

TEAM EMOTIONAL COMPETENCE

Vanessa Urch Druskat

Peter T. Paul College of Business & Economics
University of New Hampshire

Steven B. Wolff

Independent Consultant

Both Vanessa and Steve are members of the Expert Ei World team, focused on Team Emotional Intelligence. They are the authors of the Team Emotional Intelligence Survey used in Ei World's practice.

This paper is in press and being published in the Academy of Management Journal.

November 2014

ABSTRACT

Despite wide recognition that emotion influences team member attention, team process quality, and team effectiveness, little research or theory focuses on effective work team emotion management. We aim to fill this knowledge gap by introducing a theory of team-level emotional competence (EC) defined as: a team culture created through EC norms that shape a productive social and emotional climate by improving a team's ability to anticipate and manage issues that trigger emotion. Our theory advances three central arguments: (1) most team-generated emotions stem from predictable cognitive and affective social motives that naturally emerge in work team environments, (2) teams can satisfy social motives by adopting a set of EC norms that influence behavior, and (3) EC norm adoption shapes a productive social and emotional emergent climate of team psychological safety, team identity, and team efficacy. This climate stimulates cooperative and engaged team processes and team effectiveness that, in turn, increases team-level emotional competence. Implications for theory, research, and practice are discussed.

In documenting the relationship between emotion and team effectiveness for over six decades, scholars have become increasingly aware that emotion in teams can trigger both threats and opportunities. Emotion fuels feedback spirals that can perpetuate, on the one hand, productive interactions, increased motivation, and greater team effectiveness, or, on the other hand, unproductive interactions, decreased motivation, and lower levels of team effectiveness (Bales, 1950; Barsade, 2002; Homans, 1950; Losada & Heaphy, 2004). Despite growing knowledge about emotion's central role in social systems' behavior (Niedenthal & Brauer, 2012), and repeated assertions that social scientists overlook emotion's interpersonal aspects (Clark, Fitness & Brissette, 2004; Ekman & Davidson, 1994), the underlying causes of productive versus unproductive emotional spirals in teams remain largely unexamined. Furthermore, despite teams' known propensity for negative conflict and the greater intensity and length of downward spirals (see Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Finkenauer & Vohs, 2001), few scholars focus on team emotion management as a way to build productive, upward feedback spirals.

Given this dearth of productivity-focused team emotion research, we believe the time has come to develop a dynamic team emotion management theory that provides a foundation for improved team cooperation, engagement, and effectiveness. During the last two decades there has been a surge in theory and research that further compels our theory development: recent research reveals emotion's purpose in human systems (Niedenthal & Brauer, 2012); emotion's speed as an involuntary contagion that rapidly spreads among team members (Barsade, 2002; Ilies, Wagner, Morgeson, 2007); and productive emotion's value when it comes to team effectiveness (Losada & Heaphy, 2004). Prior theory and research has also notably uncovered interdependent systems' common positive and negative emotion triggers (Boudins, 2005; Fiske,

2004; Shapiro, 2010), the skills that increase awareness and management of work team emotion-triggering issues (Jordan & Troth, 2004; Offermann, Bailey, Vasilopoulos, Seal, & Sass, 2004; Sanchez-Burks & Huy, 2009), and the social system components that build social and emotional resilience in the face of inevitable challenges (Cacioppo, Reis, & Zautra, 2011; Huy, 1999). Research furthermore continues to show that teams can reduce insular thinking and intergroup conflict if they build emotional ties with relevant parties outside of their team boundaries (Hogg, Turner, & Davidson, 1990; Mackie, Devos, & Smith, 2000). Lastly, growing evidence demonstrates that emotion management is more reliable when it is grounded in team norms, rather than in individual skills (Gantt & Agazarian, 2004; Huy, 1999; Lewis & Rees, 2013; McLaughlin, 2008).

In this article, we present a theory of *team emotional competence* that advances knowledge of team emotion management and team effectiveness with three arguments: (1) most team-generated emotions stem from predictable cognitive and affective social motives that naturally emerge in work team environments; (2) teams can satisfy social motives by adopting a set of behavior-influencing emotionally competent (EC) norms; and (3) EC norm-adoption builds a productive social and emotional emergent climate of team psychological safety, team identity, and team efficacy.

Our theory applies to teams or groups composed of people who: (1) view themselves, and are viewed by others, as a social entity; (2) engage in interdependent tasks that require cooperation; (3) are embedded in one or more larger social systems (e.g., a community or organization) that necessitate collaboration with other social entities; and (4) perform tasks that affect others (e.g., customers) (see Guzzo & Dickson, 1996). In other words, our theory focuses on the team types that organizations increasingly structure work around in order to enable the

timely exchange and integration of knowledge, information, and ideas. These include project teams, cross-functional teams, product development teams, leadership teams, and other teams whose successful performance requires them to interact, cooperate, and collaborate.

In presenting our theory, we first define the productive social and emotional emergent climate that team emotional competence creates. We define this climate as including three well-established team emergent states: team psychological safety, team identity, and team efficacy. Each of these has been found to stimulate team member cooperation, engagement, and team effectiveness (Edmondson, 1999; Gibson & Early, 2007; Van Der Vegt & Bunderson, 2005). We then present our theory of team emotional competence by: (1) discussing the current state of team emotion management theory and research, (2) presenting theory and research on the underlying human social motives that predictably and commonly trigger emotion in work teams, and (3) presenting the nine emotionally competent team norms that build team emotional competence. We offer theoretical propositions about how each norm helps a team satisfy member social motives, which contributes to developing a productive social and emotional climate. Finally, we conclude with a discussion of how our theory contributes to current knowledge and practice.

ACHIEVING TEAM EFFECTIVENESS THROUGH A PRODUCTIVE SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL CLIMATE

In this section, we present three well-established cognitive and affective team emergent states that both constitute and develop, through feed-forward processes, a highly productive social and emotional team climate: team psychological safety, team identity, and team efficacy (Edmondson, 1999; Gibson & Early, 2007; Van Der Vegt & Bunderson, 2005). Team emergent states are defined as cognitive, motivational, and affective conditions that are collective

properties emerging from the way a team interacts, conducts its work, and achieves its outcomes (Marks, Mathieu, & Zaccaro, 2001). Emergent states are dynamic, increasing (or decreasing) as they are reinforced (or depleted) by the way a team conducts its work. Although team emergent states require support if they are to be sustained, they remain fairly stable in teams with strong norms (Mullen & Cooper, 1994). Below, we define each state and discuss its utility for cooperation, engagement, and effectiveness of and in teams.

Team Psychological Safety

For a team to take full advantage of members' expertise and knowledge, members must feel that they can be open and honest despite the risk of negative consequences or rejection (Kahn, 1992). The cognitive and affective emergent state of team psychological safety describes this shared belief among members that a social climate is conducive to taking interpersonal risks (Edmondson, 1999) such as asking questions, seeking feedback, and discussing errors or mistakes, which ultimately benefits teams with improved team learning and task effectiveness (Edmondson, 1999). Teams with higher levels of psychological safety also accomplish more work (Edmondson, 1999), are more creative and innovative (Brenneman & West, 1995), are more engaged in their work (Kahn, 1990; Nembhard & Edmondson, 2006), and perform better due to team members' greater job engagement and effort (Brown & Leigh, 1996).

Team Identity

Our theory's second emergent state is team identity, a shared cognitive and affective state through which people classify themselves as unified members of an interdependent team. Through a cohesive team identity, members feel a sense of emotional involvement, attachment, and unity with other team members, collectively owning the team's problems and successes (Van Der Veegt & Bunderson, 2005). The concept emerges out of social identity theory, which

contends that, as a way of making sense of themselves and the world around them, individuals strongly tend to define themselves through their social identities or social group associations (Brickson, 2007; Tajfel, 1982). However, whereas social identity is typically an individual-level construct, team identity is group-level; it resides in communal relationships, is jointly owned by team members, and is greater than the sum of individual social identities (Pratt, 2003; Van Der Veegt & Bunderson, 2005).

Team identity stimulates emotional involvement, which in turn creates a motivational force that facilitates team member interaction and cooperation (Bergami & Bagozzi, 2000). Numerous studies reveal that a team identity motivates high levels of cooperation, accommodation, and sacrifice (Ellmers, De Glider, & Haslam, 2004). Team identity leads people to internalize group values, beliefs, and goals, as well as curb their self-interests in favor of engaging in actions that benefit the team, such as cooperation and effective information processing (Kearney & Gebert, 2009; Kramer & Brewer, 1984; Tyler & Blader, 2001; Van Der Veegt & Bunderson, 2005). Although a unified identity is productive, research also reveals that strong group attachment feelings can distort perceptions of one's own group (exaggerating the good) and how it differs from other groups (Tajfel, Billig, Bundy, & Flament, 1971), which is a common precursor to inter-group conflict (Sherif & Sherif, 1953). By increasing team cooperation with other groups, emotionally competent team norms reduce potential conflict and improve team emotion management and effectiveness.

Team Efficacy

Interactions among team members determines team efficacy (Srivastava, Bartol, & Locke, 2006), which is another group-level cognitive and affective motivational state and is defined as the shared belief that the team can effectively perform (Lindsley, Brass, & Thomas,

1995; Park, Spitzmuller, & DeShon, 2013). Long-standing theory and research reveals that positive expectations stimulate self-fulfilling actions for individuals (Darley & Fazio, 1980) and teams (Bandura, 1997). Theory and research also reveals a link between team efficacy and task processes focused inside and outside of the team. For instance, Silver and Bufanio (1996) found that team efficacy predicts a team's level of goal aspiration, and accounts for more goal achievement variance than a team's previous performance. Likewise, Guzzo and his associates (Guzzo, Yost, Campbell, & Shea, 1993; Shea & Guzzo, 1987) found that team efficacy significantly correlates with measures of service to others inside and outside of the company. Finally, Tasa, Taggar, and Seijts' (2007) longitudinal study found that efficacy at Time 2 was jointly predicted by efficacy at Time 1 and the way members interacted and worked together.

EMOTION MANAGEMENT IN WORK TEAMS

Emotion is defined as the display of relatively intense affected or agitated feeling states (e.g., joy, fear, and embarrassment) accompanied by physiological and psychological change (Fineman, 1991). Emotions differ from feelings, which involve awareness, and from moods, which are longer in duration. Emotions activate when a person detects an environmental stimulus (e.g., a birthday cake or an irritated look on someone's face), although memories can also stimulate emotion. Stimulus detection commences an instant, automatic, unconscious (or subconscious) cognitive evaluation of the stimulus in relation to one's motives (i.e., needs and concerns) in that moment and situation (Ferguson, 2000; Lazarus, 1991). The evaluation produces the emotion, which at its core ranges from pleasurable to displeasurable (Barrett, Mesquita, Ochsner, & Gross, 2007). Emotion researchers disagree over several issues, including number and structure of emotions, but agree that emotion has important adaptive significance for individuals and groups (Norris & Cacioppo, 2007).

Typically, emotion management aims to control emotion toward effective or socially acceptable experiences and displays. At the individual level, emotion management involves employing diverse strategies, ranging from stifling emotional impulses to actively reframing one's interpretation of a situation to increase the ability to feel or exhibit the emotions necessary for meeting one's goals (Humphrey, Pollak, & Hawver, 2008). For example, poor emotion management is associated with socially awkward behavior, whereas effective emotion management is associated with socially effective behavior (Baumeister & Exline, 1999), and thus greater wellbeing and economic success (Côté, Gyurak, & Levenson, 2010). Emotion regulation plays a central role in the exhibition of emotional intelligence (Mayer, Roberts, Barsade, 2008).

At the team level, emotion management is essential because emotion is central to many of the challenges facing teams, including motivating members and resolving teamwork's inherent conflict. It is no surprise that teams have even been referred to as emotional incubators (DeDreu, et al., 2001) due to the speed and power of emotional contagion to result in team members literally "catching" one another's emotion (Barsade, 2002). Team-level emotion management has primarily been studied through the lens of individual-level emotional intelligence theory (see Mayer et al., 2008). This research reveals that teams with members who display higher levels of emotional self-control (Jordan & Troth, 2004), as well as those with members who have higher levels of emotional intelligence, generally perform at higher levels (Jordan, Ashkanasy, Hartel, & Hooper, 2002; Offermann, Bailey, Vasilopoulos, Seal, & Sass, 2004; Troth, Jordan, Lawrence, & Tse, 2012).

A growing number of researchers have begun to conceptualize and study effective system-level emotion management at the organization level and as a construct manifested in norms and culture (Gantt & Agazarian, 2004; Huy, 1999; Lewis & Rees, 2013; McLaughlin,

2008). These new conceptualizations transcend traditional bureaucratic organizational cultures' "old-school" emotion management, which aimed to stifle employee's emotions and emotional needs (see Martin, Knopoff, & Beckman, 1998). Borrowing from emotional intelligence theory, new theories suggest that organizational norms and routines can encourage holistic, emotionally competent, and emotionally attending employee behaviors and interactions that address emotional needs (e.g., through empathy). The authors argue that system-level emotional competence supports behavior with norms, and thus most individuals do not themselves need to be emotionally intelligent (Huy, 1999). This idea is supported by systems theory, which proposes that the essence of any system lies in the patterns of interactions among its parts (i.e., members) rather than within the parts themselves (Steiner, 1972; Weick, & Roberts, 1993). Managing emotion through norms, especially strong norms that enable self-regulation and require less leadership intervention, beneficially produces more reliable and sustainable emotionally competent interactions than relying on presumed member skills alone (Gantt & Agazarian, 2004; Lewis & Rees, 2013; McLaughlin, 2008).

Despite emotion management's centrality to team function, little theory and research has addressed team-level emotion management or emotional competence. A key exception is George's (2002) conceptualization of affect regulation in teams, which identifies four mechanisms teams consciously use to regulate emotion: (1) team member selection and attrition, (2) interpersonal influence (i.e., socialization), (3) normative pressure, and (4) power and status relations that influence security and vulnerability feelings.

Our theory of team emotion management through emotionally competent team norms builds on systems' theories. We argue that through the development of team norms and expectations, a team environment can be built to manage emotion in a way that facilitates a

feedback cycle of productive interactions, increased motivation, and greater team collaboration and effectiveness. Identifying such norms requires understanding the aspects of emotion that matter most in team environments.

Properties of Emotion Central to Emotion Management in Teams

We propose that three emotional properties are especially relevant to work team emotion management. First, emotions are not arbitrary; rather, they are highly evolved signals (Archer, 2004) that automatically emerge when the brain senses something pertinent to the person's motives or needs (Frijda, 1994; Parrott, 2004; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). The physiological and psychological reaction generated by emotion focuses a person's attention and behavior toward satisfying the motive (e.g., fight or flight), and provides information about the extent to which a motive is satisfied or threatened. Thus, identifying and working to satisfy predictably emerging work team motives can help a team manage emotion and its potentially attendant positive/negative emotional and motivational spiral. Also, since emotion carries information that affects members' wellbeing, it may be further helpful for team functioning (George, 2002). We revisit this point in our section on emotionally competent team norms.

A second property of emotion relevant to team emotion management is *social motives*, the most common emotion trigger (Ferguson, 2000; Norris & Cacioppo, 2007). Social motives are fundamental underlying psychological needs (such as, the need to belong) that drive how individuals in groups think, feel, and behave (Fiske, 2004). Evolutionary models show humans evolved in conditions where group membership (i.e., in tribes) significantly increased survival chances by providing defense against enemies and access to food and mates, whereas social exclusion or rejection led to certain death (Cacioppo & Patrick, 2008; Kerr & Levine, 2008; Spoor & Kelly, 2004). Thus, social motives evolved to enable humans to fit well in groups and,

relatedly, to ensure group success (Spoor & Williams, 2007). Emotion influences human survival by signaling a person when his or her social motives are satisfied (e.g., they have secured group membership) or under threat (e.g., group membership is not secure). Due to the importance of group inclusion for survival, the human brain evolved to experience social exclusion akin to physical pain—its signal activates pain centers in the brain (Lieberman & Eisenberger, 2009). In this light, we can better understand why team conflicts that arouse perceived rejection are difficult to avoid and repair.

Social motives are also prime workplace emotion triggers (Boudins, 2005; Elfenbein, 2007; McCarthy, 1989; Mignonac & Herrback, 2004). Boudens' (2005) narrative analysis of work stories reveals that work's social world is not only a reprieve from concrete responsibilities; it is also fundamental to one's work experience. This is particularly true in work teams where task interdependencies increase social interaction and intensify social motives (Fiske, 2004). Summarizing her thematic analysis, Boudens (2005) writes:

“The stories demonstrate ... the undeniable importance of the human element in work. Staying connected to others is a vital and inspiring part of our everyday work lives, one that frequently works its way in between the cracks of our nominal work tasks. Connections are not made passively as a byproduct of doing work, but are worked at and maintained, sometimes through considerable effort and sacrifice” (Boudens, 2005, p. 1301).

The third relevant emotional property for team emotion management is that the positive emotions that emerge from social motives' satisfaction serve as the glue that unites and bonds team members as a collective entity (Barsade & Gibson, 1998; George, 2002). Evolutionarily, just as we experience social exclusion as physical pain, the brain activates pleasure and reward centers when members experience group cooperation (Lieberman & Eisenberger, 2009). The pleasurable experience of team emotional bonding and cooperation helps produce a self-reinforcing cycle that unites a team and supports member willingness to place team needs ahead

of their own (George, 2002). However, emotional bonding can also have negative effects within a team (Smith & Berg, 1987), since it can engulf individuality and member's distinctive qualities. It can also feed prejudice against outsiders, as tension inheres between close team emotional bonds and openness to difference both inside and outside the team (Arrow, 2007; Deutch, 1973). In our section on emotionally competent team norms, we argue that the most productive emotional bonds allow individuality and seek to build relationships with relevant individuals and groups outside of the team boundary.

An essential point for our theory of team emotional competence is that team cultures vary in how well their norms help satisfy members' social motives, build productive social and emotional bonds, and support resilience when motives are unsatisfied (Caccioppo, et al., 2011). We propose that effective team emotion management involves developing a team culture (i.e., team values, norms and routines) that helps satisfy member social motives. Thus, our first step toward defining effective team emotion management, and a team culture that supports it, is to identify the social motives that commonly trigger emotion in work teams.

COMMON SOCIAL MOTIVES IN WORK TEAMS

Research on workplace social motives has primarily focused on comparing the influence of social motives' general categories, referred to as prosocial (i.e., cooperative) and egoistic (i.e., individualistic) (Beersma & De Dreu, 2005; Weingart, Brett, Olekains, & Smith, 2007). To identify a specific list of social motives likely to emerge in work teams, we examined: identification motives in organizations (Cooper & Thatcher, 2010, Vignoles, Regalia, Manzi, Golledge, & Scabini, 2006), relational identity motives (Shapiro, 2002, 2010), self-determination motives (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2000), and social motives emerging from personality and social psychology research (Fiske, 2004; Leary 2007). We used three criteria to establish a set of social

motives that predictably emerge in work team environments: (1) motives most commonly discussed, (2) motives most strongly related to needs arising when a person enters a work team, and (3) parsimony (see Cooper & Thatcher, 2010, who use similar criteria).

Our review produced four social motives that commonly arise when a person enters work teams, and that team members are driven to satisfy: belonging, shared understanding, control, and self-enhancement. When these motives are perceived as satisfactorily met, pleasurable emotions are generated (e.g., joy, contentment); when perceived as under threat, displeasurable emotions are generated (e.g., frustration, anxiety, anger) (Niedenthal & Brauer, 2012). As discussed above, these emotions impact team attention and behavior.

Social motives are not mutually exclusive. There is wide agreement that the most fundamental human social motive is *belonging*, which arouses all other social motives (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Fiske, 2004). Later in this article, we propose that specific emotionally competent team norms help address these common and predictable social motives and, therefore, help teams build a beneficially productive social and emotional climate. Each of the four social motives is discussed below.

Belonging

Belonging describes the need to form secure and stable interpersonal relationships (Reis, Collins, & Berscheid, 2000). Deeper than mere affiliation or rapport, belonging implies true acceptance in a relationship. The need to belong is strengthened by its complement—the need to avoid social rejection (similarly referred to as ostracism or social exclusion) (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Research reveals that people are highly sensitive to perceptions of social rejection. When a team member feels excluded by another team member, the excluded member interprets it as full team rejection, and thus mistakes subsequent attempted inclusionary acts as further

exclusions (Chernyak & Zayas, 2010). Individual differences with respect to social anxiety, introversion, extroversion, secure attachment, self-esteem, loneliness, and agreeableness have little to no influence on initial levels of negative emotion and pain caused by perceived rejection (Williams, 2007). Whether perceived or real, social rejection increases anxiety, damages health, and decreases lifespan through its "...deleterious effects on the brain, hypothalamic pituitary adrenocortical axis, vascular processes, blood pressure, gene transcription, inflammatory processes, immunity, and sleep" (Cacioppo, Berstson, & Decety, 2010: 679). In fact, social rejection (perceived or real) is considered the most common and underappreciated cause of human anxiety and depression (Baumesiter & Leary 1995).

The negative emotion triggered from even the slightest hint of rejection directs attention and motivates remedial behavior toward re-gaining control and improving group status (Williams, 2007). These behaviors can be self-defeating for the individual, and detrimental to the team's collaboration and effectiveness; such behaviors include seeking attention, lashing out, and decreasing one's level of group helping and cooperation (Twenge, Baumeister, DeWall, Ciarocco, & Bartels, 2007; Twenge, Catanese, & Baumeister, 2002). Relevant to our theory of team emotional competence, social rejection reactions are heavily influenced by team culture (i.e., norms and values) and also by the broader cultural context in which the system exists (e.g., collectivistic vs. individualistic cultures) (Kim & Sasaki, 2014). A team's culture can include norms that guide interactions letting team members feel understood, cared about and secure in their sense of belonging. Such cultures reduce the threat of rejection and increase emotional resilience (Cacioppo et al., 2011).

Shared Understanding and Control

The second and third social motives we identified are relatively cognitive and strongly interrelated (Fiske, 2004): shared understanding and control. Aspects of these motives are similar to social motives known as *uncertainty reduction* (see Cooper & Thatcher, 2010), and *autonomy* (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Shapiro, 2010). In any given social situation, people implicitly ask themselves questions such as: “What is going on here?” “Who are these people?” “What are they doing and what do they want of me?” “Will my goals conflict with theirs’ and, if so, how do I choose between them?” “What are the consequences if I am wrong, and how can I recover from my mistakes?” (Cantor & Kihlstrom, 1985). The need for answers to such questions, and to have the answers confirmed by others, emerges from the motive for shared understanding, which describes a person’s need to predict what is going to happen in an environment, to make sense of what does happen, and to believe that others share one’s own perceptions, attitudes, and feelings (Fiske, 2004). Certainty about understanding of the physical and social environment instills confidence about how to behave and increases the belief that a person has some control over events (Hogg & Terry, 2000).

In team settings, the need for shared understanding drives members to construct shared mental models (i.e., working theories) that allow them to calculate potential actions’ consequences and predict future states (Cannon-Bowers, Salas, & Converse, 1993). Shared mental models improve group functioning by speeding up decisions and easing coordination (Klimoski & Mohammad, 1994). As mentioned, the need to develop shared understanding is closely related to the need for control—it motivates team members to obtain the information that allows them to control the things that matter most (Dunning, 2004).

The third social motive, control, has long been referred to as the most common trigger of emotion in teams (Hare, 1976), and is a strong predictor of a person's sense of security about his or her group relationships and subjective wellbeing (Vignoles, et al., 2006). Control connects behavior to outcomes, and in a team environment implies the ability to influence decisions and future team states. A sense of autonomy, choice, and control are central to producing and sustaining the highest levels of motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Thus, the sense that autonomy or control is under threat stimulates the need for increased control (Shapiro, 2010). For example, when team members believe their input to important decisions is ignored, it can trigger negative emotion. Conversely, positive emotion is triggered when members perceive their input matters. Even if it is an illusion, a sense of control is fundamental to the perseverance required during challenging times (Seligman, 1975; Williams, 2007).

Notably, in dynamic systems such as work teams, control is elusive, and more frequently perceived than real (Osman, 2010). Control and autonomy are constantly negotiated in systems where all members require some level of both, and this is true for all social motives. Lack of certainty about motive satisfaction is inherent in dynamic social systems, compelling members to continually collect and analyze incoming data and information (Dunning, 2004). But, context matters; some team cultures help satisfy member social motives and aid resilience even when motives are threatened.

Self-Enhancement

The fourth social motive we identified, self-enhancement, is a relatively affective motive that involves feelings of self-esteem, self-worth, and improvability (Fiske, 2004). Aspects of the self-enhancement motive are similar to motives for *self-improvement* (Sedikides & Hepper, 2009), *competence* (Deci & Ryan, 2000), and *distinctiveness* (Hornsey & Jetten, 2004; Vignoles,

et al., 2006). Individuals' desire to maintain positive views of themselves has received a great deal of research attention. It is well established that "the most important thing in one's life is the self" (Tesser, 2004: 184) and that the "self" is not a fixed entity, but rather is context-sensitive and continually being defined (Fiske, 2004). At the same time, people are highly motivated to protect and enhance their sense of self-worth and -esteem (Vignoles, et al., 2006). It is more than pleasant to be seen in a favorable light—it supports one's acceptance as a secure member in a group, and may have evolved as a survival strategy to prevent community rejection (Hicks, 2010). Self-esteem has been labeled a sociometer for measuring one's standing in a group; thus, if self-esteem falls, it informs a person that he or she is in danger of group rejection (Leary & Baumeister, 2000). This often leads a person to take remedial action to increase his or her group standing or status (Fiske, 2004)

In the workplace, people are highly attuned to others' views of their competence. Research reveals that workplace accomplishments generate more positive emotion when they are accompanied by positive recognition from others (Boudins, 2005; Mignonac & Herrback, 2004). In fact, when others notice their performance, people feel good about performing well on even the most mundane and simple tasks (Shepperd, 1993). People want to feel affirmed as worthy and improvable, but they also want this information to mirror what they already know to be true about themselves (Baumeister, 1999). Swann and his colleagues found that people are highly invested in their distinct identities and self-perceptions; when these are verified, people feel comfortable, known, and understood, and easily take over familiar roles (Swann, 1987; Swann, Polzer, Seyle, & Ko, 2004). Research reveals that self-verification in a group prompts feelings of interpersonal connection and fuels creativity, satisfaction, and team performance (Polzer, Milton & Swann, 2002; Thatcher & Greer, 2008).

Like all social motives, self-enhancement is good for individual members as well as the team. When members feel valued by their teammates, they are more open to critical feedback and more motivated to work, cooperate, and relate; when they feel badly about themselves, they are less motivated to engage even in simple tasks (Karau & Williams, 1993). Ultimately, then, it is easier to work with and be around people who feel good about themselves (Fiske, 2004).

Context and the Satisfaction of Social Motives

Entering a team environment automatically stimulates social motives. While some team environments develop cultures that help satisfy member motives, others develop cultures that are more threatening to motives. Threatened motives trigger emotion that stimulates information-seeking behavior, attuning one's sensitivity to social information in order to build understanding and control (Pittman & Pittman, 1980). Threatened motives also increase stress and lead team members' behavior to become more self-focused (Driskell, Salas, & Johnston, 1999), which in turn promotes remedial actions that may either improve one's team standing or take time and focus away from task-related activities and lead to increased conformity (Williams, 2007).

We introduce EC norms as a solution for developing a team culture that increases a team's ability to reliably address members' social motives and thus build a productive social and emotional emergent climate. Team norms provide a cognitive map that makes the team's social world easier to predict and navigate (Baldwin, 1992). At the same time, no team culture can always satisfy all members' social motives. Uncertainty, frustration, and conflict are natural and inevitable in any dynamic social system (De Dreu & Weingart, 2003; Osman, 2010; Smith & Berg, 1987), and both positive and negative emotions play a role in optimal team functioning (George & Zhou, 2007; Lindebaum & Jordan, 2014). Consequently, we propose that effective team emotion management involves building EC norms that help satisfy social motives and

develop individual and team social and emotional resilience, which describes the capacity to foster, engage in, and sustain positive relationships and to endure and recover from inevitable social system stress and social isolation (Caccioopo, et al., 2011). Such resilience turns challenges into learning opportunities, which can enhance relationships and improve team effectiveness.

EMOTIONALLY COMPETENT TEAMS NORMS

A system's culture shapes behavior in a social system (Schein, 1992; Swidler, 1986). Culture (including the values, beliefs, practices, customs, and action strategies passed on to newcomers and adapted and developed over generations) emerged through evolution to help humans effectively structure and manage their social and physical environments (Baumeister, 2005). The distinct culture that emerges in any work team starts with the expectations, values, actions, and interactions of members who jointly determine and construct behavior patterns, which become the norms influencing future interactions and behavior (Morgeson & Hoffman, 1999). Cultures and their norms are emergent properties of groups that transcend individuals.

Team norms regularize behavior about issues that matter to members; they are the least visible but most powerful form of control in any social system (Feldman, 1984). For instance, team members covertly or overtly admonish those who do not adhere to team norms. And, although strong norms have been shown to influence team behavior throughout several generations of membership changes (Sherif, 1936), norms also change to accommodate the evolving needs of a team and its members (Osman, 2010). Descriptive norms reflect team members' actual behavior patterns; prescriptive norms reflect the way a team believes members should behave (Chatman, 2010). Recent research by Hackman and his colleagues reveals that creating and enforcing well-defined prescriptive norms is an "efficient" and "powerful" team

behavior management tool (Hackman, 2011, p. 103). Ultimately, though, team norms' substance defines their influence on team effectiveness (Postmes, Spears, & Cihangir, 2001).

We introduce a prescriptive set of nine EC norms aimed to help a team effectively manage emotion by improving anticipation and management of emotion-triggering issues and building a productive social and emotional climate comprising team psychological safety, shared team identity- and efficacy. Our theory intentionally roots team emotional competence in norms rather than in individual skills (such as emotional intelligence, self-control, or agreeability). In this way, our study marks a significant departure from more common conceptualizations of team emotional competence, which link a team's emotional competence level to individual team members' social and emotional skills (Frye, Bennett & Caldwell, 2006; Harper & White, 2013; Jordan, Ashkanasy, Hartel, & Hooper, 2002).

Like others before us (Huy, 1999; Lewin, 1936; Martin, Knopoff, & Beckman, 1998), we argue that context bears an important, meaningful influence on behavior and emotions. We also argue that, because teams are *emotion incubators* (DeDreu, West, Fischer, & MacCurtain, 2001), emotion management is too complex and essential to rely solely on individual members' motivation and skills. In most teams there are significant individual differences in social and emotional skill levels, as well as in the extent to which members with such skills feel responsible for other members' needs and concerns (Clark, Fitness, & Brissette, 2004). We agree with those who argue that system-level emotional competence has a reliable, sustainable influence on individual member behavior (Gantt & Agazarian, 2004; Holmer, 1994; Huy, 1999; Lewis & Rees, 2013; McLaughlin, 2008). When EC norms are incorporated and crystallized, team-level emotional competence does not require a great number of emotionally intelligent individuals in influential positions (Huy, 1999). Further, because norms can generate routines that address

member needs, they manage team emotion in a way that dependably supports productive interactions and facilitates team effectiveness.

We argue that, by satisfying members' social motives, EC norm implementation at any level of demonstration will strengthen a team's emotion management. Of course, teams and their norms are dynamic, and the level at which a team demonstrates EC norms will fluctuate. Teams are complex, non-linear systems in which small acts can have large consequences. Yet, for the ease of description, we discuss and present our theory in a linear fashion (see Figure 1). Some groups will swiftly develop team psychological safety, which increases cooperation, leads to an increase in the demonstration of EC norms (e.g., caring behavior), and helps build deeper levels of psychological safety. The development of team emotional competence need not proceed from left to right in our model; indeed, team EC positively influences team effectiveness at no matter what point in our model the improvement begins.

Insert Figure 1 about here

Emotionally Competent Norms Address Three Levels of Dynamics and Behavior

Work teams are multi-level systems. Three levels of dynamics and behavior continually shape a team and interact to influence one another: individual, team, and cross-boundary (Arrow, McGrath, & Berdhal, 2000). For example, team-level dynamics emerge from, but also shape, individual-level dynamics. Cross-boundary-level dynamics emerge from the interaction of the team with its larger context (e.g., the organization or the external environment), which shapes and constrains team and individual dynamics (Ancona, 1990). Because all three levels and their interactions influence emotion (Ashkanasy 2003; Barsade & Gibson, 1998), we present EC norms that address behavior at each. The following discussion is summarized in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

Individual-level Team Norms

At the individual level, we include three EC norms: interpersonal understanding, addressing counterproductive behavior, and caring behavior. Each norm requires and encourages interaction among team members, and we propose that they also satisfy member social motives for belonging, shared understanding, control, and self-enhancement.

Interpersonal understanding. We define this norm as teams taking actions to build an accurate understanding of each member's unique attributes and priorities, including: strengths, weaknesses, interests, values, job, and goals. This norm takes into account that people's lives are dynamic and evolving. Teams who demonstrate it continually seek opportunities to build a more nuanced and accurate understanding of the distinctive qualities and context of team members, who take time to ask each other about evolving needs, interests, and goals.

Four concepts are related to, but differ from, the interpersonal understanding norm. The first is *cross understanding*, defined as "the extent to which group members have an accurate understanding of one another's mental models" (Huber & Lewis, 2010: 7). A second related concept is *perspective taking*, which describes the active consideration of another's perspective or point of view. A third related concept is *empathy*, defined as a state of emotional arousal that stems from the apprehension or comprehension of another's affective state and that is similar to, or congruent with, what the other person is feeling (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1990). Finally, interpersonal understanding relates to *sympathy*, defined as the process of coming to understand another's situation, mind, or reasoning, and thereby building an understanding of their thoughts,

feelings, desires, and intentions (Sally, 2000). The key difference between these interpersonal processes and the interpersonal understanding norm is that the latter endorses behavior that builds cross understanding, perspective-taking, empathy, and sympathy.

An interpersonal understanding norm helps satisfy members' belonging social motive by leading to self-disclosure, which generates reciprocal sympathetic interactions (Gabarro, 1987). People tend to like those with whom they are familiar, and familiarity leads to the discovery of mutual similarities. This relationship-building process is central to experiencing belonging (Fiske, 2004) and satisfying members' shared understanding motive. By taking actions to build familiarity with one another's strengths, weaknesses, job, etc., members improve their ability to anticipate how others will behave, and thus can calculate the consequences of potential actions.

Interpersonal understanding also helps meet member's social motives for self-enhancement. People like to belong, but they also like others to perceive them as unique and distinctive¹ (Brewer, 1991). When others verify team members' unique attributes, they feel recognized, are emboldened to offer more ideas and insights in the team (Swann, et al., 2004), and experience increased self-esteem (Fiske, 2004). This leads us to the following:

Proposition 1: A team's interpersonal understanding norm will help satisfy member belonging, shared understanding, and self-enhancement social motives.

Addressing counterproductive behavior. This norm refers to members taking actions to raise and discuss member behavior that conflicts with agreed upon productive team member behavior norms, or that team members consider harmful to team effectiveness. Members can

¹ This value is strong in many Western cultures, but not in all cultures around the world (see Hornsey & Jetton, 2004).

collectively or privately, immediately or postponedly, address counterproductive behavior. If teams do not address counterproductive behavior, they implicitly accept it. Thus, to decrease feedback recipient defensiveness and increase successful behavior changes, the team must predetermine counterproductive behavior criteria (see Jordan & Audia, 2012). Furthermore, for a norm of addressing counterproductive behavior to satisfy members' social motives, the feedback must facilitate a discussion.

Teams that ignore inappropriate member behavior decrease their performance potential; and those that avoid conflict by ignoring counterproductive behavior tend to build hostility (Nemeth & Staw, 1989). Therefore, this norm addresses member social motives for control in two ways. Firstly, it makes room for this *necessary evil* of providing difficult feedback in a team (see Margolis & Molinsky, 2008), which allows team members to have some control over others' behavior. Secondly, it prompts periodic discussions about the efficacy of specific team norms and expectations. Research shows that constructive confrontation norms enable a team to take better advantage of the team's diversity of opinions and to experience task conflict without it leading to destructive emotional conflict (Kellermanns, Floyd, Spencer, & Pearson, 2008). For instance, lower status members often consciously or unconsciously deploy counterproductive behavior to question the team's status quo (see Druskat & Wolff, 2007; Ridgeway, 1987). It is not easy to voice dissent in teams with strong norms, particularly from a minority perspective. However, norms that enable minority dissent can beneficially stimulate divergent thinking, creative ideas, debate, and improved problem solving (DeDreu & West, 2001; Nemeth, 1994).

The norm also addresses belonging and self-enhancement social motives. When a feedback recipient is known, understood, and supported by those giving the feedback (see other norms in the individual-level category), it increases his or her ability to accept the feedback as

developmental and helpful, rather than a threat to his or her self-image or sense of belonging (see Jordan & Audia, 2012). Longitudinal research by Druskat and Wolff (1999) revealed that, after feedback was provided to team members in a supportive face-to-face discussion, those who received the toughest feedback (i.e., about problem behavior) later rated themselves as feeling significantly more positive about the team and team relationships than they had before. Case study research also shows that teams build stronger relationships when members quickly and directly address work errors or problems, because it provides clear guidance for being upfront with one another (Lilius, Worline, Dutton, Kanov, & Maitlis, 2011). We propose:

Proposition 2: A team's addressing counterproductive behavior norm will help satisfy member belonging, control, and self-enhancement social motives.

Caring behavior. We define this norm as members taking actions to convey team member appreciation, by treating them with respect and kindness and supporting their needs and efforts. Norms that address how people should treat one another to cooperatively live and work are implicit in every community and culture (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). Caring is an ongoing relational process (Hawk & Lyons, 2008), and thus a caring behavior team norm neither requires close personal team member relationships (Kahn, 1998), nor implies that team members must like or socialize with one another. The norm assumes that team members aspire to build communal rather than exchange relationships, since, whereas communal relationships involve taking on some responsibility to help others to meet their needs, exchange relationships do not (e.g., car pool members do not expect to care for one another's needs) (Clark & Mills, 1993).

Caring behavior entails making sacrifices by occasionally letting go of one's self interests. Yet, since immediate impulses are often directed toward self-centeredness, prosocial behaviors require what Rusbult and Van Lange (2003) refer to as a prosocial transformation,

which is supported by understanding others (i.e., through interpersonal understanding) and building secure relationships.

Dutton and her colleagues (Lilius et al., 2011) have studied the high-quality relational connections that both constitute and support a caring behavior norm. Their recent case study reveals that a team facilitated high quality connections when team members cared for one another by acknowledging one another's good work, attending to one's preferences or strengths, and helping those who appeared to need it (Lilius, et al., 2011). Such high quality connections lead to relationship resilience—the relationship's capacity to bounce back after setbacks (Dutton & Heaphy, 2003).

A caring behavior norm addresses social motives for belonging, self-enhancement, and control by extending dignity to others, recognizing their inherent worth, and helping them feel good about themselves (Hicks, 2010). Caring behavior helps build and maintain the kind of secure base (Kahn, 1998) at the belonging motive's core. It also facilitates a sense of control by allowing team members to both physically and psychologically feel secure, as well as able to venture forth and explore without negative judgment (Clark & Lemay, 2010). This leads us to:

Proposition 3: A team's caring behavior norm will help satisfy member belonging, control, and self-enhancement social motives.

Group-level Team Norms

At the group level, we include four EC norms that influence team-level interactions and processes: team self-evaluation, creating emotion resources, encouraging optimism, and proactive problem solving. A primary task of these group-level norms is to provide team members with a level of shared understanding and control over group-level issues and concerns; their purpose is to satisfy member social motives and help reduce the inherent uncertainty

involved in working in a complex dynamic system (see Osman, 2010). Toward that end, these team-level norms work together to facilitate continuous learning, improvement, and adaptation. We propose that these team-level EC norms help a team build social and emotional resilience, including the capacity to understand and manage challenges. Thus, these norms transform challenges into learning opportunities that enhance relationships and improve team effectiveness (Cacciopo, et al., 2011).

Team self-evaluation. This norm encourages team members to engage in periodic discussions to assess process and performance effectiveness (including assessing strengths, weaknesses, routines, and habits), determining what aspects are helping or hurting team functioning and goal achievement. Positive team change and development necessitates evaluating the “status quo” (Gersick & Hackman, 1990).

Adhering to a self-evaluation team norm is emotionally difficult, since it is admittedly difficult for members to voice problems, especially in a cohesive team (Bercovitz, Jap, & Nickerson, 2006). Put another way, members take the emotionally easier path when they quietly or covertly judge the team and determine themselves unrelated to problem sources (Argyris, 1985). Team self-evaluation proves further challenging insofar as it builds awareness of more difficult problems that require time and energy to improve.

A concept similar to team self-evaluation is *team reflexivity*, defined by West (1996) as the extent to which group members openly reflect upon the group’s objectives, strategies, and processes, and adapt them to current or anticipated circumstances. Reflexivity is considered a transition activity that occurs when teams complete set performance tasks or episodes (De Jong & Elfring, 2010). Yet, the team self-evaluation norm differs from reflexivity because teams who adopt it incorporate self-evaluation as a standard (i.e., normative) operating procedure.

Furthermore, team self-evaluation focuses more specifically on discussion and evaluation than on change.

Another concept similar to team self-evaluation is team learning. A literature review by Edmondson and colleagues described three definitional team learning categories: outcome improvement, task mastery, and team processes (Edmondson, Dillon, & Roloff, 2007). The first and second categories imply change, which is excluded from the team-self-evaluation norm. The third category considers team learning a process of sharing information and reflecting on experience, which best captures our definition of the team-self evaluation norm.

A norm of team self-evaluation helps satisfy team members' shared understanding social motives. Evidence reveals that teams that spend time reflecting on their process take better advantage of team member diversity (Moreland & McMin, 2010) and dissenting ideas (i.e., minority dissent), and are therefore more innovative (DeDreu & West, 2001). A norm of team self-evaluation helps ensure that all members share and discuss their thoughts about the team and its context. We offer the following proposition:

Proposition 4: A team's self-evaluation norm will help satisfy members' shared understanding social motive.

Creating emotion resources. Emotion provides legitimate information, and its expression communicates needs (Clark, Fitness & Brissette, 2004). A creating emotion resources norm encourages team members to create and use resources (e.g., time, common language, tools) that enable the surfacing and discussion of emotion. Emotion resources make it easier for a team to consider emotion a legitimate discussion topic (e.g., frustrations, "elephants in the room").

Furthermore, by making it easier for team members to self-disclose emotions and opinions, this norm increases the quantity and range of information team members raise and

discuss during team self-evaluation. Without resources that help team members process and make sense of shared feelings, emotion is typically ignored or suppressed (Levy, 1984). In her narrative analysis of workplace emotion, Boudens (2005) discusses the active inner world of employees who lack an outlet for voicing their frustrations, releasing their tension, and developing a shared understanding of their “social reality.” Boudens’ writes:

“...there are forceful, sometimes, overwhelming emotions that accompany these [work] experiences. In many of the stories the narrators chose to do and say nothing about the way they felt. In some cases they simply felt constrained, not wanting to jeopardize their position or upset the balance between themselves and another coworker...Many gave in to the status quo and grudgingly learned to accept it...Remaining outwardly silent did not of course mean that narrators left things at that.” (Boudens, 2005, p. 1302).

Suppressed emotions lead to dysfunctions such as depression (Kleinman, 1988), and, in teams, suppressed emotion can manifest itself as apathy or lack of motivation. Conversely, an emotionally competent group accepts emotions as an inherent part of group life, legitimizes discussion of emotional issues, and creates a vocabulary for discussing them. Fineman (1996: 556) discusses the importance of “emotionalized zones” that beneficially allow employees to express rather than suppress their emotions; however, since these zones are rare within organizations, many employees must seek them elsewhere (Elfenbein, 2007). A creating emotion resources norm helps satisfy team members’ shared understanding social motives by enabling an outlet for members to share and discuss their social reality. We propose:

Proposition 5: A team’s creating emotion resources norm will help satisfy members’ shared understanding social motive.

Encouraging optimism. Once a team creates norms for team self-evaluation and emotion resource development, it has helped satisfy member shared understanding motives. Next, a team must satisfy social motives for control, for instance by encouraging an optimistic and hopeful environment. An encouraging optimism norm persuades team members to engage in

behavior that leads to hopeful interpretations of day-to-day and larger challenges. Optimism is typically defined as a mood or attitude that produces expectations of a desirable future (Peterson, 2000) and promotes a guiding image of possibility. Optimism thus provides people with a greater sense of control and plays a pivotal role in motivating individuals and teams to overcome challenges on the way to meeting goals (Ludema, Wilmot, & Srivastva, 1997). Typically, researchers treat optimism as a cognitive construct closely connected to emotions one feels about an optimistic future (Peterson, 2000). Similarly, hope is considered a relational construct that emerges through social interaction (Ludema, et al., 1997). One person influences another's hope by conveying encouragement and confidence. Both optimism and hope are useful, and can be self-fulfilling because of the motivation they invoke. Like all of the norms described in our theory, however, encouraging optimism can be taken to excess. For instance, pressure to exhibit positive emotions can have negative consequences, it can suppress honest feelings and it neglects the important point that situational forces sometimes make any positive emotion difficult to experience (see Hackman, 2009).

At the same time, as mentioned earlier, emotions are contagious in team settings (Barsade, 2002). When a team confronts challenges, positive images can significantly influence a team's shared sense of efficacy, actions, and behaviors. Research by Isen and her colleagues (Isen, Niedenthal, & Cantor, 1992) found that team members reporting positive emotions showed greater cognitive flexibility and creativity than those reporting negative or neutral emotions. Positive images and emotions also influence a team's interpretation of challenges or threats. An affirmative or optimistic interpretation reduces perceptions of threat, increases a team's sense of control over challenges, and increases its ability to identify effective solution strategies (Folkman & Lazarus, 1988) Without an optimistic interpretation, threat can increase rigidity, resulting in

information-processing restrictions and over-reliance on familiar, repeated responses (Turner & Horvitz, 2001). Conversely, an optimistic outlook on the future predisposes people to actions that support continued positive emotion (e.g., helping) (Isen & Baron, 1991). We propose:

Proposition 6: A team's encouraging optimism norm will help satisfy team members' control social motive.

Proactive problem solving. Once a team gains an optimistic view of the future it is easier to develop a norm that encourages proactive problem-solving activities. We define this norm as proactively taking actions to anticipate, and prevent or address potential challenges or problems, and teams adopting this norm meet challenges and threats without becoming rigid or reactive, as often happens in human systems (Staw, Sandelands, & Dutton, 1981).

A concept similar to proactive problem solving is *contingency planning*, or developing a back-up plan (Marks, Mathieu, & Zaccaro, 2001). Contingency planning comprises one of three planning processes types presented by Marks and her colleagues in their episodic team process model; the other two include deliberate planning and reactive planning. In a study of planning's effects on team performance over time, DeChurch and Haas (2008) found that contingency planning was the strongest predictor of a team's coordination level early in its task, whereas reactive strategy adjustment was more important to later-stage coordination. Contingency planning, along with the coordination it helped teams achieve, resulted in accounting for 34% of the variance in team performance; reactive strategy adjustment added an additional 10% of team performance variance (DeChurch & Haas, 2008).

Although ample evidence reveals that team planning (Mathieu and Schulze, 2006; Weingart, 1992), in addition to proactive or contingency planning (Ancona & Caldwell, 1992), has a positive influence on team interpersonal and task effectiveness, it also reveals that teams

naturally tend not to plan (Hackman, Brousseau, & Weiss, 1976; Weingart, 1992). This supports our proposal that proactive problem-solving should be implemented as a team norm in which a team periodically performs proactive planning and helps ensure planning occurs throughout a team's working lifespan. We offer the following proposition:

Proposition 7: A team's proactive problem solving norm will address members' control social motive.

Cross-Boundary-level Team Norms

At the cross-boundary level, we include two EC norms: organizational understanding and building external relationships. Both norms influence the way the team and its members interact with relevant individuals and groups outside of the team (e.g., people who belong to other groups: clients, managers, executives, those with whom the team is interdependent – or on whom the team is dependent). Intergroup emotions theory (Mackie, Devos, & Smith, 2000) suggests that evaluations of intergroup events and interactions trigger emotion, and these inter-group emotions influence attitudes and behavior between groups. Intergroup evaluations frequently lead to perceived threat or -superiority, which trigger negative emotion, negative behavior and intergroup conflict (Eidelson & Eidelson, 2003). Importantly, strong within-team emotional bonds and identification with one's own team, often result in strong negative judgments and feelings about outsiders and other groups; this increases the risk of intergroup conflict (Arrow, 2007; Mackie, Silver, & Smith, 2004). We propose that effective emotion management through emotionally competent norms will reduce the threat and negative emotion by increasing team members': (1) shared understanding of those outsiders, and (2) control through more trustworthy relationships with outsiders.

Organizational understanding. This norm supports team member actions that reach outside the team to seek information from relevant individuals and groups that can increase the team's understanding of their priorities, needs preferences, perspectives, and behavior. Mere contact with these outsiders reduces the potential for negative emotion directed at them (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). A norm of organizational understanding also ensures routine refreshment and re-evaluation of team members' assumptions and beliefs about these outsiders. The norm lays the groundwork for building networks and relationships that provide information and resources essential for team innovation, goal achievement and performance (Marrone, Tesluck, & Carson, 2007; Ute, Anderson, & Salgado, 2009). We propose:

Proposition 8: A team's norm of organizational awareness will help satisfy members' social motive for shared understanding.

Building external relationships. This norm encourages team members to use the information obtained through its organizational understanding to build relationships with those who can improve a team's level of control over its functioning and goal achievement. Field research reveals that team viability and effectiveness is stronger in teams with strategies that include an externally focused plan that involves developing contacts outside the team and working with them to manage expectations, buffer external pressures, and acquire key resources, and support (Ancona, 1990; Ancona & Caldwell, 1992; Marrone, et al., 2007). We propose:

Proposition 9: A team's norm of building external relationships will help satisfy members' social motive for control.

MOTIVE SATISFACTION BUILDS A PRODUCTIVE SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL CLIMATE

We propose that team member experience of team psychological safety, team identity, and team efficacy increases via the satisfaction of member belonging, shared understanding, control, and self-enhancement social motives, which results from EC-norm influenced team behavior and team emotion management. Support for specific propositions appears below.

Team Psychological Safety

We propose that an emergent climate of team psychological safety is both the outcome of satisfying members' social motives, and an input to team cooperation, engagement, and team effectiveness. Research suggests that the kind of strong, secure, supportive relationships team members experience through a true sense of group belonging leads directly to the experience of psychological safety (Carmeli, Brueller, & Dutton, 2009; Kahn, 1990). In their study of 1,440 healthcare professionals, Nembhard and Edmondson (2006) also found that team leaders' treatment of members in a relationally inclusive way, including inviting member contributions, facilitates a psychological safety climate. Finally, research also reveals that when a team member perceives their self-esteem is secure, he or she feels safe enough to hear information that, although personally unflattering, could boost future team performance (Jordan & Audia, 2012). On the other hand, when a team member feels their status as a fully belonging team member is at risk, they choose to guard themselves by withdrawing and creating an internal, safe, and protective boundary (Hirschhorn, 1988). This leads us to the following proposition:

Proposition 10: Higher satisfaction levels of team member social motives (i.e., belonging, shared understanding, control, and self-enhancement) will be associated with higher team psychological safety levels.

Team Identity

We propose that an emergent team identity climate is also the outcome of satisfying members' social motives, and an input to team cooperation, engagement, and team effectiveness. Research reveals that a sense of team belonging and control increases a person's willingness to develop team identity (Brewer, 2007; Smith, Murphy, & Coats, 1999), which in turn fuels a self-reinforcing feedback cycle wherein the team identity experience drives a sense of belonging and shared common purpose (Brickson, 2007). Research also suggests that when a team interacts with and builds an understanding of the team's external context, perceptions of the one's own group's distinctiveness increase, which then helps to build a team's unique shared identity (Brewer, 2007). Finally, it is worth noting that team members' perceived rejection (the opposite of belonging) conversely drives a negative feedback cycle of reduced team identity, in addition to increased selfish actions that decrease connection, cooperation, and team effectiveness (Rusbult & Van Lange, 2003). This leads us to the following proposition:

Proposition 11: Higher satisfaction levels of team member social motives (i.e., belonging, shared understanding, control, and self-enhancement) will be associated with higher team identity levels.

Team Efficacy

Lastly, we propose that an emergent climate of team efficacy is, like the previous two categories, both the outcome of satisfying members' social motives and an input to team cooperation, engagement, and team effectiveness. Motive satisfaction leads to the development of team efficacy through three primary paths. Firstly, team efficacy grows out of the shared understanding team members build as they interact to identify member strengths and weaknesses, team resources, and the team's place in its broader organizational context (Gibson, 1999; Gibson, & Early, 2007; Gully, Joshi, Incalcaterra, & Beaubien, 2002). Secondly, team efficacy grows out

of the sense of control that emerges from that shared understanding. In other words, team discussions that produce shared understanding enable a team to feel it can control its future by making timely self-corrections and adjustments (Lindsley et al., 1995). Teams that do not interact toward building a shared understanding and a sense of control over the team's future are less likely to build a strong climate of team efficacy (Lindsley et al., 1995). Lastly, team efficacy is higher in groups that feel the kind of relational bond or connection that comes from members' sense of team belonging (Gibson & Early, 2007). This leads us to the following proposition:

Proposition 12: Higher satisfaction levels of team member social motives (i.e., belonging, shared understanding, control, and self-enhancement) will be associated with higher team efficacy levels.

DISCUSSION

Work teams are replete with frustrations, tensions, and conflicts that are difficult to experience and manage. Some teams manage those emotions well and even inspire pleasant emotions such as enthusiasm, warmth, and joy. Although the differences among the ways teams manage their emotion are enormous, the majority of theories about groups and teams either ignore the theme of emotion entirely, or only indirectly or superficially acknowledge it (George, 2002; Smith & Berg, 1987). This is surprising because group scholars have long recognized emotion's influence on team functioning (Bales, 1950; Bartel & Saavedra, 2000; Homans, 1950; Barsade, 2002): referring to teams as *hot beds* of emotion (Barsade & Gibson, 1998) and *emotion incubators* in which member emotions combine to create an overall team-level emotional tenor (DeDreu et al, 2001) that perpetuates itself (Ashkanasy, 2003). This oversight is particularly surprising given the emotion revolution that has permeated the social sciences in the last two decades (Barsade, Brief, & Spartaro, 2003), and the fact that the management or regulation of

emotion experience and expression has been one of the most heavily studied areas among emotion researchers (Elfenbein, 2007).

Contributions

We present a theory of team emotional competence that addresses team emotion management “head-on.” Our theory contributes to current knowledge on emotion in teams in three ways. We conceptualize team emotion management as a purely team-level construct. Previous team emotion management research conceptualizes and measures team emotion management via individual team members’ emotion regulation skills, aggregating the level of individual skills to measure a team’s ability to regulate emotion (Frye, Bennett, & Caldwell, 2006; Offermann et al., 2004; Jordan, Ashkanasy, Hartel, & Hooper, 2002; Jordan & Troth, 2004). This research reveals that individual emotion regulation skills benefit teams. For example, Jordan and Troth (2004) found that, out of all the work group emotional intelligence skills they studied, team members’ ability to manage their own emotions best predicted overall team performance.

Yet, like us, a number of scholars argue that system-level emotion management is more reliable and sustainable than dependence on individual-level skill and motivation (Gantt & Agazarian, 2004; Holmer, 1994; Huy, 1999; Lewis & Rees, 2013; McLaughlin, 2008). It also does not require most team members to have individual emotional skills (Huy, 1999). Even when members have these skills, the team context affects their use. Behavior is often different inside the team than outside the team, and team dynamics always represent more (or less) than the sum of those individual skills (Granovetter, 1985; Lewin, 1936; Morgeson & Hoffman, 1999).

Another dilemma arising from dependence on individual-level emotion regulation skills is that they can result in too much control and repression of emotion. Teams tend to benefit from

the expression of positive emotion, which builds relationships and leads to higher team performance (Losada & Heaphy, 2004). However, all emotion expression, including negative emotion, carries information about needs (Clark, et al., 2004) and problems that can prove useful to a team. For example, team members who communicate frustration may carry insights and information useful for continuous team improvement. Team conflict is also often useful, especially if it focuses on the team's taskwork; a recent meta-analysis found that teams focusing conflict on task-related views and disagreements lead to higher team performance (de Wit, Greer, & Jehn, 2012). Our theory of team emotional competence emphasizes sharing, rather than stifling, emotion. More specifically, our theory describes specific norms, which encourage members to share emotions (e.g., creating emotion resources) that increase shared understanding of issues facing the team and build a climate that stimulates high levels of cooperation, engagement, and team effectiveness.

Our theory also adds to current knowledge of emotion in teams by incorporating theory and research on individual social motives. Social motives are underlying needs that drive people's thinking, feeling, and behaving when they are in groups (Fiske, 2004). Because social motives are the most common triggers of emotion, they are relevant to work teams' functioning (Ferguson, 2000; Norris & Cacioppo, 2007). We believe that information about social motives' influence in team environments has been underutilized in team effectiveness and team emotion theory. Organization researchers have only begun to understand the role of social motives in work behavior. Previous research has tended to examine the influence of only broad categories of social motives (e.g., prosocial and egoistic) (Beersma & De Dreu, 2005; Weingart, Brett, Olekains, & Smith, 2007). Our literature review identifies a more specific list of social motives likely to emerge in work teams: belonging, shared understanding, control, and self-enhancement.

We propose that these four social motives are prime triggers of emotion in work teams, and that effective team emotion management involves developing norms that help satisfy those motives and, thus, build a productive social and emotional climate.

A third contribution is our meso-level theory that blends individual and team level phenomenon to explain team outcomes. At the individual member-level of the team, our theory focuses on the social motives the team members seek to have satisfied in the team environment and the emotion experienced by these individual members as they act and interact with each other. We also recognize that the interactions and emotions individual members experience in the team do not occur in a vacuum, nor are they random (Morgeson & Hofmann, 1999). They occur within the boundaries of the team and organization and are influenced by the norms and expectations in both. At the team-level, we present the inclusion of the concepts of team culture and team climate. Most theory considers one or the other. In our model, team culture represents the relatively stable norms, values, and routines in a team. The nine emotionally competent norms we present shape behavior focused at the individual-level, team-level, and cross-boundary levels of the team. We propose that the team's climate represents a less stable emergent state in the team that consists of the dynamic team-level cognitive, motivational, and affective conditions that change daily because of the interactions, work behaviors, and achievements of the team and its members as they work together (see Marks, et al., 2001). Culture and climate are linked by the way the nine norms influence the satisfaction of team member social motives.

Practical Implications and Conclusions

Our theory of team emotional competence can serve as a guide to help teams build a productive social and emotional climate that leads to increased cooperation, engagement, and team effectiveness. The focus of much current practice with work teams is frequently on

preventing conflict and dysfunctional emotion. We know that when emotions are suppressed or when individual and team behavior is driven by the avoidance of negative emotion, (e.g., fear or discomfort), unproductive emotions and attitudes do not go away. They often manifest in unproductive behavior. This is particularly true when the emotions stem from unmet social motives. Social motives evolved to enable humans to fit well in groups and, relatedly, to ensure the success of the group (Spoor & Williams, 2007). When these motives are perceived as met, pleasurable emotions are generated (e.g., joy, contentment); when perceived as under threat the team member frequently becomes self-focused in their behavior which can disrupt the team and hurt its performance (Driskel et al., 1999). Finally, team emotional competence promotes team learning and resilience. Both are essential in the fast-paced, complex environments in which many teams work today.

REFERENCES

- Ancona, D. G. 1990. Outward bound: Strategies for team survival in the organization. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33: 334-365.
- Ancona, D. G., Caldwell, D. F. 1992. Bridging the boundary: External activity and performance in organizational teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37: 634-665.
- Andersson, L. M., & Pearson, C. 1999. Tit for Tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review*, 24: 452-471.
- Archer, M. S. 2004. Emotions as commentaries on human concerns. In J. H. Turner (Ed.), *Advances in Group Processes: Theory and Research on Human Emotions*, 21: 327-356. Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science.
- Argyris, C. 1985. *Strategy, change, and defensive routines*. Southport, England: Pitman Publishing.
- Arrow, H. 2007. The sharp end of altruism. *Science*, 318: 581-582.
- Arrow, H., McGrath, J. E., & Berdahl, J. L. 2000. *Small groups as complex systems: Formation, coordination, development, and adaptation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ashkanasy, N. M. 2003. Emotions in organizations: A multilevel perspective. In F. Dansereau & F. J. Yammarino (Eds.), *Research in multi-level issues, vol. 2: Multi-level issues in organizational behavior and strategy*: 9-54. Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science.
- Ashmore, R. D., Deaux, K., & McLaughlin-Volpe, T. 2004. An organizing framework for collective identity: Articulation and significance of multidimensionality. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130(1): 80-114.
- Baldwin, M. W. 1992. Relational schemas and the processing of social information. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(3): 461-484.
- Bales, R. F. 1950. *Interaction process analysis: A method for the study of small groups*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bandura, A. 1997. *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Barrett, L. F., Mesquita, B., Ochsner, K. N., & Gross, J. J. 2007. The experience of emotion. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58: 373-403.
- Barsade, S. B. 2002. The ripple effect: Emotional contagion in groups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47, 644-675.

- Barsade, S. G., Brief, A. P., & Spataro, S. E. 2003. The affective revolution in organizational behavior: The emergence of a paradigm. In G. Greenberg (Ed.), *OB: The state of the science* (2nd. ed.), 3-52. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Barsade, S. G., & Gibson, D. E. 1998. Group emotion: A view from top and bottom. In D. Gruenfeld (Ed.), *Research on managing groups and teams: Composition*, 1: 81-102. Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Bartel, C. A., & Saavedra, R. 2000. The collective construction of work group moods. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45: 197-231.
- Baumeister, R. F. 1999. The self. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed.), 1: 680-740. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Baumeister, R. F. 2005. *The cultural animal: Human nature, meaning, and social life*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Finkenauer, C., & Vohs, K. D. 2001. Bad is stronger than good. *Review of General Psychology*, 5: 323-370.
- Baumeister, R. B., & Exline, J. J. 1999. Virtue, personality and social relations: Self-control as the moral muscle. *Journal of Personality*, 67(6): 1165-1194.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. 1995. The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117: 497-529.
- Bercovitz, J., Jap, S. D., & Nickerson, J. A. 2006. The antecedents and performance implications of cooperative exchange norms. *Organization Science*, 17: 724-740.
- Bergami, M., & Bagozzi, R. P. 2000. Self-categorization, affective commitment, and group self-esteem as distinct aspects of social identity in the organization. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 39: 555-577.
- Boudens, C. J. 2005. The story of work: A narrative analysis of workplace emotion. *Organization Studies*, 26: 1285-1306.
- Brewer, M. B. 1991. The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 17: 475-482.
- Brewer, M. B. 2007. The importance of being we: Human nature and intergroup relations. *American Psychologist*, 62: 728-738.
- Brickson, S. L. 2007. Organizational identity orientation: The genesis of the role of the firm and distinct forms of social value. *Academy of Management Review*. 32: 864-888.

- Brown, S. P., & Leigh, T. W. 1996. A new look at psychological climate and its relationship to job involvement, effort, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(4): 358-368.
- Burningham, C., & West, M. A. 1995. Individual, climate, and group interaction processes as predictors of work team innovation. *Small Group Research*, 26(1): 106-117.
- Cacioppo, J. T., Berntson, G. G., & Decety, J. 2010. Social neuroscience and its relationship to social psychology. *Social Cognition*, 28(6): 675-685.
- Cacioppo, J. T., & Patrick, W. 2008. *Loneliness: Human nature and the need for social connection*. New York: Norton.
- Cacioppo, J. T., Reis, H. T., & Zautra, A. J. 2011. Social resilience: The value of social fitness with an application to the military. *American Psychologist*, 66(1): 43-51.
- Cannon-Bowers, J. A., Salas, E., & Converse, S. 1993. Shared mental models in expert team decision making. In J. Castellan, N. J. (Ed.), *Individual and group decision making*: 221-246. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Canter, N. & Kihlstrom, J. F. 1985. Social intelligence: The cognitive basis of personality. In P. Shaver (Ed.), *Review of Personality and Social Psychology: Vol. 6. Self, situation's, and social behavior*: 15-34. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Carmeli, A., Brueller, D., & Dutton, J. E. 2009. Learning behaviours in the workplace: The role of high-quality interpersonal relationships and psychological safety. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 26(1), 81-98.
- Chatman, J. A. 2010. Norms in mixed sex and mixed race work groups. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 4(1): 447-484.
- Chernyak, N. & Zayas, V. 2010. Being excluded by one means being excluded by all: Perceiving exclusion from inclusive others during one-person social exclusion. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46(3): 582-585.
- Clark, M. S., Fitness, J., & Brissette, I. 2004. Understanding people's perceptions of relationships is crucial to understanding their emotional lives. In M. B. Brewer and M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Emotion and Motivation*. Malden: MA, Blackwell: 21-46.
- Clark, M. S. & Lemay, Jr. E. P. 2010. Close Relationships. In S. T. Fiske, D. T. Gilbert & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology*: 898-940. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Clark, M. S., & Mills, J. 1993. The difference between communal and exchange relationships: What it is and is not. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19: 684-691.

- Cooper, D., & Thatcher, S. M. B. 2010. Identification in organizations: The role of self-concept orientations and identification motives. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(4): 516-538.
- Côté, S., Gyurak, A., & Levenson, R. W. 2010. The ability to regulate emotion is associated with greater well-being, income, and socioeconomic status. *Emotion*, 10(6): 923-933.
- Darley, J. M., & Fazio, R. H. 1980. Expectancy confirmation processes arising in the social interaction sequence. *American Psychologist*, 35: 867-881.
- DeChurch, L. A., & Haas, C. D. 2008. Examining team planning through an episodic lens: Effects of deliberate, contingency, and reactive planning on team effectiveness. *Small Group Research*, 39(5): 542-568.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. 1985. *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. 2000. The what and why of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11: 227-268.
- De Dreu, C., & Weingart, L. 2003. Task versus relationship conflict, team performance, and team member satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88: 741-749.
- De Dreu, C. K. W., & West, M. A. 2001. Minority dissent and team innovation: The importance of participation in decision making. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(6): 1191-1201.
- De Dreu, C. K. W., West, M. A., Fischer, A. H., & MacCurtain, S. 2001. Origins and consequences of emotions in organizational teams. In R. L. Payne, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Emotions at work: Theory, research and applications for management*: 199-217. Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- De Jong, B. A., & Elfring, T. 2010. How does trust affect the performance of ongoing teams? The mediating role of reflectivity, monitoring, and effort. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3): 535-549.
- Deutsch, M. 1973. *The resolution of conflict: Constructive and destructive processes*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- de Wit, F. R. C., Greer, L. L., & Jehn, K. A. 2012. The paradox of intragroup conflict: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(2): 360-390.
- Driskell, J. E., Salas, E., & Johnston, J. 1999. Does stress lead to a loss of team perspective? *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research and Practice*, 3(4): 291-302.
- Druskat, V. U., & Wolff, S. B. 1999. Effects and timing of developmental peer appraisals in self-managing work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(1): 58-74.

- Druskat, V. U., & Wolff, S. B. 2007. Confronting members who break norms: The influence on team effectiveness. In K. J. Behfar & L. L. Thompson, (Eds.), ***Conflict in organizational groups: New directions in theory and practice***: 229 -259. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Dunning, D. 2004. On the motives underlying social cognition. In M. B. Brewer, & M. Hewstone (Eds.), ***Emotion and Motivation***: 137-164. Malen, MA: Blackwell.
- Dutton, J. E., & Heaphy, E. D. 2003. The power of high-quality connections. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), ***Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline***, 263-278. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Edmondson, A. 1999. Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 44(2): 350-383.
- Edmondson, A. C., Dillon, J. R., & Roloff, K. S. 2007. Three perspectives on team learning. ***The Academy of Management Annals***, 1(1): 269-314.
- Eidelson, R. J., & Eidelson, J. I. 2003. Dangerous ideas: Five believes that propel groups toward conflict. ***American Psychologist***, 58(3): 182-192.
- Eisenberger, N. I., & Fabes, R. A. 1990. Empathy: Conceptualization measurement and relation to prosocial behavior. ***Motivation and Emotion***, 14(2): 131-149.
- Ekman, P., & Davidson, R. J. 1994. Afterword: What is the function of emotions? In P. Ekman & R. J. Davidson (Eds.), ***The Nature of emotion: Fundamental questions***: 137-139. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Elfenbein, H. A. 2007. Emotion in organizations. ***The Academy of Management Annals***, 1: 315-386.
- Ellemers, N., De Gilder, D., & Haslam, S. A. 2004. Motivating individuals and groups at work: A social identity perspective on leadership and group performance. ***Academy of Management Review***, 29: 459-478.
- Feldman, D. C. 1984. The development and enforcement of group norms. ***Academy of Management Review***, 9: 47-53.
- Ferguson, E. D. 2000. ***Motivation: A biosocial and cognitive integration of motivation and emotion***. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fineman, S. 1991. ***Emotion and organizing***. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fineman, S. 1996. Emotion and organizing. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, & W. R. Nord (Eds.), ***Handbook of organization studies***: 543–564. London: Sage.

- Fiske, S. T. 2004. *Social beings: A core motives approach to social psychology*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. S. 1988. Coping as a mediator of emotion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54: 466-475.
- Frijda, N. H. 1994. Emotions are functional, most of the time. In P. Ekman, & R. J. Richardson (Eds.), *The nature of emotions*: 112-122. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Frye, C. M., Bennett, R., & Caldwell, S. 2006. Team emotional intelligence and team interpersonal process effectiveness. *Mid-American Journal of Business*, 21(1): 49-56.
- Gabarro, J. J. 1987. The development of working relationships. In J. Lorsch (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational behavior*: 172-189. Englewood, NH: Prentice Hall.
- Gantt, S. P., & Agazarian, Y. M. 2004. Systems-centered emotional intelligence: Beyond individual systems to organizational systems. *Organizational Analysis*, 12(2): 147-169.
- George, J. M. 2002. Affect regulation in groups and teams. In R. G. Lord, R. J. Klimoski, & R. Kanfer (Eds.), *Emotions in the workplace: Understanding the structure and role of emotions in organizational behavior*: 183-217. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- George, J. M., & Zhou, J. 2007. Dual tuning in a supportive context: Joint contributions of positive mood, negative mood, and supervisory behaviors to employee creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(3): 605-622.
- Gersick, C. J. G., & Hackman, J. R. 1990. Habitual routines in task-performing groups. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 47: 65-97.
- Gibson, C. B. 1999. Do they do what they believe they can? Group efficacy and group effectiveness across tasks and cultures. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(2): 138-152.
- Gibson, C. B., & Earley, P. C. 2007. Collective cognition in action: Accumulation, interaction, examination, and accommodation in the development and operation of group efficacy beliefs in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(2): 438-458.
- Granovetter, M. 1985. Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91: 481-510.
- Gully, S. M., Joshi, A., Incalcaterra, K. A., & Beaubien, J. M. 2002. Efficacy, Potency, and Performance: Interdependence and Level of Analysis as Moderators of Observed Relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(5): 819-832.
- Guzzo, R. A., & Dickson, M. W. 1996. Teams in organizations: Recent research on performance and effectiveness. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 47: 307-338.

- Guzzo, R. A., Yost, P. R., Campbell, R. J., & Shea, G. P. 1993. Potency in groups: Articulating a construct. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 32: 87-106.
- Hackman, J. R. 2009. The perils of positivity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30: 309-319.
- Hackman, J. R. 2011. *Collaborative intelligence: Using teams to solve hard problems*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Hackman, J. R., Brousseau, K. R., & Weiss, J. A. 1976. The interaction of task design and group performance strategies in determining group effectiveness. *Organizational behavior and human performance*, 16: 350-365.
- Hare, A. P. 1976. *The handbook of small group research* (2nd ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Hicks, D. 2010. Dignity in forgiveness: Pathways to emotional development. In L. Narvaez (Ed.), *Political culture of forgiveness and reconciliation*: 99-114. Bogota, Columbia: Fundacion Para La Reconciliacion.
- Hirschhorn, L. 1988. *The workplace within*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hogg, M. A., & Terry, D. J. 2000. Social identity and self-categorization processes in organizational contexts. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1): 121-140.
- Hogg, M. A., Turner, J. C., & Davidson, B. 1990. Polarized norms and social frames of reference: A test of the self-categorization theory of group polarization. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 11: 77-100.
- Holmer, L. L. 1994. Developing emotional capacity and organizational health. In R. H. Kilmann, I. Kilmann, & Associates (Eds.), *Managing ego energy: The transformation of personal meaning into organizational success*: 49-72. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Homans, G. 1950. *The human group*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Hornsey, M. J., & Jetten, J. 2004. The individual within the group: Balancing the need to belong with the need to be different. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 8(3): 248-264.
- Huy, Q. N. 1999. Emotional capability, emotional intelligence, and radical change. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(2): 325-345.
- Ilies, R., Wagner, D. T., & Morgeson, F. P. 2007. Explaining affective linkages in teams: Individual differences in susceptibility to contagion and individualism-collectivism. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92: 1140-1148.
- Isen, A. M., & Baron, R. A. 1991. Positive affect as a factor in organizational behavior. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 13: 1-53.

- Jordan, A. H., & Audia, P. G. 2012. Self-enhancement and learning from performance feedback. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(2): 211-231.
- Jordan, P. J., Ashkanasy, N. M., Hartel, C. E. J., & Hooper, G. S. 2002. Workgroup emotional intelligence: Scale development and relationship to team process effectiveness and goal focus. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12: 195-214.
- Jordan, P. J., & Toth, A. C. 2004. Managing emotions during team problem solving: Emotional intelligence and conflict resolution. *Human Performance*, 17(2): 195-218.
- Kahn, W. A. 1990. Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4): 692-724.
- Kahn, W. A. 1992. To be fully there: Psychological presence at work. *Human relations*, 45(4): 321-349.
- Kahn, W. A. 1998. Relational systems at work. In L. L. Cummings, & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, 20: 39-76. Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Karau, S. J., & Williams, K. D. 1993. Social loafing: A meta-analytic review and theoretical integration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65: 681-706.
- Kearney, E., & Gebert, D. 2009. Managing diversity and enhancing team outcomes: The promise of transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94:77-89.
- Kellermanns, F. W., Floyd, S. W., Spencer, B., & Pearson, A. W. 2008. The contingent effect of constructive confrontation on the relationship between shared mental models and decision quality. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29: 119-137.
- Kerr, N. L. & Levine, J. M. 2008. The detection of social exclusion: Evolution and beyond. *Group Dynamics*, 12: 39-52.
- Kerr, N. L. & Tindale, S. R. 2004. Group performance and decision making. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 55: 623-655.
- Kim, H. S., & Sasaki, J. Y. 2014. Cultural Neuroscience: Biology of the Mind in Cultural Contexts. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 65: 487-514.
- Kleinman, A. 1988. *Rethinking psychiatry: From cultural category to personal experience*. New York: The Free Press.
- Klimoski, R., & Mohammed, S. 1994. Team mental model: construct or metaphor. *Journal of Management*, 20: 403-437.
- Kramer, R. M., & Brewer, M. B. 1984. Effects of group identity on resource use in a simulated commons dilemma. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46: 1044-1057.

- Leary, M. R. 2007. Motivational and emotional aspects of the self. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58: 317-344.
- Leary, M. R., & Baumeister, R. F. 2000. The nature and function of self-esteem: Sociometer theory. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 32: 1-62. New York: Academic Press.
- Levy, R. I. 1984. Emotion, knowing, and culture. In R. A. Sweder, & R. A. LeVine (Eds.), *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self, and emotion*: 214-237. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lewin, K. 1936. Principles of topological psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lewis, N. J., & Rees, C. E. 2013. Distributed emotional intelligence. In C. Figley, P. Huggard, & C. E. Rees, *First do no self-harm: Understanding and promoting physician stress resilience*: 5-23. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lieberman, M. D. & Eisenberger, N. I. 2009. Pains and pleasures of social life. *Science*, 323: 890-891.
- Lilius, J. M., Worline, M. C., Dutton, J. E., Kanov, J. M., & Maitlis, S. 2011. Understanding compassion capability. *Human Relations*, 64(7): 873-899.
- Lindebaum, K., & Jordan, P. J. 2014. When it can be good to feel bad and bad to feel good. *Human Relations*, in press.
- Lindsley, D. H., Brass, D. J., & Thomas, J. B. 1995. Efficacy performance spirals: A multilevel perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 20: 645-678.
- Losada, M., & Heaphy, E. 2004. The role of positivity and connectivity in the performance of business teams. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 47(6): 740-765.
- Ludema, J. D., Wilmost, T. B., & Srivastava, S. 1997. Organizational hope: Reaffirming the constructive task of social and organizational inquiry. *Human Relations*, 50: 1015-1052.
- Mackie, D. M., Devos, T. Smith, E. R. 2000. Intergroup emotions: Explaining offensive action tendencies in an intergroup context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79: 602-619.
- Mackie, D. M., Silver, L. A., & Smith, E. R. 2004. Intergroup emotion: Emotion as an intergroup phenomenon. In L. Z. Tiedens, & C. W. Leach (Eds.), *The social life of emotions*: 227-245. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Margolis, J. D., & Molinsky, A. 2008. Navigating the bind of necessary evils: Psychological engagement and the production of interpersonally sensitive behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51: 847-872.

- Marks, M. A., Mathieu, J. E., & Zaccaro, S. J. 2001. A temporally based framework and taxonomy of team processes. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(3): 356-376.
- Marrone, J. A., Tesluk, P. E. & Carson, J. A. 2007. A multi-level investigation of antecedents and consequences to team member boundary-spanning behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50: 1423-1439.
- Martin, J., Knopoff, K., & Beckman C. 1998. An alternative to bureaucratic impersonality and emotional labor: Bounded emotionality at The Body Shop. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43: 429-469.
- Mathieu, J. E., & Schulze, W. 2006. Examining team process: Performance relationships within and across performance episodes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(3): 605-619.
- Mayer, J. D., Roberts, R. D., & Barsade, S. G. 2008. Human abilities: Emotional intelligence. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 59: 507-536.
- McCarthy, E. D. 1989. Emotions are social things: An essay in the sociology of emotions. In D. D. Franks, & E. D. McCarthy (Eds.), *The sociology of emotions: Original essays and research papers*: 51-72. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- McLaughlin, C. 2008. Emotional well-being and its relationship to schools and classrooms: A critical reflection. *British Journal of Guidance & Counseling*, 36(4): 353-366.
- Menon, T., Thompson, L. L., & Choi, H. 2006. Tainted knowledge versus tempting knowledge: People avoid knowledge from internal rivals and seek knowledge from external rivals. *Management Science*, 52: 1129-1144.
- Mignonac, K., & Herrbach, O. 2004. Linking work events, affective states, and attitudes: An empirical study of managers' emotions. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 19(2): 221-240.
- Moreland, R. L. & McMinn, J. G. 2010. Group reflexivity and performance. *Advances in Group Processes*, 27: 63-95.
- Morgeson, F. P., & Hofmann, D. A. 1999. The structure and function of collective constructs: Implications for multilevel research and theory development. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(2): 249-265.
- Mullen, B., & Cooper, C. 1994. The relationship between group cohesiveness and performance: An integration. *Psychological Bulletin*, 115: 210-227.
- Nembhard, I. M., & Edmondson, A. C. 2006. Making it safe: The effects of leader inclusiveness and professional status on psychological safety and improvement efforts in health care teams. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27(7): 941-966.

- Nemeth, C. J. 1994. The value of minority dissent. In A. Mucchi-Faina, A. Maass, & S. Moscovici (Eds.), *Minority influence*: 3-31. Chicago: Nelson Hall.
- Nemeth, C. J., & Staw, B. M. 1989. The tradeoffs of social control and innovation in groups and organizations. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 22: 175-210. New York: Academic Press.
- Niedenthal, P. M., & Brauer, M. 2012. Social functionality of human emotion. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63: 259-285.
- Norris, C. J., & Cacioppo, J. T. 2007. I know how you feel: Social and emotional information processing in the brain. In E. Harmon-Jones & P. Winkielman (Eds.), *Social Neuroscience: Integrating Biological and Psychological Explanations of Social Behavior*: 84-105. New York: Guildford Press.
- Offermann, L. R., Bailey, J. R., Vasilopoulos, N. L., Seal, C., & Sass, M. 2004. The relative contribution of emotional competence and cognitive ability to individual and team performance. *Human Performance*, 17: 219-243.
- Osman, M. 2010. Controlling uncertainty: A review of human behavior in complex dynamic environments. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136(1): 65-86.
- Park, G. Spitzmuller, M. & DeShon, R. P. 2013. Advancing our understanding of team motivation: Integrating conceptual approaches and content areas. *Journal of Management*, 39: 1339-1379.
- Parrott, W. G. 2004. The nature of emotion. In M. B. Brewer, & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Emotion and motivation*: 5-20. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Peterson, C. 2000. The future of optimism. *American Psychologist*, 55: 44-55.
- Pittman, T. S., & Pittman, N. L. 1980. Deprivation of control and the attribution process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39: 377-389.
- Polzer, J. T., Milton, L. P., & Swann Jr., W. B. 2002. Capitalizing on diversity: Interpersonal congruence in small work groups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47(2): 296-324.
- Postmes, T., Spears, R., & Cihangir, S. 2001. Quality of decision-making and group norms. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80(6): 918-930.
- Pratt, M. G. 2003. Disentangling collective identities. In J. T. Polzer (Ed.), *Identity issues in groups*: 161-188. Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science.
- Reis, H. T., Collins, W. A., & Berscheid, E. 2000. The relationship context of human behavior and development. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126(6): 844-872.

- Shepperd, J. A. 1993. Productivity loss in performance groups: A motivation analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113(1): 67-81.
- Ridgeway, C. L. 1987. Nonverbal behavior, dominance, and the basis of status in task groups. *American Sociological Review*, 52: 683-694.
- Rusbult, C. E., & Van Lange, P. A. M. 2003. Interdependence, interaction, and relationships. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54: 351-375.
- Sally, D. 2000. A general theory of sympathy, mind-reading, and social interaction, with an application to the Prisoners' Dilemma. *Social Science Information*, 39(4): 567-634.
- Sanchez-Burks, J., & Huy, Q. N. 2009. Emotional aperture and strategic change: The accurate recognition of collective emotions. *Organization Science*, 20(1): 22-34.
- Schein, E. H. 1992. *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd. ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sedikides, C. & Gregg, A. P. 2008. Self-enhancement: Food for thought. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3: 102-116.
- Sedikides C., & Hepper, E. G. D. 2009. Self-improvement. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 3: 899-917.
- Seligman, M. E. P. 1975. *Helplessness*. San Francisco: Freeman.
- Shapiro, D. L. 2002. Negotiating emotions. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 20: 67-82.
- Shapiro, D. L. 2010. Relational identity theory: A systematic approach for transforming the emotional dimension of conflict. *American Psychologist*, 65(7): 634-645.
- Shea, G. P., & Guzzo, R. A. 1987. Group effectiveness: What really matters? *Sloan Management Review*, 28: 25-31.
- Sherif, M. 1936. *The psychology of social norms*. New York, Harper.
- Sherif, M., & Sherif, C. W. 1953. *Groups in harmony and tension: An integration of studies on intergroup relations*. New York: Octagon.
- Silver, W. S., & Bufanio, K. M. 1996. The impact of group efficacy and group goals on group task performance. *Small Group Research*, 27(3): 347-359.
- Smith, E. R., Murphy, J. & Coats, S. 1999. Attachment to groups: Theory and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(1): 94-110.
- Smith, K. K., & D. N. Berg. 1987. *Paradoxes of group life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Spoor, J. R., & Kelly, J. R. 2004. The evolutionary significance of affect in groups: Communication and group bonding. *Group processes & intergroup relations*, 7(4), 398-412.
- Spoor, J., & Williams, K. D. 2007. The evolution of an ostracism detection system. In J.P. Forgas, M.G. Haselton, & W. von Hippel (Eds.), *The evolution of the social mind: Evolutionary psychology and social cognition*, 279-292.
- Srivastava, A., Bartol, K. M., & Locke, E. A. 2006. Empowering leadership in management teams: Effects on knowledge sharing, efficacy, and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(6), 1239-1251.
- Staw, B. M., Sandelands, L. E., & Dutton, J. E. 1981. Threat-rigidity effects in organizational behavior: A multilevel analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26: 501-524.
- Steiner, I. D. 1972. *Group process and productivity*. New York, Academic Press.
- Swann, W. B. 1987. Identity negotiation: Where two roads meet. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53: 1038-1051.
- Swann Jr., W. B., Polzer, J. T., Seyle, D. C., & Ko, S. J. 2004. Finding value in diversity: Verification of personal and social self-views in diverse groups. *Academy of Management Review*, 29(1): 9-27.
- Swidler, A. 1986. Culture in action: Symbols and strategies. *American sociological review*, 51: 273-286.
- Sy, T., Côté, S., & Saavedra, R. 2005. The contagious leader: Impact of the leader's mood on the mood of group members, group affective tone, and group processes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(2), 295-305.
- Tajfel, H. 1982. *Social identity and intergroup relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tajfel, H., M. Billig, R. P. Bundy, and C. Flament. 1971. Social categorization and intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 1: 149-77.
- Tasa, K., Taggar, S., & Seijts, G. H. 2007. The development of collective efficacy in teams: A multilevel and longitudinal perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92: 17-27.
- Tesser, A. 2004. Self-esteem. In M. B. Brewer, & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Motivation and emotion*: 184-203. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

- Thatcher, S. M. B., & Greer, L. L. 2008. Does it really matter if you recognize who I am? The implications of identity comprehension for individuals in work teams. *Journal of Management*, 34(1): 5-24.
- Troth, A. C., Jordan, P. J., Lawrence, S. A., & Tse, H. H. 2012. A multilevel model of emotional skills, communication performance, and task performance in teams. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33(5), 700-722.
- Turner, M. E., & Horvitz, T. 2001. The dilemma of threat: Group effectiveness and ineffectiveness under adversity. In M. E. Turner (Ed.), *Groups at work: Theory and research*: 445-470. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Tyler, T. R., & Blader, S. L. 2001. Identity and cooperative behavior in groups. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 4(3): 207-226.
- Twenge, J. M., Baumeister, R. F., DeWall, N. Ciarocco, N. J., Bartels, J. M. 2007. Social exclusion decreases prosocial behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92: 56-66.
- Twenge, J. M., Catanese, K. R., & Baumeister, R. F. 2002. Social exclusion causes self-defeating behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 8: 606-615.
- van Ginkel, W. P. & van Kippenberg, D. 2008. Group information elaboration and group decision making: The role of shared task representations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 108(1): 82-97.
- Van Der Vegt, G., & Bunderson, J. S. 2005. Learning and performance in multidisciplinary teams: The importance of collective team identification. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(3): 532-547.
- Vignoles, V. L., Regalia, C., Manzi, C., Golledge, J., & Scabini, E. 2006. Beyond self-esteem: Influence of multiple motives on identity construction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(2): 308-333.
- Weick, K. E., & Roberts, K. H. 1993. Collective mind in organizations: Heedful interrelating on flight decks. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38: 357-381.
- Weingart, L. R. 1992. Impact of group goals, task component complexity, effort, and planning on group performance. *Journal of applied psychology*, 77(5), 682.
- Weiss, H., & Cropanzano, R. 1996. Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes, and consequences of affective experiences at Work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 18: 1-74.
- West, M. 1996. Reflexivity and work group effectiveness: a conceptual integration. In M.A. West (Ed.), *Handbook of work group psychology*: 555-579. Chichester, UK: John Wiley.

Wilder, D. & A. F. Simon 2004. Affect as a cause of intergroup bias. In M. B. Brewer & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Emotion and Motivation*. Malden: MA, Blackwell: 113-132.

Williams, K. D. 2007. Ostracism. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58: 425-452.

TABLE 1
Definition of Emotionally Competent Norms

Level	Emotionally Competent Norms	Behaviors	Social Motive Satisfied	Productive Social and Emotional Climate
Individual	Interpersonal Understanding	Actions to build an accurate understanding of each member's unique attributes and priorities including: strengths, weaknesses, interests, values, job, and goals.	Belonging Shared Understanding Self-Enhancement	<div style="display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> <div style="border-left: 1px solid black; height: 100%; margin-right: 5px;"></div> <div style="display: flex; flex-direction: column; align-items: center;"> <div style="margin-bottom: 10px;">→ Team Psychological Safety</div> <div style="margin-bottom: 10px;">→ Team Identity</div> <div>→ Team Efficacy</div> </div> </div>
	Addressing Counterproductive Behavior	Actions to address and discuss member behavior that goes against agreed upon norms of productive behavior in the team, or that is considered by team members to be harmful to team effectiveness.	Belonging Control Self-Enhancement	
	Caring Behavior	Actions to convey appreciation to team members by treating them with respect and kindness and by supporting their needs and efforts.	Belonging Control Self-Enhancement	
Team	Team Self-Evaluation	Periodically assess the effectiveness of its processes and performance including its strengths, weaknesses, routines and habits that are helping or hurting team functioning and goal achievement.	Shared Understanding	
	Creating Emotion Resources	Members create and use resources that enable emotions to surface and get discussed (e.g., time, common language, tools).	Shared Understanding	
	Encouraging Optimism	Encouraging engagement in behavior that leads members to interpret day-to-day and larger challenges in a hopeful, optimistic manner.	Control	
	Proactive Problem Solving	Proactive actions to anticipate potential challenges or problems and to prevent or address them.	Control	
Cross-Boundary	Organizational Understanding	Actions to build understanding of the social and political system of which the group is a part.	Shared Understanding	
	Building External Relations	Actions to build relationships with groups and individuals outside the group.	Control	

FIGURE 1
A Theoretical Framework for Team-level Emotional Competence (EC)

