*Corresponding author: Rashmi Y Pai, Department of Commerce, Manipal Academy of Higher Education, Manipal, India
E-mail: rashmi.pai@manipal.edu

Reviewing editor:
Yogesh Pai P, Manipal Institute of Management, Manipal Academy of Higher Education, Manipal, India

Additional information is available at the end of the article

GENERAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS | RESEARCH ARTICLE

Underlying assumptions in team effectiveness research: An application of problematization methodology

Nandan Prabhu K.P.[2], Rashmi Y Pai[1]* and Abhishek S Rao K. P.[1]

Abstract: This paper examines current assumptions underlying the team effectiveness literature so as to propose alternative assumptions. Problematization methodology was used to problematize the existing assumptions. Integral Framework was applied to categorize constructs of team effectiveness literature. Alternative assumptions were proposed along with a discussion on their theory generation potential and the potential audience to whom these assumptions would be of benefit. Results of the application of problematization methodology and integral framework have problematized the three current assumptions, i.e. "experienced meaningfulness", "outside-in" view of team processes, and the impact of "structure on behavior" of team members. Alternative assumptions of "felt meaningfulness", inside-out' view of team processes, and the impact of "culture of leadership on behavior" of team members have resulted in relevant research propositions. Limitations and directions for future research are discussed along with theoretical and managerial implications.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Dr. Rashmi Y. Pa is an Associate Professor at Department of Commerce, Manipal Academy of Higher Education, Manipal. Her research interests are in the domain of human resource management and organizational behavior.

Dr. Nandan Prabhu K. P. is an Associate Professor at Manipal Institute of Management, Manipal Academy of Higher Education, Manipal, India. His research interest is in the areas of leadership, workplace spirituality, and team effectiveness. He is currently working on his research on the impact of team transformation leadership on facilitating knowledge sharing through workplace spirituality and trust within teams.

Abhishek S Rao K.P. is an Assistant Professor-Senior Scale at Department of Commerce, Manipal Academy of Higher Education, Manipal. His research interest is organizational behavior in services, service recovery.

In this research, the authors have attempted to integrate transformation leadership, workplace spirituality, and team effectiveness unveiling the underlying assumptions in team effectiveness research discourse.

PUBLIC INTEREST STATEMENT

The objective of this paper is to explore the underlying assumptions in team effectiveness research. For this, this paper examines four types of antecedents of team effectiveness, i.e. team composition constructs, team context constructs, work design constructs, and team process constructs. Adopting the problematization methodology, this paper analyses the underlying assumptions in five categories, i.e. in-house assumptions, root metaphors, paradigms, ideological assumptions, and field assumptions. Further, the antecedent constructs are categorized in accordance with the Integral Framework of Ken Wilber. Accordingly, this paper has made a case for the influence of team culture on team members' behavior, the importance of felt meaningfulness, and the role of inside-out perspective of team processes. Accordingly, the paper has called for going beyond the existing assumptions such as the influence of structure on behavior, the experienced meaningfulness as the basis of internal motivation, and the preeminence of outside-in perspective of team processes.

cogent ·· economics & finance

Subjects: Work & Organizational Psychology; Development Theory; Business, Management and Accounting

Keywords: Transformational leadership; workplace spirituality; team effectiveness; team motivation

1. Introduction

There is an emerging need for working in teams in the corporate world due to changing business scenario (Hackman, 1987). Prior research (Hackman, 2002) has shown that successful teams come into being as a result of several factors such as supportive context (Duygulu & Ciraklar, 2009; Hackman, 1987), team structure (Hackman, 2002), team leader's support (Bishop, Scott, & Burroughs, 2000; McClurg, 2001; Morgeson, DeRue, & Karam, 2010) etc. Literature on team effectiveness has laid varying emphasis on organizational factors (Gilson, Mathieu, Shalley, & Ruddy, 2005; Tarricone & Luca, 2002), work design factors (Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Mathieu, Maynard, Rapp, & Gilson, 2008; Tarricone & Luca, 2002), and team composition factors (Bell, 2007; Hirschfeld, Jordan, Field, Giles, & Armenakis, 2006; Humphrey, Morgeson, & Mannor, 2009; Othman, Abdullah, & Ahmad, 2009) while explaining why teams work and attain effectiveness. In this regard, literature on team effectiveness (Hackman, 2002) has viewed it as a function of enabling conditions, as also to be the result of causal frameworks (Gladstein, 1984). In this connection, this paper has concentrated on variables relating to work teams while examining the constructs relating to both causal frameworks and diagnostic models of team effectiveness.

Teams, as opposed to individuals, are being increasingly recognized as the building blocks of organizations (Guzzo & Shea, 1992). Therefore, teamwork effectiveness has gained the attention of the research community. Though the issue of team effectiveness is viewed as a function of enabling conditions (Hackman, 2002), there are also attempts at building causal models of team effectiveness (Campion, Medsker, & Higgs, 1993; Gladstein, 1984). These models of team effectiveness have either considered antecedent constructs at all three levels of analysis, i.e. individual, group, and organization (Campion et al., 1993) or have primarily adopted an "outside-in" approach to team effectiveness by considering only the enablers of team effectiveness (Hackman, 1987), especially in diagnostic models of team effectiveness. "Outside-in approach" refers to those factors that are external to teams, which exercise their impact on the effectiveness of teams. "Inside-out" approach to team effectiveness refers to those factors which are characterized as "emergent states" in team process literature (Marks, Mathieu, & Zaccaro, 2001), which are, however, not limited to mediating variables but also include the antecedent factors of team effectiveness.

Further, the leadership styles that aim at inducing teamwork effectiveness have also emphasized the "inducement-reward" exchange paradigm (Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). Therefore, there exists a need to study how the augmentation of efforts of team members can be facilitated by going beyond the "outside-in approach" to team effectiveness. In this regard, this paper considers team level factors such as those of team interaction process and workplace spirituality so as to explore the comparative mediating roles of team processes, induced by team transformational leadership, on team effectiveness. It is worth noting, in this connection, that the prior research on the effect of team processes on team effectiveness hasn't examined the "process effect" of workplace spirituality on team effectiveness.

Team processes are conceptualized, in this paper, in two constructs, i.e. team interaction process and workplace spirituality. 'Team interaction process'constructs represents the "outside-in" approach to bring about teamwork whereas "workplace spirituality" represents the "inside-out" approach to "felt meaningfulness" and the consequent intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2008) that the team members experience. In this context, there is a paucity of research on the comparative evaluation of "outside-in" and "inside-out" perspectives of team processes. Furthermore, the idea of team leadership is contended to be vested in not just the designated team leader but also in team members

(Sivasubramaniam, Murry, Avolio, & Jung, 2002). As there is a paucity of literature that examines the dominant assumptions in team effectiveness research, this paper examines current assumptions and proposes alternative assumptions based on which it makes testable research propositions.

The purpose of this critical review of the literature on team effectiveness is to identify the existing assumptions in the team effectiveness literature. This paper has problematized those assumptions in order to propose alternative assumptions based on which team effectiveness research can make further advances. In this regard, this paper critiques four strands of team effectiveness literature, namely, 'team composition, "team context", "team process" and "work design" constructs. Further, this paper examines the literature on transformational leadership so as to build a possible conceptual relationship between team transformational leadership and team effectiveness. Furthermore, this paper explores the literature on team processes to find out the mediating construct that matches with the essential theme that underlies the concept of transformational leadership, i.e. self-interest transcendence. In this regard, workplace spirituality is shown to be the appropriate mediating construct that represents "inside-out" mediating process, which can also act as a source of "inside-out" kind of team motivation. Accordingly, this paper addresses the need for viewing leadership from the team-exchange perspective so that the notion of shared leadership can be operationalized at the team level.

2. Literature review

We would begin, in this process of literature review, with the review of team effectiveness literature so as to examine antecedents of team effectiveness. In this regard, we focus primarily on team "composition" and team "context" constructs in order to identify the underlying assumptions in these domains of team effectiveness literature as also to come up with alternative assumptions. Second, we also focus on the process constructs of input-process-output framework of team effectiveness literature. In this regard, we have attempted to identify the dominant assumption that characterizes team "process" constructs. Further, we would point out alternative assumptions and articulate appropriate constructs so as to conceptualize those "process" constructs which give rise to incremental "process" effects. Lastly, we review the "work design" constructs so as to analyze the standpoint of prior research on the nature of the source of internal work motivation. Having identified the articulation of the source of work motivation, we provide an alternative viewpoint on the nature of motivation which contributes to team effectiveness. In this regard, we make use of integral mapping model of Wilber (2002) in order to identify the existing assumptions in order to propose alternative assumptions.

2.1. Methodology of literature review

This paper's originality stems from its attempt to identify the underlying assumptions of team effectiveness literature. Adopting the method of literature review suggested by Alvesson and Sandberg (2011), this paper has evolved research propositions. Alvesson and Sandberg (2011) argue that a theory becomes interesting when it challenges the existing assumptions. However, the gap-spotting process (Daft & Lewin, 2008), through which researchers try to advance knowledge, constrains (Sandberg & Alvesson, 2011) the task of challenging the existing assumptions. Therefore, the knowledge in a given research area advances incrementally without making either significant contributions or leading to a new theory (Davis, 1986). Therefore, prior research on the process of generating research questions has proposed problematization methodology (Alvesson & Sandberg, 2011) which we can apply in social sciences in general, and management in particular. Accordingly, this research endeavor has adopted the problematization methodology to generate relevant research propositions.

The problematization methodology of generating research objectives or research propositions consists of six steps (Alvesson & Sandberg, 2011). First, we identify an area of prior research literature and choose the key ideas and texts for our investigation. Second, we identify the underlying assumptions that exist within the relevant literature domain. Third, we enquire whether it is worthwhile to challenge the existing assumptions. Fourth, we develop alternative assumptions. Fifth, we analyze the broader audience for whom the existing and challenged assumptions make sense. Lastly, we enquire whether there exists any possibility of developing a theory based on alternative assumptions which may be of interest to the target group of audience.

cogent ·· economics & finance

As regards the underlying assumptions to be challenged, this research endeavor has identified the underlying assumptions in team effectiveness literature based on a typology of assumptions (Alvesson & Sandberg, 2011). This typology consists of those assumptions which are termed as (a) in-house assumptions, (b) root metaphors, (c) paradigms, (d) ideological assumptions, and (e) field assumptions. This study has identified a few of these assumptions in the team effectiveness literature. In this regard, these assumptions are identified and challenged in accordance with the above-mentioned problematization methodology so as to develop its research propositions.

This paper situates the constructs, used in prior research, on team effectiveness in accordance with the scheme of categorization of knowledge streams as proposed by the integral mapping model of Wilber (2002). The "integral mapping model" categorizes not only the academic knowledge streams but also the worldviews into two main levels, i.e. left-hand vs. right-hand paths, and individual and collective levels. This model is helpful to situate different levels of analysis and categories of constructs. To state the implications of the model, in essence, it looks upon reality as both interpretive and positivistic which exist at individual and collective levels. Accordingly, reality/knowledge categories are articulated in a manner that they fall within individual and collective interior domains that originate from interpretive/hermeneutic view of reality, and individual and collective exterior domains that emanate from positivistic/empirical view of reality. While the interior domain explains interpretatively the ideological view of individual and collective "consciousness", the individual and collective "exterior" views of reality address the "form" of reality in "exterior" domains, even as the "reality" is interpreted as "out there" in accordance with the "realist" philosophical school.

Integral mapping model categorizes all theorists across knowledge disciplines into four broad quadrants, i.e. individual interior, individual exterior, collective interior, and collective exterior. While the individual exterior and collective exterior quadrants capture the theories that have emerged from an empirical and positivistic perspective, the individual interior and collective interior quadrants tap the theories that have emanated from an interpretive or hermeneutic perspective. This paper has categorized constructs used in prior research on team effectiveness in accordance with the integral mapping model, along the four quadrants that are noted above. This categorization is particularly useful from the viewpoint of examining the antecedents and mediators of team effectiveness process in terms of levels of analysis, i.e. individual, group and organization.

2.2. Antecedents of team effectiveness: team "composition" constructs

We have chosen team "composition" and team "context" constructs, among several categories of antecedents, for identifying the underlying assumptions. Team "composition" and "context" constructs constitute the "structural" constructs or the enabling conditions of team effectiveness. Prior research on team "composition" constructs has investigated the structural/situational variables such as size of teams (Curral, Forrester, & Dawson, 2001; Liden, Wayne, & Jaworski, 2004), member preferences (Kiffin-Petersen & Cordery., 1998; Shaw, Duffy, & Stark, 2000), allocating roles (Humphrey et al., 2009), member flexibility (Sundstrom, de Meuse, & Futrell, 1990), and diversity and size (Campion et al., 1993; Horwitz & Horwitz, 2007; Joshi, 2006; Joshi & Roh, 2009; Shin & Zhou, 2007; Van Der Vegt, Bunderson, & Oosterhof, 2006). Further, prior research has also investigated several behavioral/perceptual/cognitive constructs such as abilities of members (Colquitt, Hollenbeck, & Ilgen, 2002; LePine, 2003; Moon et al., 2004) and personality (Hirschfeld et al., 2006; Humphrey et al., 2009).

Among the above-mentioned constructs, the constructs at the individual level are abilities of members (Hirschfeld et al., 2006), personality (Humphrey et al., 2009), member preferences (Kiffin-Petersen & Cordery., 1998), affect (Tanghe, Wisse, & Van Der Flier, 2010), and cognition (Bertua, Anderson, & Salgado, 2004); the constructs at the group level are size of teams (Liden et al., 2004), allocating roles (Humphrey et al., 2009), member flexibility (Sundstrom et al., 1990), diversity and size (Horwitz & Horwitz, 2007; Joshi & Roh, 2009), conflict (Wagner-johnson, 1995), collaboration (Peters & Manz, 2007), cohesiveness (Stashevsky & Koslowsky, 2006), and norms (Cohen, Ledford,

cogent ·· economics & finance

& Spreitzer, 1996). Hackman (2002) views "team composition" constructs as consisting of constructs at both individual and team levels. While task skills and interpersonal skills are constructs at the individual level, the constructs such as team size and mix of heterogeneity and homogeneity among team members are constructs at the group level. Hackman (2002) categorizes these constructs under the category of "enabling team structure" in his theory of enabling conditions of teamwork effectiveness. Therefore, these constructs fall within the framework of the "outside-in" approach to team effectiveness. Obviously, this approach doesn't consider self-interest transcendence as the cultural constructs do. In this regard, the "composition" constructs are grouped as shown in Table 1 from the standpoint of integral mapping model.

The literature on team effectiveness has shown that team size, team mix, and interpersonal skills of team members exercise their influence on team effectiveness (Hackman, 2002). Accordingly, the root metaphor that we find in the literature domain of team "composition" is that "the more is not the better", implying thereby that effecting an increase in the number of team members does not necessarily lead to increase in team effectiveness. Further, the essential individual nature of interpersonal skills cannot be challenged. Therefore, this research endeavor does not challenge the existing categories of these assumptions except that of the paradigmatic assumption which argues that the "exterior or structure influences behavior" of team members.

The paradigmatic assumption that exists in the prior literature on "team composition" is that the "structure influences behavior of team members". For example, the construct of "team size" is a structural variable that belongs to the domain of team structure (Hackman, 2002) or what are called to be the "composition" constructs (Campion et al., 1993). Prior research, in this regard, has shown that optimum team size reduces social loafing (Latane, Williams, & Harkins, 1979). However, team size is a structural construct and, therefore, the underlying assumption is that the "structure" influences "behavior" of team members. The issue of mix, i.e. heterogeneity

Table 1. Antecedents of team effectiveness: Team "composition" constructs	
Interior quadrants	**Exterior quadrants**
• Interpretative	• Monological
• Hermeneutic	• Empirical, positivistic
• Consciousness	• Form
Individual interior	**Individual exterior**
Cognitive/Perceptual constructs	**Behavioral constructs**
• Abilities of members (Hirschfeld et al., 2006) • Member preferences (Kiffin-Petersen & Cordery., 1998) • Emotional intelligence (Othman et al., 2009) • Dimensions of the big five model (Quigley & Gardner, 2007) • Personality (Brandt & Edinger, 2015)	• Member flexibility (Sundstrom et al., 1990) • Member diversity (Hackman, 2002)
Collective interior	**Collective exterior Structural constructs** • Size of teams (Liden et al., 2004) • Allocating roles (Humphrey et al., 2009
In-house—assumption Size, mix, and interpersonal skills enable team effectiveness	**Paradigm** "Exterior" or "structure" enables the "interior"
Root—metaphor "The more is not the better", in team context	**Field assumption** Interpersonal skills are essentially individual in nature

Source: The table is constructed by the author based on the integral mapping model of Wilber (2002).

and homogeneity (Campion et al., 1993) also revolves around the assumption of the influence of "team structure on behavior" of team members. Further, the inherent assumption regarding interpersonal skills, though counterproductive if not erroneous, that homogeneity of beliefs, attitudes, and behavior among team members is conducive to team functioning rests on the premise that a homogenous "structure" of team members contributes to effective team functioning. This idea doesn't discuss the impact of team culture, which may accommodate even the deviant behavior as it can positively contribute to overall team objectives (Hackman, 2002). Even as the diversity in terms of gender and race is found to have no relationship with team performance (Joshi & Roh, 2009), the diversity as regards function, education, and expertise is found to be correlated with team performance (Bell, Villado, Lukasik, Belau, & Briggs, 2011; Horwitz & Horwitz, 2007). However, the "composition" constructs such as function, education, and expertise are acquired abilities and skills. They do not describe either the "internal" traits or "behavior". Thus, it is obvious that "team composition" constructs have an underlying assumption that the "team structure influences behavior" of team members. In other words, this category of antecedent constructs has rarely considered any construct that belongs to the quadrant of "collective interior" domain, which captures "cultural" constructs as an antecedent of team effectiveness.

2.3. Antecedents of team effectiveness: team "context" constructs

The second set of antecedent constructs that provide a structural platform for team effectiveness belongs to the category of organizational "context" constructs. Team effectiveness models, in prior research, have dwelt on organizational "context" constructs to explain team effectiveness. For example, the normative model of design of work teams proposed by prior research (Hackman, 1987) on team effectiveness discusses three broad "context" constructs, i.e. the reward system that leads to augmentation of team members' efforts, the educational system that decides the degree of sufficiency of knowledge and skills of team members, and the information system that ensures the presence of reflexivity in team functioning, or dynamic performance strategy. All these constructs belong to the organizational level and, therefore, teams have less control over them. Hackman (1987) argues that the presence of real teams, providing compelling direction, and creating an enabling structure can be likened to the process of creation of a conducive platform for enabling teamwork effectiveness. As teams don't work in a vacuum but do so in an organizational context (Ancona & Caldwell, 1992), organizations are expected to provide teams the supportive context that consists of the reward system, information system, and educational system (Hackman, 2002).

The input-process-output framework for assessing the group behavior and performance (McGrath, 1984) articulates that inputs of team effectiveness models can be categorized along three levels of factors, i.e. individual, group, and environmental. Applying this framework to categorize the "context" variables, it can be inferred that the individual-level variables are leadership roles (Duygulu & Ciraklar, 2009) and transformational leadership (Burns, 1978); the environmental level variables are adequate resources (Bishop et al., 2000), leadership and structure (Carson, Tesluk, & Marrone, 2007; Chen, Kirkman, Kanfer, Allen, & Rosen, 2007; DeChurch & Marks, 2006; Duygulu & Ciraklar, 2009; LaFasto & Larson, 2001; Mathieu, Gilson, & Ruddy, 2006; Srivastava, Bartol, & Locke, 2006), performance evaluation and reward system (McClurg, 2001), informational system and education system (Hackman, 1987); and the group level variables are team leadership and climate of trust (Dirks, 2000). Accordingly, team "context" constructs can be categorized, in accordance with the integral mapping model, as shown in Table 2:

All categories of assumptions underlying team "context" literature, which are mentioned above, are interlinked. As the field assumption of this domain of team effectiveness consists in viewing human beings as essentially rational beings, the presence of "reward-performance" linkage implies that human beings adopt the attitude of "work for pay" and, therefore, the essential paradigmatic assumption in this domain of team effectiveness literature is that the organizational or "team structure influences behavior" of team members.

cogent · · economics & finance

Table 2. Antecedents of team effectiveness: Team "context" constructs	
Interior quadrants	**Exterior quadrants**
• Interpretative	• Monological
• Hermeneutic	• Empirical, positivistic
• Consciousness	• Form
	Behavioral constructs
	• Leadership roles (Duygulu & Ciraklar, 2009)
	• Transformational leadership (Burns, 1978)
Collective interior	**Collective exterior:**
Situational constructs	**Structural constructs**
• Climate of trust (Dirks, 2000)	• Adequate resources (Bishop et al., 2000)
• Team leadership (Kuo, 2004)	• Performance evaluation and reward systems (McClurg, 2001)
In-house—assumption "Reward-performance" exchanges	**Paradigm** "Exterior" enables the "interior"
Root—metaphor "Work for Pay"; "Give and take"	**Field assumption** Human beings are essentially rational

Source: The table is constructed by the author based on the integral mapping model of Wilber (2002).

Team "context" constructs address structural variables as well as "internal" variables including those that belong to the cultural/collective interior domain. While the constructs such as leadership roles (Duygulu & Ciraklar, 2009) and transformational leadership (Burns, 1978) are behavioral constructs, the constructs such as educational system (Hackman, 2002) and information system are structural in nature. Structural constructs such as adequate resources (Bishop et al., 2000), performance evaluation and reward systems (McClurg, 2001) are essentially those constructs that pertain to "outside—in" approach to explain group performance. They become effective only if the underlying premise regarding the nature of human beings as being merely instrumental, calculative, and rational is completely true. The idea of the instrumentality of human nature neglects emotional side of human beings, especially the presence of intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2008). Therefore, it is necessary to invoke both "outside-in" and "inside-out" approaches to bring about transformational effects on team members. Thus, this calls for exploration of cultural constructs that belong to the "collective interior" domain in order to explain team effectiveness. Thus, though the "team context" constructs encompass both "structural" and "internal" perceptual constructs, the dominant assumption that underlies "context" constructs is the influence of "structure on behavior".

2.4. Influence of culture on behavior: conceptualization of an alternative assumption
On an observation of the categories within which "context" constructs find themselves in, we can infer that they address essentially the impact of "structure" on "behavior", except the collective interior constructs of trust and team leadership. Therefore, it is apparent that they do not address the issue of the impact of "culture on behavior" or the impact of "collective interior" on "collective exterior", which implies the influence of "culture" that exists within teams on "team effectiveness", a construct that belongs to the quadrant of collective exterior, if the construct of team effectiveness is conceptualized essentially as a "structural" construct. Therefore, the alternative paradigmatic assumption, that we propose, is that the "culture influences behavior" of team members as an alternative to the existing assumption, i.e. "structure influences behavior" of team members.

Transformational leadership, among the constructs discussed so far, has the potential to exercise its impact on teams (Bass & Avolio, 1996) so as to inspire felt meaningfulness and internalized intrinsic motivation (Dehler & Welsh, 1994) among team members in order to bring about team

effectiveness. The essence of research findings, in this regard, can be found in the theory of enabling conditions of teamwork effectiveness (Hackman, 2002). There are several insights, which the theory of enabling conditions of teamwork effectiveness provides us on the influence of leadership on team effectiveness.

First, team effectiveness literature observes the pervasive presence of leadership attribution error while analyzing teams' performance. Successes or failures of work teams are attributed to leaders of work teams even while team members' functioning might have caused teamwork effectiveness (Meindl, Ehrlich, & Dukerich, 1985). Thus, the idea of leadership is situated within the "individual exterior" quadrant as leadership is interpreted to be vested in individuals and, therefore, is a function of their organizational position. Consequently, the high degree of leadership attribution error forces us to view leaders' inaction as the cause of team's success though the same should have been attributed to team's sense of responsibility towards its work. It is only when it is impossible to establish conclusively the success or failure of team performance that the leader attribution error does not surface (Hackman, 2002). However, this is not to deny the role that the team leaders play in determining their teams' success or failure. The debated issue, in this context, is whether leader behavior is the cause of member behavior or vice versa. It is quite probable that member behavior might also be the cause of leader behavior. Therefore, it is argued that leader behavior styles cannot be conclusively proved to be the cause of teamwork effectiveness. Accordingly, it is increasingly held that leadership behaviors that the entire team displays determine the degree of team effectiveness (Sivasubramaniam et al., 2002).

Second, the theory of enabling conditions of teamwork effectiveness argues that team effectiveness is not even a function of leader traits as no single trait can be held as the cause of follower behavior (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994). Moreover, different situations require the display of different traits, the complexity of which is difficult to assimilate and practice. The same is true of behavior styles too (Fleishman & Hunt, 1973). Furthermore, it is well-learnt behavior that surfaces in situations of crisis rather than any leader behavior style which might have been taught in a training program (Hackman, 2002). However, this is not to argue that behavioral styles of leadership are not relevant or effective. What is, in fact, implied is that it requires cognitive programming of leaders' way of thinking about situations in order to practice the most appropriate leadership behavioral style that may be contextually relevant for the dynamically changing organizational, business situations. Therefore, Hackman (2002) proposes that leaders can work on enabling conditions and organizational context factors in order to apply a stabilized approach to facilitate teamwork effectiveness instead of concentrating on real time readjustments in task work processes and teamwork processes.

As regards the specific leadership styles that leaders need to adopt in getting the work done through their team members, Hackman (2002) argues that any leadership behavior style which suits particularly to a team leader will suffice as long as ends are reached. Therefore, Hackman (2002) contends that the principle of equifinality becomes applicable on this issue. The principle of equifinality states that you can reach an end through several paths and, therefore, what matters more is reaching the end rather than considering only the comparative merits and demerits of specific paths.

2.5. Team-member exchange and team leadership

The literature on leadership describes two perspectives on leadership, i.e. leader-focused perspective and team-member exchange perspective (Bass, 1985; Cogliser & Schriesheim, 2000). Leader-focused perspective views leadership as consisting in an individual. Therefore, organizational designation decides the position of an individual as a leader. However, team-member exchange perspective interprets leadership as essentially a collective concept (Seers, 1989). Therefore, this perspective interprets leadership as a collective, cultural construct that belongs to the "collective interior" domain. The concept of team-member exchange discusses precisely the idea of leadership as a collective concept.

Team-member exchange is the perceived exchange with team members (Seers, 1989). The idea of team-member exchange is, therefore, similar to the team's sense of community that signifies high-quality team-member exchange (Sivasubramaniam et al., 2002). Accordingly, team-member exchange perspective views leadership as a function of dyadic and team relationship. Arguing that leadership can be found in either individuals or a group, researchers postulate team leadership to be a social influence process whereby team members influence each other (House & Aditya, 1997). Therefore, it connotes "within team" behaviors as a result of which there arise team identity and motivation (Sivasubramaniam et al., 2002). Furthermore, it is argued that the "peer leadership" exercises greater influence on performance than the influence that an individual leader exercises. Accordingly, this kind of conceptualization of leadership is termed as collective leadership behavior, which might be present in the entire work unit (House & Aditya, 1997). Therefore, the theoretical basis of the concept of team leadership is that it is inappropriate to define leadership in collaborative and teamwork contexts as consisting in one person alone. Therefore, it is argued that leader effectiveness and the related findings can be applied to team leadership also (Sivasubramaniam et al., 2002).

As regards the types of team leadership, four types of team leadership are identified by prior research on team leadership based on its dimensions of locus of leadership and formality of leadership. These types of team leadership are internal formal leadership, external formal leadership, internal informal leadership, and external informal leadership (Morgeson, DeRue, & Karam, 2010). Among these types of team leadership, informal internal leadership is what constitutes the idea of team transformational leadership.

Team transformational leadership represents the presence of the "culture" of transformational leadership that may be prevalent among team members. Therefore the construct of team transformational leadership does not view leadership as an organizational designation and, therefore, as a structural construct. Obviously, this implies that leadership is not viewed as being vested in an individual. Alternatively, the assumption of the presence of leadership in the entire team is implied by the construct of team transformational leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1996). Accordingly, the following research proposition has been framed:

Proposition 1: *The higher the degree of culture of transformational leadership among team members, the greater would be the team effectiveness that manifests itself in the forms of individual well-being of team members and their shared social skills.*

2.6. Team effectiveness models: team processes

Team effectiveness models can be categorized primarily (Hackman, 1987) as "teamwork characteristics" models (LaFasto & Larson, 2001) and "input-process-output" (IPO) models of team effectiveness. While the "teamwork effectiveness characteristics" models speak of the essential characteristics required for teamwork, the "input-process-output" framework of team effectiveness deliberates on antecedents, mediators, and moderators of team effectiveness. Normative team effectiveness model of Hackman (1987) speaks of group interaction as a process construct that facilitates team effectiveness. There are several "process" constructs that the prior research on "IPO"(Input-process-output) framework of the team effectiveness models examines, among which there are structural as well as perceptual variables. These constructs have an underlying outside-in approach, as for example, Hackman (1987) argues that team effectiveness is a function of enabling conditions more than that of causal factors.

However, the theory of enabling conditions of teamwork effectiveness, proposed by Hackman (1987), interprets the construct of team interaction process as consisting of effort, performance strategy, and utilization of knowledge and development of skills of team members (Wageman, Hackman, & Lehman, 2005). Group interaction, as a process construct that gives rise to several "team-process" variables, points towards how well a team is performing and, therefore, is an indicator of team effectiveness. Secondly, it is also a pointer towards "group synergy" (Hackman, 1987) which talks about the excess of team output over the sum of individual outputs.

Team interaction process views, therefore, augmentation of efforts put in by team members as a function of work design characteristics. This line of explanation of the process of augmentation of efforts adopts an outside-in approach to explain the collective internal motivation that results from the nature of work design. Therefore, the source of this kind of internal motivation exists outside individuals, i.e., in the work design. However, workplace spirituality (Pawar, 2009b) explains internalized intrinsic motivation (Dehler & Welsh, 1994) that results from within because of the factors such as self-work integration (Sheep, 2006), integration of meaning of one's life with work (Ashmos & Duchon, 2000; Duchon & Plowman, 2005; Mitroff & Denton, 1999), connectedness (Marques, Dhiman, & King, 2005; Pawar, 2009b), and transcendence of self-interests (Pawar, 2009b). Table 3 categorizes the team "process" constructs, used in prior research, from the standpoint of integral mapping model.

The dominant underlying assumption that exists in "team process" constructs which operationalize team interaction process (Hackman, 1987) is the presence of "outside-in" approach to bring about team effectiveness. The constructs of transition processes (Mathieu & Rapp, 2009; Schippers, Den Hartog, & Koopman, 2007), action processes (Hultman & Hultman, 2008), and interpersonal processes (Staples & Webster, 2008) look at those variables (Behfar et al., 2008; DeShon et al., 2004; Lemieux-charles et al., 2011; LePine et al., 2008; Woerkom & Croon, 2009) which exist "outside" an individual. Further, "work design" attributes (Campion et al., 1993; Gladstein, 1984; Hackman, 1987; Tannenbaum, Beard, & Salas, 1992) are expected to increase the degree of effort that team members put forth. Furthermore, the idea of internal motivation is viewed as essentially a function of "work design" (Hackman & Oldham, 1976) on team effectiveness. Thus, the underlying assumption regarding the flow of internal motivation belongs to "outside-in" category that facilitates the emergence of process gains.

Table 3. Antecedents of team effectiveness: Team "process" constructs	
Interior quadrants	**Exterior quadrants**
• Interpretative	• Monological
• Hermeneutic	• Empirical, positivistic
• Consciousness	• Form
Individual interior	**Individual exterior**
• Trust (Staples & Webster, 2008)	• Social loafing (Kahai, Sosik, & Avolio, 1997)
Collective interior	**Collective exterior** **Structural/Situational variables**:
• Team's integration plan (Balakrishnan, Kiesler, Cummings, & Zadeh, 2011)	• Team-learning activities (Woerkom & Croon, 2009)
• Team efficacy (Pescosolido, 2003)	• Quality improvement practices (Lemieux-charles et al., 2011)
• Conflict (Wagner, 1995)	• Specific goals (DeShon, Kozlowski, Schmidt, Milner, & Wiechmann, 2004)
• Collaboration (Peters & Manz, 2007)	• Common purpose (LePine, Piccolo, Jackson, Mathieu, & Saul, 2008)
• Cohesiveness (Stashevsky & Koslowsky, 2006)	
• Norms (Cohen et al., 1996)	• Conflict management (Behfar, Peterson, Mannix, & Trochim, 2008)
• Affect (Tanghe et al., 2010)	
In-house—assumption: External individual coaching can reduce process losses	**Paradigm** "Exterior" informs and guides the "interior"
Root—metaphor "Process losses" and "Process gains"	**Field Assumption**: Every process has its inherent "process losses"

Source: The table is constructed by the author based on the integral mapping model of Wilber (2002).

The assumption of the influence of collective domains is the paradigm that guides the process variables discussed in team effectiveness literature. The in-house assumption that underlies the teamwork diagnostics school of team effectiveness is that coaching is the effective medium to reduce process losses, even as the root metaphors of "process gains" and "process losses" dominate the literature on team processes. The field assumption that dominates both the team-work characteristics school and input-process-output school of team effectiveness literature is that process improvement interventions are essentially structural, external and, therefore, constitute an "outside-in" phenomenon.

We provide an alternative assumption (Hackman, 1987) by proposing the construct of workplace spirituality (Kinjerski & Skrypnek, 2006) at the team level, which is an "inside-out" intervention that seeks to reduce "process losses". However, the prior research hasn't investigated the impact of workplace spirituality, as a process construct, on team effectiveness. The process constructs of "collective interior" quadrant concentrate on the reduction of conflict (Behfar et al., 2008), increase in co-operation (Stashevsky & Koslowsky, 2006), and self-efficacy (Pescosolido, 2003; Peters & Manz, 2007). However, these constructs haven't looked at the potential source of reduction in conflict and an increase in co-operation. As workplace spirituality is expected to tap the presence of internalized intrinsic motivation (Dehler & Welsh, 1994), whose process effect is not investigated by prior research, this paper seeks to situate workplace spirituality as an "inside-out" effort to increase the degree of team effectiveness. Therefore, this study views workplace spirituality as a process construct that has the potential to reduce conflict, and increase communication and co-operation among team members.

Team process constructs have investigated the "process effect" from the standpoint of all four quadrants, i.e., individual interior, collective interior, individual exterior, and collective exterior. Among the constructs that belong to the quadrant of collective interior, which is the prime focus of this research endeavor, prior research hasn't investigated the impact of workplace spirituality as a process construct. However, the workplace spirituality facilitation model situates workplace spirituality as emanating from leadership (Pardasani, Sharma, & Bindlish, 2014; Pawar, 2009a) and, therefore, provides a theoretical ground for conceptualizing the antecedent–consequent relationship between leadership and workplace spirituality. Further, prior research has also shown the antecedent—consequent relationship between workplace spirituality and team effectiveness (Daniel, 2010). Furthermore, workplace spirituality is the operationalization of the ideas of felt meaningfulness and internalized intrinsic motivation (Dehler & Welsh, 1994). Therefore, workplace spirituality has the potential to be a process construct to increase the degree of team effectiveness. An observation of the constructs that fall within the "collective interior" quadrant (Table 3) makes it clear that prior research hasn't investigated the impact of workplace spirituality, as a process construct, on team effectiveness.

Literature on the relationship between transformational leadership and team performance has provided sufficient evidence regarding the relationship between these two constructs (Dionne, Yammarino, Atwater, & Spangler, 2004). However, this kind of conceptualization of leadership addresses the issue of leadership vested in an individual. Therefore, prior research has also investigated the effect of within-team transformational leadership behaviors on team performance (Sivasubramaniam et al., 2002). In case of team contexts, prior research argues that team transformational leadership is more appropriate than the transformational leadership vested in an individual team leader. Accordingly, transformational leadership behaviors are expected to lead to transcendence of self-interests (Shamir et al., 1993), a key underlying theme of the concept of workplace spirituality (Pawar, 2009b) in general and the construct of "spirit at work" (Kinjerski & Skrypnek, 2006) in particular.

As prior research has indicated transformational leadership to be a precursor to workplace spirituality (Pawar, 2009b), and workplace spirituality to be an antecedent of team effectiveness (Daniel, 2010), it is logically sound to conceptualize workplace spirituality as the mediating

cogent ·· economics & finance

mechanism between team transformational leadership and team effectiveness. Workplace spirituality captures the individual spiritual experiences at the workplace (Kinjerski & Skrypnek, 2006). It is conceptualized to measure the extent of felt meaningfulness and the consequent intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2008) that individual spiritual experiences create at the workplace. While the construct of team interaction (Wageman et al., 2005) process leads to internal motivation resulting from work attributes, the construct of workplace spirituality operationalizes the experience of intrinsic motivation. Hence, the following research proposition is framed:

Proposition 2: *Workplace spirituality exercises its mediating effect in the relationship between team transformational leadership and team effectiveness.*

2.7. Motivation: two alternative viewpoints
Current literature on team effectiveness has attempted to understand the source of motivation of team members in their work in a team context. Scholars have pointed out the meaningfulness of work as a strong source of internal work motivation that team members experience (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). Against this background, there exists sound reasoning as to why human beings adopt "controlling" mindset as well as why they attempt to transcend the same. The inherent apprehension of human beings regarding their safety leads them to adopt a "control and dominate" paradigm in their relationship with others (Dehler & Welsh, 1994). It is impossible to expect organizational alignment among employees through the "controlling" mindset unless they find meaning in their work. Therefore, "control" mindset does not lead to inspired action. The inspired action is, no doubt, a result of motivation. However, much of the research on motivation centers round cognitive information processing. Theories of motivation are, essentially, cognitive/rational theories. They neglect emotional/non-rational reasons of motivation. Therefore, it is argued by researchers that theories of motivation are based on satisfaction of deficient needs, and therefore, are basically the models of homeostasis. Therefore, there exists a need to look at the issue of enabling internal motivation with an "inside-out" perspective rather than from an "outside-in" viewpoint.

2.8. Work design and the idea of internal motivation
Prior research has used, in its team effectiveness models, "work design" constructs which are theoretically grounded in job design theory (Hackman & Lawler, 1972; Herzberg, 1966; Lawler, 1973). Though the work design constructs lay emphasis on the idea of "experienced meaningfulness" (Hackman & Oldham, 1976), they do not look at the notion of meaning in a holistic manner as search for meaning is a function of higher purpose, values, efficacy, sense of self-worth, self-interest transcendence, joy, the sense of completeness, and the notion of self-actualization (Baumeister & Vohs, 2005). Work design constructs draw themselves mainly from the works of Gladstein (1984), McGrath (1984), Hackman (1987), and Tannenbaum et al. (1992). Internal work motivation is the key idea that acts as the foundational principle of work design of teams (Hackman, 1987). Therefore, team effectiveness research discourse has investigated to know how work can be made meaningful through an appropriate design of work. The advantage of internal work motivation is that team members own up responsibility for their performance. Internal work motivation is a function of three dimensions, i.e. experienced meaningfulness, felt a responsibility, and knowledge of results. Prior research indicates that even as the construct of internal work motivation is an individual-level variable, it has applications at the team level too (Hackman, 2002). Work becomes meaningful because of moderate challenge, a sense of completeness, and the feeling of significance. This leads consequently to augmentation of team effort and the resultant increase in team performance.

2.9. Antecedents of team effectiveness: work design constructs
The constructs addressed by prior research on the phenomenon of collective internal motivation and team learning (Woerkom & Croon, 2009), that emanate from team's work design, consist in task traits (Campion et al., 1993; Hackman & Oldham, 1976), task identity (Campion et al., 1993; Hackman, 1987; Hackman & Oldham, 1976), task variety (Campion, Papper, & Medsker, 1996;

Hackman, 1987; Hackman & Oldham, 1976), task significance (Campion et al., 1993; Hackman, 1987; Hackman & Oldham, 1976), autonomy (Cohen et al., 1996; Hackman & Oldham, 1976), standardized work procedures (Gilson et al., 2005), and feedback (Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Hackman & Wageman, 1995). These constructs are either work attributes or situational constructs as in the case of the availability of expert coaching. Therefore, these constructs situate the source of internal motivation and the consequent team learning (Woerkom & Croon, 2009) "outside" the team members themselves. These constructs are categorized, for the purpose of examination of the levels of analysis, in Table 4:

Categorization of "work design" variables, as shown above, implies that the idea of internal motivation, which the "work design" attributes aim at, is essentially viewed in a structural perspective as these work attributes fall within the "collective exterior" domain. Therefore, the source of intrinsic motivation is also postulated to be an "outside-in" kind of phenomenon. These structural constructs speak essentially about "outside-in" approach to induce extra effort among team members. The idea of team effectiveness is, so far, viewed either in a causal framework or in a framework of enabling conditions (Hackman, 1987). Further, the underlying "outside-in" approach of these models does not call for self-interest transcendence (Pawar, 2009b). As self-interest transcendence is a probable propelling force of any extra effort that emanates from an "inside-out" phenomenon, felt meaningfulness and the consequent internalized intrinsic motivation seek to induce extra effort through an inside-out perspective.

Work design constructs are guided by the dominant paradigm of "exterior" domains, which argue that "external" work characteristics such as those we find in individual exterior and collective exterior domains, provide meaningfulness of work. These constructs do not address the probable role of constructs of either individual interior or collective interior domains in creating meaning at work. For example, team effectiveness literature hasn't looked at the possibility of creation of meaningfulness at

Table 4. Antecedents of team effectiveness: "Work design" constructs	
Interior quadrants	**Exterior quadrants**
• Interpretative	• Monological
• Hermeneutic	• Empirical, positivistic
• Consciousness	• Form
Individual interior **Cognitive/Perceptual variables**: • Creativity (Gilson et al., 2005)	**Individual exterior** **Behavioral variables**: • Skill variety (Hackman & Oldham, 1976)
Collective Interior **Perceptual/Behavioral variables**:	**Collective exterior** **Structural variables**: • Team autonomy (Cohen et al., 1996) • Task interdependence (Tarricone & Luca, 2002) • Task traits (Ganster & Dwyer, 1995) • Standardized work procedures (Gilson et al., 2005) • Task identity (Campion et al., 1993) • Task significance (Hackman & Oldham, 1976)
Field assumption: Self-work integration is essentially an "outside-in" phenomenon	**General paradigm**: "Exterior" provides meaning at work more than the "Interior"
Root-metaphor: Experienced meaningfulness	**Dominant paradigm**: Collective exterior is the either the determinant or the enabler of team effectiveness

Source: The table is constructed by the author based on the integral mapping model of Wilber (2002).

work either by constructs of individual interior domain such as individual spirituality (Kolodinsky, Giacalone, & Jurkiewicz, 2008) or meaning-making or by a construct of collective interior domain such as team spirituality (Rego & Cunha, 2007). Accordingly, both the teamwork characteristics models (LaFasto & Larson, 2001) and input-process–output models of team effectiveness have seldom examined the constructs that belong to "interior" domains. Furthermore, the field assumption that exists among diverse schools of thought of team effectiveness research discourse is that team effectiveness is essentially an "outside-in" phenomenon. Therefore, the root metaphor that appears frequently in team effectiveness literature is the image of "experienced meaningfulness" (Hackman, 1987) that results from work attributes. We do not contradict the paradigmatic assumption of influence of "structure on behavior" as this assumption is perfectly valid (Hackman, 2002). Moreover, we do not challenge the field assumption of self-work integration being an "outside-in" phenomenon. However, this research endeavor provides an alternative to the "root metaphor" of work design constructs that postulates the notion of "experienced meaningfulness".

The root metaphor, that exists among variables relating to team "work design", advocates that work attributes and the manner in which they are structured provide meaning to workers, and the consequent internal work motivation among team members. This assumption articulates that those work behaviors which we characterize as "inspired" contain stimuli in the work itself rather than rewards of work. Therefore, it is not necessary that the goal-directed activity necessarily produces high quality "inspired" work more than an inherently challenging work can do (Dehler & Welsh, 1994). As for example, the idea of internal work motivation is conceptualized as a result of work design constructs, which are those structural variables that exist in something outside a team member (Hackman, 2002). However, source of motivation could also be intrinsic, i.e. the motivation that one can derive from the work as well as the internalized intrinsic motivation whose source is within an individual. Therefore, the basic proposition of this view is that many times people make their choices and act accordingly without any outcome-orientation (Dehler & Welsh, 1994). However, prior models of team effectiveness (Campion et al., 1993; Gladstein, 1984; Hackman, 1987) haven't considered the idea of the internalized approach to internal work motivation in particular, and towards team effectiveness in general. Evidently, the current team effectiveness literature (Wageman et al., 2005) also views the idea of internal motivation with an "outside-in" emphasis. Further, prior team effectiveness models have spoken essentially in terms of "team commitment" and not "alignment". Alignment isn't a function of variables that are external to human beings (Dehler & Welsh, 1994). "External" variables can bring about intrinsic motivation. If, however, the variables that lead to intrinsic motivation are internalized, the same will lead to "alignment" in addition to "commitment". Therefore, we intend to provide an alternative assumption of "felt meaningfulness" as a new root metaphor that can complement the existing root metaphor of "experienced meaningfulness" (Hackman, 1987). Accordingly, we contend that the concept of internalized intrinsic motivation symbolizes the alternative root metaphor, i.e. "felt meaningfulness" (Dehler & Welsh, 1994), as against "experienced meaningfulness" (Hackman, 1987), that leads to internalized intrinsic motivation and "flow" experience (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). Therefore, workplace spirituality is postulated to be an antecedent of team effectiveness (Daniel, 2010) as the concept of workplace spirituality conceptualizes the notion of "felt meaningfulness". In this regard, no prior study has investigated the relationship between workplace spirituality and team effectiveness. Accordingly, the following research proposition is framed:

Proposition 3: *Felt meaningfulness that team members feel because of self-work integration, integration of meaning in life with meaning at work, aspiration for connectedness with fellow team members, and the aspiration for self-interest transcendence that the team members feel lead to intrinsic motivation among team members.*

3. Discussion
This paper has attempted to provide alternative assumptions with regard to influence of team "structure on behavior" of team members, "outside-in" viewpoint of team processes, and the notion of "experienced meaningfulness" that results from work design as the source of internal work motivation of team members. Scholars have argued that team effectiveness is not to be

viewed in a causal framework but should be viewed as essentially within a framework of enabling conditions (Hackman, 1987). Further, this school of thought also proposes the idea of equifinality of leadership. Accordingly, it does not view leadership as the cause of member behavior. Therefore, positioning team transformational leadership as an antecedent of team effectiveness is essentially an attempt to contradict structuralist viewpoint to explain team effectiveness. This paper has proposed, in this regard, the construct of team transformational leadership as a construct that represents the culture of transformational leadership behaviors that may be present among team members. The alternative paradigmatic assumption of the impact of "culture on behavior" of team members has the potential to generate a theory of team effectiveness mainly on two counts: First, the cultural conceptualization of collective leadership can explain the impact of team members' leadership behaviors on team interaction process, workplace spirituality, and team effectiveness. Second, it can also explain how the ideas of felt meaningfulness and internalized intrinsic motivation create an incremental effect on team effectiveness over and above the effect of internal work motivation that the work design and team interaction process exercise on team effectiveness by inspiring spirit at work within team members. This process situates, therefore, the source of internal motivation within team members themselves rather than in work attributes.

This paper has investigated the role of workplace spirituality by examining the possible team-level implications of the alternative assumption of "felt meaningfulness", in enabling the emergence of intrinsic motivation so as to facilitate the intensifying process of team effectiveness. The idea of workplace spirituality in general and "team spirit at work" in particular, as a process construct, presents an "inside-out" perspective towards the reduction of process losses so as to increase the degree of team effectiveness. This alternative assumption will be of interest primarily to two sections of audiences. First, this will be of interest to those theorists who articulate the importance of constructs of "collective interior" domain in bringing about team effectiveness. Second, it is beneficial to team leaders in order to practice the concept of team leadership in a transformational manner.

Invocation of workplace spirituality, as a process construct, has theory generation potential because of several reasons. First, the positive incremental effect of workplace spirituality over and above the process effect that the team interaction process is expected to produce will show that search for meaning is a primary need of human beings and not just a rationalization of instinctual drives. Second, it validates the assertion of existential theorists (Frankl, 1959) that human beings have specific, individualized sources of meaning. Third, it supports the argument that human beings seek integration of their personal identity with their work role identity (Burke, 1980). These three reasons explain employee performance at workplace. This goes beyond the explanation for the extra effort put in by team members, which we find in the team effectiveness literature, as consisting in internal work motivation that results from work design attributes. Further, this provides managerial clues to team leaders regarding how not to impose themselves upon their colleagues, by virtue of their officially designated leadership positions, but to evoke transformational leadership behaviors from their team members.

The alternative assumption of "felt meaningfulness" would be of interest to both structuralist and cultural schools of thought of team effectiveness research. The idea of internalized intrinsic motivation is important for the cultural school of thought because this viewpoint explains the extra effort that the team members put in. The extra effort that a worker exerts that may be attributable to reasons other than those that we can attribute to work design can be explained by the phenomenon of "workplace spirituality", which results from the internalized intrinsic motivation as a consequence of the presence of workplace spirituality. The idea of "internalized intrinsic motivation" is useful to know and draw inferences to explain the absence of team effectiveness even after all enabling conditions are met. Therefore, we can go beyond the mere diagnostic analysis of team effectiveness to understand the impact of those constructs that can explain the existing degree of team effectiveness.

cogent ·· economics & finance

The alternative assumption of "felt meaningfulness" and the consequent internalized intrinsic motivation have the potential to develop an integrated theory of team effectiveness by combining the existing theories of transformational leadership (Burns, 1978), the theory of transformational effects based on the self-concept (Shamir et al., 1993), the identity theory (Stryker, 1980), the theory of team processes (Marks et al., 2001), and the theory of workplace spirituality facilitation (Pawar, 2009a). Thus, the idea of "felt meaningfulness" and the consequent intrinsic motivation have the potential to enable the team effectiveness research discourse to go beyond the theory of enabling conditions of teamwork effectiveness (Hackman, 1987). Further, it validates the theory of organizational transformation proposed by Dehler and Welsh (1994).

The idea of intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2008) goes beyond the concept of challenging work. Scholars have argued that internalized motivation could also be the result of individual spiritual experiences at the workplace. Accordingly, the alternative assumption contends that the source of intrinsic motivation could also be in the individual himself, as he or she tries to find verification of one's own identity (Stets & Burke, 2000), values and thus makes an attempt to find meaning in work and at workplace, going beyond the attempt to realize meaning through work attributes as it may not be the specific and individualized "meaning" that an individual is searching for. From this point of view, it is logical to argue that workplace spirituality is the operationalization of individual "flow" experience or spiritual experiences of individuals either individually or collectively. Thus, the alternative assumption, regarding work motivation, views the same as internalized in the individual himself or herself. However, this is not to deny the emanation of work motivation from work attributes. Therefore, workplace spirituality is postulated to be an antecedent of team effectiveness (Daniel, 2010).

4. Managerial implications

This research endeavor has several managerial implications. It contributes to our understanding of the empirical validity of the assumptions of the impact of "culture on behavior" of team members, and the impact of "felt meaningfulness" and "internalized intrinsic motivation" on team effectiveness. This implies that team managers cannot ignore the process of creating a culture of transformational leadership behaviors among team members as team leadership is no less important than the individual leadership. Further, this research endeavor throws light on the relative importance of the study, i.e. team transformational leadership, team interaction process, and team spirit at work. Therefore, this research calls for paying attention to "inside-out" factors as well as "outside-in" factors of team processes as this combination is more likely to reduce "process losses" than the exclusive attention paid to either of these two factors of team processes. Furthermore, this study has managerial implications with regard to injecting meaning at work and inspiring the feeling of transcendence among team members. Accordingly, internal motivation that results from "internal" sources is as important as the internal motivation that results from "external sources". Therefore, workplace spirituality supplements the known team processes that belong essentially to an outside-in perspective.

5. Limitations and future directions

Though this paper has examined the possibility of an alternative assumption of "felt meaningfulness", it hasn't dwelt upon an in-depth discussion upon the possible dimensions of the notion of "felt meaningfulness". However, this paper has assumed workplace spirituality to be the concept that can represent the notion of "felt meaningfulness". What is required to be investigated is how the notion of "experienced meaningfulness" and its dimensions of skill variety, task variety, and task significance are different from "felt meaningfulness" and, consequently, from the dimensions of workplace spirituality.

Further, this paper hasn't discussed how internal work motivation can be distinguished in terms of the essential similarity with and differences from the dimensions of internalized intrinsic work motivation. Furthermore, there is a need to situate the notion of internalized intrinsic motivation

that emanates from the presence of workplace spirituality within the research discourse on work motivation in general, and internal motivation of team members, in particular.

Lastly, this paper hasn't positioned the alternative assumptions of the impact of "culture on behavior" of team members, "inside-out" view of team processes, and the notion of "felt meaningfulness" on the premises of relevant theories. Therefore, future research can explore the relevant theories that can provide justification for the conceptualized relationships among team transformational leadership, workplace spirituality, and team effectiveness.

6. Conclusion

We have examined, in this paper, four streams of team effectiveness literature, i.e. team composition constructs, team context constructs, team process constructs, and teamwork design constructs so as to identify the underlying assumptions in these respective streams of team effectiveness literature. Application of problematization methodology led us to identify several assumptions in each of these streams, which we analyzed for the purpose of postulating alternative assumptions that have theory generation potential. These alternative assumptions were, thereafter, discussed for the purpose of proposing research propositions. Accordingly, this paper has proposed three research propositions that deal with the examination of the effect of culture of team transformational leadership on team effectiveness, the mediating effect of workplace spirituality in the relationship between team transformational leadership and team effectiveness, and the impact of felt meaningfulness that can be found in workplace spirituality as an antecedent of team effectiveness. Thus, this paper has proposed the alternative assumptions of the effect of "culture on behavior" of team members, "inside-out" process effect of workplace spirituality, and of "felt meaningfulness" that can better explain the source of motivational issues among team members. As a result, this paper has proposed these assumptions as alternatives to the existing assumptions of the effect of "structure on behavior" of team members, "outside-in" process effect on team effectiveness, and "experienced meaningfulness" as the premise of the internal motivation of team members. The implications relating to felt meaningfulness, discussed in this paper, are relevant for team leaders. The idea of team transformational leadership has relevance for the cultural school of research discourse on team effectiveness. Lastly, the "inside-out" viewpoint on team processes would have practical managerial implications to increase team motivation, and thereby, team processes.

Author details
Nandan Prabhu K.P.[2]
E-mail: nandan.prabhu@manipal.edu
Rashmi Y Pai[1]
E-mail: rashmi.pai@manipal.edu
Abhishek S Rao K. P.[1]
E-mail: abhishek.rao@manipal.edu
[1] Department of Commerce, Manipal Academy of Higher Education, Manipal, India.
[2] Manipal Institute of Management, Manipal Academy of Higher Education, Manipal, India.

References
Alvesson, M., & Sandberg, J. (2011). Generating research questions through problematization. *Academy of Management Review, 36*(2), 247–271. doi:10.5465/amr.2009.0188
Ancona, D. G., & Caldwell, D. F. (1992). Bridging the boundary: External activity and performance in organizational teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 37*(4), 634–665. Retrieved from http://web.b.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail/detail?sid=d4566bb4-bb49-41db-966b88054d57e337%40sessionmgr120&vid=0&hid=125&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZW hvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#AN=9306166621&db=bth
Ashmos, D. P., & Duchon, D. (2000). Spirituality at work: A conceptualization and measure. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 9*(2), 134–145. doi:10.1177/105649260092008
Balakrishnan, A. D., Kiesler, S., Cummings, J. N., & Zadeh, R. (2011). Research team integration: What it is and why it matters. In *Proceedings of the ACM 2011 conference on Computer supported cooperative work* (pp. 523–532). Hangzhou, China: ACM. doi:10.1145/1958824.1958905
Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press; Collier Macmillan.
Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1996). Team multifactor leadership questionnaire. *Published by Mind Garden, Inc.*
Baumeister, R. F., & Vohs, K. D. (2005). The pursuit of meaningfulness in life. In C. R. Synder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Psychology* (pp. 608–618). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
Behfar, K. J., Peterson, R. S., Mannix, E. A., & Trochim, W. M. K. (2008). The critical role of conflict resolution in teams: A close look at the links between conflict type, conflict management strategies, and

team outcomes. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(1), 170–188. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.170

Bell, S. T. (2007). Deep-level composition variables as predictors of team performance: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(3), 595. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.3.595

Bell, S. T., Villado, A. J., Lukasik, M. A., Belau, L., & Briggs, A. L. (2011). Getting specific about demographic diversity variable and team performance relationships: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management*, 37(3), 709–743. doi:10.1177/0149206310365001

Bertua, C., Anderson, N., & Salgado, J. F. (2004). The predictive validity of cognitive ability tests: A UK meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 78(2004), 387–409. doi:10.1348/096317905X26994

Bishop, J., Scott, K., & Burroughs, S. (2000). Support, commitment, and employee outcomes in a team environment. *Journal of Management*, 26(6), 1113–1132. doi:10.1177/014920630002600603

Brandt, T., & Edinger, P. (2015). Transformational leadership in teams – the effects of a team leader's sex and personality. *Gender in Management: an International Journal*, 30(1), 44–68. doi:10.1108/GM-08-2013-0100

Burke, P. J. (1980). The self: Measurement requirements from an interactionist perspective. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 43(1), 18–29. doi:10.2307/3033745

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: HarperCollins.

Campion, M. A., Medsker, G. J., & Higgs, A. C. (1993). Relations between work group characteristics and effectiveness: Implications for designing effective work groups. *Personnel Psychology*, 46(4), 823–850. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1996.tb01806.x

Campion, M. A., Papper, E. M., & Medsker, G. J. (1996). Relations between work team characteristics and effectiveness: A replication and extension. *Personnel Psychology*, 49(2), 429–452. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1996.tb01806.x

Carson, J. B., Tesluk, P. E., & Marrone, J. A. (2007). Shared leadership in teams: An investigation of antecedent conditions and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(5), 1217–1234. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/20159921

Chen, G., Kirkman, B. L., Kanfer, R., Allen, D., & Rosen, B. (2007). A multilevel study of leadership, empowerment, and performance in teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(2), 331–346. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.331

Cogliser, C. C., & Schriesheim, C. A. (2000). Exploring work unit context and leader member exchange: A multi-level perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 487–511. doi:10.1002/1099-1379-(200008)21:5<487::AID-JOB57>3.0.CO;2-P

Cohen, S. G., Ledford, G. E., & Spreitzer, G. M. (1996). A predictive model of self-managing work team effectiveness. *Human Relations*, 49(5), 643–676. doi:10.1177/001872679604900506

Colquitt, A., Hollenbeck, J. R., & Ilgen, D. R. (2002). Computer-assisted communication and team decision-making performance: The moderating effect of openness to experience. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 402–410. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.402

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. New York: Harper perennial.

Curral, L. A., Forrester, R. H., & Dawson, J. F. (2001). It's what you do and the way that you do it: Team task, team size, and innovation-related group processes. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology*, 10(2), 187–204. doi:10.1080/13594320143000627

Daft, R. L., & Lewin, A. Y. (2008). Perspective-rigor and relevance in organization studies: Idea migration and academic journal evolution. *Organization Science*, 19(1), 177–183. doi:10.1287/orsc.1070.0346

Daniel, J. L. (2010). The effect of workplace spirituality on team effectiveness. *Journal of Management Development*, 29(5), 442–456. doi:10.1108/02621711011039213

Davis, M. S. (1986). 'That's classic!' The phenomenology and rhetoric of successful social theories. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 16(3), 285–301. doi:10.1177/004839318601600301

DeChurch, L. A., & Marks, M. A. (2006). Leadership in multi-team systems. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(2), 311–329. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.91.2.311

Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Self-determination theory: A macro theory of human motivation, development, and health.*Canadian Psychology*, 49(3), 182–185

Dehler, G. E., & Welsh, M. A. (1994). Spirituality and organizational transformation implications for the new management paradigm. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 9(6), 17–26. doi:10.1177/1056492604265218

DeShon, R. P., Kozlowski, S. W., Schmidt, A. M., Milner, K. R., & Wiechmann, D. (2004). A multiple-goal, multilevel model of feedback effects on the regulation of individual and team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(6), 1035. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.89.6.1035

Dionne, S. D., Yammarino, F. J., Atwater, L. E., & Spangler, W. D. (2004). Transformational leadership and team performance. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 17(2), 177–193. doi:10.1108/09534810410530601

Dirks, K. (2000). Trust in leadership and team performance: Evidence from NCAA basketball. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(6), 1004–1012. doi:10.1037//0021-90I0.85.6.100

Duchon, D., & Plowman, D. A. (2005). Nurturing the spirit at work: Impact on work unit performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(5), 807–833. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.07.008

Duygulu, E., & Ciraklar, N. (2009). Effects of leadership roles on team effectiveness. *Ege Academic Review*, 9(2), 389–400.

Fleishman, E. A., & Hunt, J. G. (1973). *Current developments in the study of leadership: a centennial event symposium held at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale* (Vol. 1). Illinois, USA: Southern Illinois University Press.

Frankl, V. E. (1959). *Man's search for meaning*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Ganster, G. C., & Dwyer, D. J. (1995). The effects of understaffing on individual professional and trade occupations. *Journal of Management*, 21(2), 175–190. doi:10.1177/014920639502100201

Gilson, L., Mathieu, J. E., Shalley, C., & Ruddy, T. (2005). Creativity and standardization: Complementary or conflicting drivers of team effectiveness?. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(3), 521–531. doi:10.5465/AMJ.2005.17407916

Gladstein, D. (1984). Groups in context: a model of task group effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29(4), 499–517. doi:10.2307/2392936

Guzzo, R. A., & Shea, G. P. (1992). Group performance and intergroup relations in organizations. *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 3, 269–313.

Hackman, J. R., & Lawler, E. (1972). Conditions under which jobs facilitate internal motivation. In L. E. Davis & J. C. Taylor (Eds.), *Design of jobs* (pp.141–153). Baltimore: Penguin Books.

Hackman, J. R. (1987). The design of work teams. In J. W. lorsch (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational behavior* (pp. 315–342).Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Hackman, J. R. (2002). *Leading teams: Setting the stage for great performances*. Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard Business Press.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16* (2), 250–279. Retrieved from http://www.orbee.org/images/5cc-resource-files/1319789168_Hackman%20%26 %20Oldham%20(1976).pdf

Hackman, J. R., & Wageman, R. (1995). Total quality management: Empirical, conceptual, and practical issues. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 40*, 309–342.

Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. Cleveland: World Publishing Co..

Hirschfeld, R. R., Jordan, M. H., Field, H. S., Giles, W. F., & Armenakis, A. A. (2006). Becoming team players: Team members' mastery of teamwork knowledge as a predictor of team task proficiency and observed teamwork effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(2), 467–474. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.91.2.467

Hogan, R., Curphy, G. J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality. *American Psychologist, 49*(6), 493–504. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.49.6.493

Horwitz, S. K., & Horwitz, I. B. (2007). The effects of team diversity on team outcomes: A meta-analytic review of tem demography. *Journal of Management, 33*(6), 987–1015. doi:10.1177/0149206307308587

House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis?. *Journal of Management, 23*(3), 409–473. doi:10.1016/S0149-2063(97)90037-4

Hultman, K., & Hultman, J. (2008). Deep teams: Leveraging the implicit organization. *Organization Development Journal, 26*(3), 11–22. Retrieved from https://www Academia.edu/595693/Deep_Teams_Leveraging_the_Implicit_Organization

Humphrey, S. E., Morgeson, F., & Mannor, M. J. (2009). Developing a theory of the strategic core of teams: A role composition model of team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(1), 48–61. doi:10.1037/a0012997

Joshi, A. (2006). The influence of organizational demography on the external networking behavior of teams. *Academy of Management Review, 31*(3), 583–595. doi:10.5465/AMR.2006.21318919

Joshi, A., & Roh, H. (2009). The role of context in work team diversity research: A meta analystic review. *Academy of Management Journal, 52*(3), 599–627. doi:10.5465/AMJ.2009.41331491

Kahai, S. S., Sosik, J. J., & Avolio, B. J. (1997). Effects of leadership style and problem structure on work group process and outcomes in an electronic meeting system environment. *Personnel Psychology, 50*(1), 121–146. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1997.tb00903.x

Kiffin-Petersen, S. A., & Cordery., J., . L. (1998). The importance at trasi in the implementation and viability of self-managing work teams'. *Paper presented at the 199K international work psychology conference, University of Sheffield, South Yorkshire, England.*

Kinjerski, V., & Skrypnek, B. J. (2006). Measuring the intangible: Development of the spirit at work scale. In K. M. Weaver (Ed.). *Proceedings of the sixty-fifth Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management (CD), Atlanta.*

Kolodinsky, R. W., Giacalone, R. A., & Jurkiewicz, C. L. (2008). Workplace values and outcomes: Exploring personal, organizational, and interactive workplace spirituality. *Journal of Business Ethics, 81*(2), 465–480. doi:10.1007/s10551-007-9507-0

Kuo, C. C. (2004). Research on impacts of team leadership on team effectiveness. *Journal of American Academy of Business, 5*(1), 266–277.

LaFasto, F., & Larson, C. (2001). *When teams work best: 6,000 team members and leaders tell what it takes to succeed*. Thousand Oaks:Sage.

Latane, B., Williams, K., & Harkins, S. (1979). Many hands make light the work: The causes and consequences of social loafing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37*(6), 822–832. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.37.6.822

Lawler, E. (1973). *Job design and employee motivation, in management and motivation*. ed. V. Vroom and E. Deci. Baltimore: Penguin Books.

Lemieux-charles, A. L., Murray, M., Baker, G. R., Barnsley, J., Tasa, K., Ibrahim, S. A., … Barnsley, J. A. N. (2011). The effects of quality improvement practices on team effectiveness : A mediational model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*(5), 533–553. doi:10.1002/job.154

LePine, J. A. (2003). Team adaptation and postchange performance: Effects of team composition in terms of members' cognitive ability and personality. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(1), 27–39. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.1.27

LePine, J. A., Piccolo, R. F., Jackson, C. L., Mathieu, J. E., & Saul, J. R. (2008). A meta-analysis of teamwork processes: tests of a multidimensional model and relationships with team effectiveness criteria. *Personnel Psychology, 61*(2), 273–307. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2008.00114.x

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., & Jaworski, R. A. (2004). Social loafing: A field investigation. *Journal of Management, 30*(2), 285–304. doi:10.1016/j.jm.2003.02.002

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. doi:10.5465/AMR.2001.4845785

Marques, J., Dhiman, S., & King, R. (2005). Spirituality in the workplace: Developing an integral model and a comprehensive definition. *Journal of American Academy of Business, 7*(1), 81–91. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.025

Mathieu, J., Maynard, M. T., Rapp, T., & Gilson, L. (2008). Team effectiveness 1997–2007: A review of recent advancements and a glimpse into the future. *Journal of Management, 34*(3), 410–476.

Mathieu, J. E., Gilson, K. K., & Ruddy, T. M. (2006). Empowering and team effectiveness: An empirical test of an integrated model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(1), 97–108.

Mathieu, J. E., & Rapp, T. L. (2009). Laying the foundation for successful team performance trajectories: The roles of team charters and performance strategies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(1), 90–103. doi:10.1037/a0013257

McClurg, L. N. (2001). Team rewards: how far have we come?. *Human Resource Management, 40*(1), 73–86. doi:10.1002/hrm.4017

McGrath, J. E. (1984). *Groups: Interaction and performance* (Vol. 14). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Meindl, J. R., Ehrlich, S. B., & Dukerich, J. M. (1985). The romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 30*, 78–102. Retrieved from http://www.wiggo.com/mgmt8510/Readings/Readings11/meindl1985asq.pdf

Mitroff, I., & Denton, E. (1999). A study of spirituality in the workplace. *Sloan Management Review, 40*(4), 83–92.

Moon, H., Hollenbeck, J. R., Humphrey, S. E., Ilgen, D. R., West, B., Ellis, A. P. J., & Porter, C. O. L. H. (2004). Asymmetric adaptability: Dynamic team structures as one-way streets. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(5), 681–695. doi:10.2307/20159611

Morgeson, F. P, DeRue, D. S, & Karam, E. P. (2010). Leadership in teams: a functional approach to understanding leadership structures and processes. *Journal Of Management*, 36(1), 5-39. doi:10.1177/0149206309347376

Othman, A., Abdullah, H., & Ahmad, J. (2009). The influence of work motivation on emotional intelligence and team effectiveness. *Vision*, 13(4), 1–14. doi:10.1177/097226290901300401

Pardasani, R., Sharma, R. R., & Bindlish, P. (2014). Facilitating workplace spirituality: lessons from Indian spiritual traditions. *Journal of Management Development*, 33(8/9), 847–859. doi:10.1108/JMD-07-2013-0096

Pawar, B. S. (2009a). Workplace spirituality facilitation: A comprehensive model. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 90(3), 375–386. doi:10.1177/0971685814539407

Pawar, B. S. (2009b). Some of the recent organizational behavior concepts as precursors to workplace spirituality. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 88(2), 245–261. doi:10.1007/s10551-008-9961-3

Pescosolido, A. T. (2003). Group efficacy and group effectiveness: The effects of group efficacy over time on group performance and development. *Small Group Research*, 34(1), 20–42. doi:10.1177/1046496402239576

Peters, L. M., & Manz, C. C. (2007). Identifying antecedents of virtual team collaboration. *Team Performance Management*, 13(3/4), 117–129. doi:10.1108/13527590710759865

Quigley, N. R., & Gardner, S. (2007). Team personality composition, collective personality, and team effectiveness. *Academy of Management Annual Meeting Proceedings*, 2007, 1–6.

Rego, A., & Cunha, M. P. (2007). Workplace spirituality and organizational commitment: An empirical study. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 21(1), 53–75. doi:10.1108/09534810810847039

Sandberg, J., & Alvesson, M. (2011). Ways of constructing research questions: gap-spotting or problematization?. *Organization*, 18(1), 23–44. doi:10.1177/1350508410372151

Schippers, M. C., Den Hartog, D. N., & Koopman, P. L. (2007). Reflexivity in teams: A measure and correlates. *Applied Psychology*, 56(2), 189–211. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.2006.00250.x

Seers, A. (1989). Team-member exchange quality: A new construct for role-making research. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 43(1), 118–135. doi:10.1016/0749-5978(89)90060-5

Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science*, 4(4), 577–594. doi:10.1287/orsc.4.4.577

Shaw, J. D., Duffy, M. K., & Stark, E. M. (2000). Interdependence and preference for group work: Main and congruence effects on the satisfaction and performance of group members. *Journal of Management*, 26(2), 259–279. doi:10.1177/014920630002600205

Sheep, M. L. (2006). Nurturing the whole person: The ethics of workplace spirituality in a society of organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 66(4), 357–375.

Shin, S. J., & Zhou, J. (2007). When is educational specialization heterogeneity related to creativity in research and development teams? Transformational leadership as a moderator. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6), 1709–1721. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1709

Sivasubramaniam, N., Murry, W. D., Avolio, B. J., & Jung, D. I. (2002). A longitudinal model of the effects of team leadership and group potency on group performance. *Group & Organization Management*, 27(1), 66–96. doi:10.1177/1059601102027001005

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. doi:10.5465/AMJ.2006.23478718

Staples, D., & Webster, J. (2008). Exploring the effects of trust, task interdependence and virtualness on knowledge sharing in teams. *Information Systems Journal*, 18(6), 617–640. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2575.2007.00244.x

Stashevsky, S., & Koslowsky, M. (2006). Leadership team cohesiveness and performance. *International Journal of Manpower*, 27(1), 63–74. doi:10.1108/01437720610652844

Stets, J. E., & Burke, P. J. (2000). Identity theory and social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 224–237. Retrieved from http://wat2146.ucr.edu/papers/00a.pdf

Stryker, S. (1980). *Symbolic interactionism: A social structural version*. San Francisco, UK: Benjamin-Cummings Publishing Company.

Sundstrom, E., de Meuse, K. P., & Futrell, D. (1990). Work teams: Applications and effectiveness. *American Psychologist*, 45(2), 120–133. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.45.2.120

Tanghe, J., Wisse, B., & Van Der Flier, H. (2010). The formation of group affect and team effectiveness: The moderating role of identification. *British Journal of Management*, 21(2), 340–358. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8551.2009.00656.x

Tannenbaum, S. I., Beard, R. L., & Salas, E. (1992). Team building and its influence on team effectiveness: an examination of conceptual and empirical developments. In K. Kelley (Ed.), *Issues, theory, and research in industrial/organizational psychology* (pp. 117–153). Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.

Tarricone, P., & Luca, J. (2002). Successful teamwork: A case study, 640–641. Retrieved from http://www.unice.fr/crookall-cours/teams/docs/team%20Successful%20teamwork.pdf

Van Der Vegt, G. S., Bunderson, J. S., & Oosterhof, A. (2006). Expertness diversity and interpersonal helping in teams: Why those who need the most help end up getting the least. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(5), 877–893. doi:10.5465/AMJ.2006.22798169

Wageman, R., Hackman, J. R., & Lehman, E. (2005). Team diagnostic survey, development of an instrument. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 41(4), 373–398. doi:10.1177/0021886305281984

Wagner, J. A. (1995). Studies of individualism – collectivism: Effects on cooperation in groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1), 152–172. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/256731

Wilber, K. (2002). *A theory of everything*. Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications.

Woerkom, M. V., & Croon, M. (2009). The relationships between team learning activities and team performance. *Personnel Review*, 38(5), 560–577. doi:10.1108/00483480910978054

cogent •• economics & finance

Cogent Economics & Finance (ISSN: 2332-2039) is published by Cogent OA, part of Taylor & Francis Group.

Publishing with Cogent OA ensures:

- Immediate, universal access to your article on publication
- High visibility and discoverability via the Cogent OA website as well as Taylor & Francis Online
- Download and citation statistics for your article
- Rapid online publication
- Input from, and dialog with, expert editors and editorial boards
- Retention of full copyright of your article
- Guaranteed legacy preservation of your article
- Discounts and waivers for authors in developing regions

Submit your manuscript to a Cogent OA journal at www.CogentOA.com

cogent •• economics & finance