>
<td>.29^b</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8347)</td>
<td>(2559)</td>
<td>(658)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Performance</td>
<td>.31^a</td>
<td>.30^a</td>
<td>.35^c</td>
<td>.30^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5618)</td>
<td>(1079)</td>
<td>(2946)</td>
<td>(1891)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Total N = 2280 (harmonic mean); N for each of the relationships is included in parenthesis under each effect. ^aSource: current study. ^bSource: Lepine et al. (2002). ^cSource: Chiocchio & Essiembre (2009).
Analysis: Step 2

- **Meta-Analytic Path Analysis**
  - Examine impact of team and organizational identity on focal constructs
  - Utilized correlations from prior published metas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Identity</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Identity</td>
<td>.51a(8020)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Affect</td>
<td>.49a(9473)</td>
<td>.29a(6627)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Team Behavior</td>
<td>.30a(8347)</td>
<td>.35a(2559)</td>
<td>.29b(658)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Performance</td>
<td>.31a(5618)</td>
<td>.30a(1079)</td>
<td>.35c(2946)</td>
<td>.30b(1891)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Total N = 2280 (harmonic mean); N for each of the relationships is included in parenthesis under each effect.

Identity Instrumentality

Model Fit

\( \chi^2 (1, 2280) = 6.53, ns; \) CFI = 1.00, RMSEA = .05, SRMR = .01

**p < .001**
H1: Organizational Identity and “Team Instrumental” Behavior

\[ \chi^2 (1, 2280) = 6.53, \text{ ns}; \text{CFI} = 1.00, \text{RMSEA} = .05, \text{SRMR} = .01 \]

\[ *p < .01, **p < .001 \]
H2: Organizational Identity & “Organizationally Instrumental” Behavior

χ² (1, 2280) = 6.53, ns; CFI = 1.00, RMSEA = .05, SRMR = .01

* p < .01, ** p < .001
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## Alternative Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model number</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>( \Delta \chi^2 )</th>
<th>( \Delta df )</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized Model – Mixed Mediation</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>161.41**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. Model 1 – Full Mediation</td>
<td>171.63**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Path removed**

- Organizational Identity → Team Identity
- Team Identity → Team Affect
- Team Affect → Team Performance
- Team Performance → Cooperative Team Behavior
Key Findings
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Key Findings

• Organizational identity affects team functioning – two pathways
• Organizational identity does not guarantee positive team affect if employees do not also identify with the team
• Organizational identity uniquely contributes to performance and cooperative behaviors
  • In short term teams, the consequences of team affect are “buffered” by organizational identity
Short-Term Teams Need Organizational Identity
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Study 2

How Team Identity Affects Multiteam Functioning

with Raquel Asencio
Identity Instrumentality in MTSs
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• Need to consider the primacy of the enduring collective
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• Need to consider the primacy of the enduring collective
  – Organizations endure beyond teams
  – Teams endure beyond MTSs
  – The enduring collective generates cross-level “identity instrumentality” effects
Research Question:

How does team identity affect multiteam functioning?
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Identity Instrumentality Hypothesis
“Primacy of the Enduring Collective”
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Hypothesis 1: The effect of team identity on MTS affect is fully mediated by MTS identity
Hypothesis 2: Accounting for MTS identity, team identity directly affects motivation to contribute to the MTS.
Method

• Focal Teams: 95 Students, 30 Teams (Psychology), 3-4 members
• Teams partnered with Business Teams to form MTSs, 6-8 members
• Duration: 8 weeks

Teams studied the behavioral and attitudinal issues surrounding an ecological problem (Psych), and determined marketplace barriers to the adoption of potential technological solutions (Business).
Measures

Team/MTS Identity (Time 1):

“Select the picture that best describes your relationship with your team/MTS” (Hinds & Mortensen, 2005)
1=very different – 6=very close

Team: Median Rwg = .67, ICC1 = .17
MTS: Median Rwg = .83, ICC1 = .07
Measures

Team/MTS Collective Efficacy (Time 3):

“My team/MTS will be able to successfully overcome challenges in the global innovation project” (Chen et al., 2001)
1=strongly disagree – 5=strongly agree

Team: Alpha = .96, Median Rwg = .85, ICC1 = .20
MTS: Alpha = .98, Median Rwg = .83, ICC1 = .35
Measures

Motivation to work on behalf of the team/MTS (Time 3):

“I am motivated to go above and beyond what is required by the project to help my team”
1=strongly disagree – 5=strongly agree

Team: Alpha = .89, Median Rwg = .85, ICC1 = .31
MTS: Alpha = .89, Median Rwg = .83, ICC1 = .11
Analysis

- Path analysis using lavaan in R
- Maximum Likelihood Estimation
Identity Instrumentality Model

MTS Identity Time 1 → MTS Collective Efficacy Time 3

\[ \beta = .45^{**} \]

MTS Identity Time 1 → Motivation to Work on Behalf of the MTS Time 3

\[ \beta = .37^{**} \]

Team Identity Time 1 → Motivation to Work on Behalf of the Team Time 3

\[ \beta = .23^{+} \]

Team Identity Time 1 → Team Collective Efficacy Time 3

\[ \beta = .57^{***} \]

Team Identity Time 1

\[ r = .62 \]

\[ \chi^2 (3, N = 30) = 2.34, p > .05, CFI = 1, RMSEA = 0, SRMR = .05 \]
Identity Instrumentality Model Fit

\[ \chi^2 (3, N = 30) = 2.34, p > .05, CFI = 1, RMSEA = 0, SRMR = .05 \]
H1: Team Identity & “MTS Instrumental” Behavior

\[
\begin{align*}
\chi^2 (3, N = 30) &= 2.34, \quad p > .05, \quad CFI = 1, \quad RMSEA = 0, \quad SRMR = .05 \\
R^2 &= .21 \\
R^2 &= .29 \\
R^2 &= .33 \\
R^2 &= .26 \\
r &= .62 \\
\beta &= .45^{**} \\
\beta &= .37^{**} \\
\beta &= .23^+ \\
\beta &= .57^{***} \\
\beta &= .51^{***}
\end{align*}
\]
H2: Team Identity & “Team Instrumental” Behavior

MTS Identity Time 1

\[ \beta = .45^{**} \]

\[ \beta = .37^{**} \]

\[ \beta = .23^+ \]

\[ \beta = .57^{***} \]

\[ \beta = .51^{***} \]

Motivation to Work on Behalf of the MTS Time 3

Motivation to Work on Behalf of the Team Time 3

Team Collective Efficacy Time 3

Team Collective Efficacy Time 3

\[ R^2 = .21 \]

\[ R^2 = .29 \]

\[ R^2 = .33 \]

\[ R^2 = .26 \]

\[ \chi^2 (3, N = 30) = 2.34, p > .05, CFI = 1, RMSEA = 0, SRMR = .05 \]
Alternative Full Mediation Model:
Chi-square difference test shows marginal difference between hyp. Model and this one, but the other fit criteria indicate poor fit for this model.

$\chi^2 (4, N = 30) = 5.762, p > .05, \text{CFI} = .99, \text{RMSEA} = .12, \text{SRMR} = .10$

$\Delta \chi^2 = 3.42, \Delta df = 1, p = .06$
Key Findings

• Team identity affects MTS functioning – two pathways
• Team identity does not guarantee positive MTS affect if individuals do not also identify with the MTS
• Team identity uniquely contributes to motivation to work for the MTS
Short-Term MTSs Need Team Identity

Emergency Response
MTSs
Short-Term MTSs Need Team Identity

Emergency Response MTSs

Long-Term MTSs Need MTS Identity

Space Exploration MTSs

Military MTSs
Contributions

• Social identity has many foci
• This work provides a framework for understanding the drivers of cross-level relations between identity and collective functioning
  – Identity instrumentality
  – Primacy of the enduring collective
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• This work provides a framework for understanding the drivers of cross-level relations between identity and collective functioning
  – Identity instrumentality
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Questions, Suggestions, Ideas?

@dechurch
dechurch@gatech.edu