



**Erasmus Mundus Joint Master's Degree in Work, Organizational and
Personnel Psychology**

Reflexivity and satisfaction in the work groups: the mediating role of
affective commitment with the team

Sara Castela Simões

Faculdade de Psicologia e de Ciências da Educação - Universidade de Coimbra

Home tutor:

PhD. Paulo Renato Lourenço

Faculdade de Psicologia e de Ciências da Educação - Universidade de Coimbra

Host tutor:

PhD. Rejina Selvam

Facultat de Psicologia – Universitat de Barcelona

Title:

Reflexivity and satisfaction in the work groups: the mediating role of affective commitment with the team.

Keywords:

Team reflexivity, Team satisfaction, Team affective commitment

Author:

Sara Castela Simões

Faculdade de Psicologia e de Ciências da Educação

Universidade de Coimbra

sara.castela@hotmail.com

Home tutor:

PhD. Paulo Renato Lourenço

Faculdade de Psicologia e de Ciências da Educação

Universidade de Coimbra

prenato@fpce.uc.pt

Host tutor:

PhD. Rejina Selvam

Facultat de Psicologia

Universitat de Barcelona

rmselvam@uic.es

Agradecimentos

Aos meus pais pelo apoio que me deram ao longo desta fase e por me proporcionarem tantas oportunidades. Sem eles nada disto seria possível.

Ao meu orientador, Professor Doutor Paulo Lourenço, pela sua ajuda imprescindível e disponibilidade durante este processo e por todos os ensinamentos prestados. Sem dúvida que foi alguém essencial na concretização desta tese e, por isso, expresso aqui um sincero agradecimento.

A todos professores do mestrado, pelo conhecimento essencial que me transmitiram e pela disponibilidade prestada, contribuindo assim para o meu crescimento profissional e pessoal.

Ao Ivo, por me ter “aturado” e fornecido apoio nas fases de maior stresse. Obrigada pela paciência e pela motivação que me deste.

À melhor turma que este mestrado me proporcionou. Obrigada pela união, cooperação e apoio em todos os momentos. Fazer parte desta turma ajudou bastante no sucesso do meu percurso e, por isso, estou bastante grata pela amizade de todos.

Abstract

In the context of work groups/teams, reflexive practices are increasingly considered essential processes for the functioning and performance of a group. Accordingly, group reflexivity has been one of the topics of growing research interest. Overall, the studies suggest that both the affective commitment with the team and the group satisfaction are consequents of team reflexivity. The literature also shows a positive relationship between team affective commitment and group satisfaction. However, the studies focusing on these relationships are still scarce. The aim of this study was to expand the knowledge about group functioning and their results, particularly on the topic of group reflexivity. Based on the IMOI model, we tested a mediation model using PROCESS, which included team reflexivity as the input variable, group satisfaction as the output variable and the team affective commitment as the mediating variable. The sample was composed by 111 teams, from 72 Portuguese organizations, and as data gathering method the questionnaire survey was used. The results have shown that team affective commitment partially mediates the relationship between team reflexivity and group satisfaction. These data reinforce the literature, and alert us to the relevance of team reflexivity and team affective commitment in the increase of group satisfaction.

Table of contents

Introduction	1
State of Art	2
Team reflexivity and team satisfaction.....	2
The mediating role of team affective commitment in the relationship between team reflexivity and team satisfaction	7
Objective, Model under Analysis and Research Hypotheses	9
Method	10
Sample	10
Procedure	11
Measures	12
Data analysis procedures	15
Results	17
Psychometric qualities of measuring instruments.....	17
Hypotheses testing.....	17
Discussion	19
Conclusions	21
References	24
APPENDIXES.....	33
Appendix A.....	33
Appendix B.....	36
Appendix C.....	39

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Model under analysis (based on Ilgen et al., 2005).....	10
--------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations of the Study Variables.....	18
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

Table 2. Mediation regression analysis for model 4 tested (Hypothesis 4).....	19
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

Introduction

Nowadays, organizations increasingly choose to structure work in teams¹ so that they can respond more quickly and effectively to complex problems. Indeed, teams enable crucial multifunctional collaboration and the sharing of scarce resources, so that projects can be successfully accomplished (Hoegl & Parboteeah, 2006).

A group consists of a set of individuals, constituted by a minimum of three individuals, which are perceived by themselves and are perceived by others as a team, interacting regularly to achieve common goals, in an interdependent way (Lourenço, Dimas, & Rebelo, 2014). Work teams are inserted in an organizational context, which defines limits and influences the group's exchanges with other units within the organization (Dimas, Lourenço, & Rebelo, 2016).

One of the goals of work teams is sharing knowledge among members, which will enable the group to provide faster, innovative and flexible responses to problems that may arise, as well as enabling its members to learn new skills and experiences to promote group performance and satisfaction (Rico, De la Hera & Taberero, 2011).

To be effective, teams must respond to changing circumstances and environments in an appropriate way (Carter & West, 1996). Team reflexivity, i.e., a process in which teams assess their current information and their planned or past actions, decisions, or conclusions, according to goals, processes or outcomes (Schippers, Edmondson & West, 2014), is considered a good predictor of group functioning, namely regarding group affective commitment (e.g., Farnese & Livi, 2016; Sol, van der Wal, Beers & Wals, 2017). This latter construct, can be conceived as the psychological attachment that members feel towards their team (Pearce & Herbig, 2004), a strong emotional connection, high involvement and identification with the goals and values of the team, as well as the desire to continue to belong to the same (Allen & Meyer, 1990). In the same way, the literature suggests that team reflexivity is a predictor of team results such as group satisfaction (Schippers, Den Hartog, Koopman & Wienk, 2003), an affective response that members feel towards a group (Wiiteman, 1991). Thus, we can state that team reflexivity is an antecedent of both, group affective commitment and team satisfaction. On the other hand, a meta-analysis made by Riketta

¹ The terms group and team will be used in an undifferentiated way throughout this dissertation, following previously published papers (e.g., Cohen & Bailey, 1997; Lourenço et al., 2014; Mathieu, Hollenbeck, van Knippenberg & Ilgen, 2017).

and Van Dick (2005) showed a positive relationship between team affective commitment and group satisfaction, suggesting that team affective commitment is an antecedent of group satisfaction. Therefore, we can state that team affective commitment is a consequent of team reflexivity and an antecedent of team satisfaction.

Considering the relationships suggested in the literature, this study aims to analyze the mediating role of team affective commitment in the relationship between group reflexivity and the satisfaction with the team.

To achieve the proposed objective and adopting the general IMOI (Input, Mediator, Output, Input) model proposed by Ilgen, Hollenbeck, Johnson and Jundt (2005) as framework, we will test a mediation model. Considering the relationships among the constructs under analysis, this model includes group reflexivity as the input variable, group affective commitment as the mediator, and group satisfaction as the output variable.

Taking into account the growing relevance of teams within organizations and the importance of their capability to achieve their expected goals, this study aims to contribute to understanding the work group's functioning and provides relevant information for those who study, manage, intervene and are responsible for improving teams' outcomes. It can help organizations, managers, and team leaders to better manage their teams and rethink their strategies, to incorporate more reflexive practices into their teams. In this way, they can potentiate the benefits of this reflexivity, namely improving team members' affective commitment and satisfaction with the group.

At a research level, this study reinforces the relevance of the team reflexivity both in group functioning and group results and highlights the importance of affective commitment in organizational teams, particularly regarding its impact on team satisfaction and its role as a mediating variable in the relationship between team reflexivity and team satisfaction. The results from the relationships studied can contribute to a better understanding of group functioning and therefore to add knowledge to the literature on this domain.

State of Art

Team reflexivity and team satisfaction

As companies are continuously relying on teams, creating a climate where team results can be improved has become a major challenge for organizations (Dayan &

Basarir, 2009). Team reflexivity, which can promote the proper functioning of the teams and, consequently, the organizations, is therefore a relevant research topic (Widmer, Schippers, & West, 2009).

Team reflexivity can be defined as “the extent to which group members overtly reflect upon, and communicate about the group’s objectives, strategies, and processes, and adapt them to current or anticipated circumstances” (West, 1996, p. 559). It is a team process that enables teams know their current work and develop new understandings and methods that respond to emerging conditions and challenges (Carter & West, 1998). In other words, reflexivity is established through the team's ability to overcome the adversities that arise along the way, helping team to manage frustrations, strengthen interpersonal relationships, coordinate efforts, develop and apply solutions (Tjosvold, Tang, & West, 2004).

Furthermore, a reflexive team is more aware of the consequences of its actions and more proactive, while a non-reflexive team is simply functioning without any self-awareness of their actions (Hoegl & Parboteeah, 2006). As West (1996) argues, team reflexivity involves such components as better interaction, better communication, better feedback, and better intragroup relations, which may lead to an increase of group members’ well-being (Dayan & Basarir, 2009; Schippers et al., 2003).

Group reflexivity differentiates from other constructs studied in the literature, such as knowledge sharing and team learning. The first one can be defined as the extent to which members exchange and combine information and knowledge within their team, to make knowledgeable decisions about the direction of their actions (MacCurtain et al., 2010). This process allows knowledge in each working team to spread within the team and throughout the organization.

Regarding team learning, this concept is considered “a change in the group’s repertoire of potential behavior” (Wilson, Goodman, & Cronin, 2007, p. 1043) that occurs over time in group interaction. When teams have learned from their previous interaction, they can assess their goals and current situation and try to find solutions for problems that occur (Schippers, Homan, & van Knippenberg, 2012). According to Schippers et al. (2014) reflexivity is not team learning but is one aspect of the learning process, being a specific and essential team learning activity.

Carter and West (1998) consider that reflexivity involves two dimensions: task reflexivity and social reflexivity. The first dimension refers to the reflection and discussion about the objectives, strategies and group processes that allow the team to

adapt to the different circumstances and phases of change. On the other hand, social reflexivity focuses on reflecting on how members deal with conflicts, perceive group support, and promote team well-being (Carter & West, 1998). In spite of that distinction, it should be noted that most of the authors focus their work on task reflexivity, adopting the definition we already presented (proposed by West, 1996) and tend to designate the construct only as (group/team) reflexivity (e.g., Schippers et al., 2015; Widmer et al., 2009). In this work, we will follow that research line.

Reflexivity is an interactive process involving three components: reflection, planning and action/adaptation (Gabelica et al., 2014; West, 1996, 2002; Widmer et al., 2009). Reflection refers to the awareness of issues related to team tasks and it can be considered an important learning factor, including questioning, planning, analysis, content exploration, explicit use of knowledge and review of past events, allowing the development of new ideas and perceptions (West, 1996; Widmer et al., 2009). However, on its own, reflection does not promote change, requiring action preceded by a planning phase (West, 1996; Widmer et al., 2009), so the action phase refers to the behaviors that aim to achieve the goals imposed by the group, in order to achieve the desired changes (West, 2002).

Reflexivity can keep groups focused and efficient and it is especially appropriate for groups working on challenging tasks and operating in complex environments (Tjosvold et al., 2004). According to Carter and West (1998), teams that experience phases of change, uncertainty and that have to make complex decisions, often use reflexive strategies as a way to better manage their tasks. Schippers et al., (2014) propose the reflexivity of the team as a way to reduce the probability of error in processing the information between members, increasing the probability of promoting useful changes in the team. In this way, reflexivity enhances the ability of a group to engage in the decision-making process through critical evaluation of alternative ideas or viewpoints (Farnese & Livi, 2016) so avoiding the risk of activating negative group phenomena such as groupthink (Schippers et al., 2003).

It is also important to emphasize that groups that are reflexive tend to make changes regarding their goals, processes, and strategies to achieve those objectives, and even their environment (West, 1996). On the other hand, teams that are not reflexive and have little awareness of the factors mentioned above, react defensively to the threats that arise along their path (Schippers, Hartog & Koopman, 2007).

Therefore, it is expected that reflexivity allows teams, based on self-awareness, to develop and implement new strategies that respond to the requirements of emerging conditions. In fact, team reflexivity as a process characterized by collective reflection on goals and strategies has been shown to be valuable for team functioning (e.g., team work engagement, team commitment) and found to be related to several group results, such as performance, team innovation and, also, team satisfaction (e.g., Carter & West, 1998; Dayan & Basarir, 2009; Farnese & Livi, 2016; Schippers et al., 2003; Shippers et al., 2015; Tjosvold et al., 2004).

Although research about the influence of reflexivity on group satisfaction is scarce and, consequently, calls for the development of new studies, West (1996) states that teams that reflect on their tasks, objectives and behaviors, show high levels of satisfaction. This statement is reinforced by Schippers et al. (2003), for whom there is a positive effect of reflexivity on satisfaction.

Satisfaction has become a variable of interest for researchers in organizational domain, due to its importance related with the organizational and teams' functioning.

Although the most referred definition of satisfaction at work is that one proposed by Locke (1976), who conceived it as a positive or pleasing emotional state which emerges as the result of evaluating one's work or experiences in the workplace, overall, satisfaction has been conceptualized and categorized in a variety of ways. Accordingly, the construct has been approached and evaluated according to the definition of each author, leading to a diversity of measures which tend to evaluate the construct as multidimensional, measuring satisfaction facets, (e.g., Schneider & Dachler, 1978) or as unidimensional, measuring overall satisfaction (e.g., Brayfield & Rothe, 1951). In this paper we will adopt this latter approach.

Judge and Klinger (2007), regarding the factors of satisfaction, divided the existing theories into three types: situational, dispositional and interactional. Situational theories state that the nature of work and its environmental aspects are antecedents of satisfaction. Thus, characteristics such as required competencies, received feedback, conflicts, autonomy and task importance are variables that influence satisfaction (Meier & Spector, 2015). The dispositional category relates satisfaction at work with the characteristics of the employees' personality. In this way, satisfaction will be influenced by individual differences such as self-efficacy, self-esteem, and some genetic factors (Judge, Heller, & Mount, 2002; Meier & Spector, 2015). Finally, interactional theories argue that satisfaction will be the result of the interaction between situational and

dispositional factors, since individual perception about the characteristics and/or conditions of work will be influenced by the personality of each individual (Judge & Klinger, 2007).

At a group level, satisfaction can be conceived as an affective response that members feel towards to an element belonging to a group (Witteman, 1991), that is, it is the degree of satisfaction of the members with the different aspects of the team (Dimas, 2007). Examples of aspects in which members may be more or less satisfied are group decision-making processes, communication within the team, the atmosphere maintained among members, and/or issues related to leadership and task characteristics (Witteman, 1991). Therefore, the satisfaction of the members with the group includes aspects related to the task dimension of the group (e.g., autonomy degree), and aspects related to the affective dimension (e.g., work climate within the team) (Dimas et al., 2016).

In the literature, we can find group satisfaction studied as an input or as a mediator variable, conceived as an antecedent of several relevant results to the organizations and/or teams, related to productivity and well-being of employees (e.g., Meier & Spector, 2015; Morrison, 2008). However, most often, similar to our research, group satisfaction is analyzed as an output, that is, as a result of teams' processes/emergent states², such as decision-making processes, leadership or team trust (e.g., Costa, Roe, & Taillieu 2001; Geister, Konradt, & Hertel, 2006; Kozlowski & Ilgen, 2006; Witteman, 1991), and then as a team effectiveness criterion (Rico et al., 2001).

Witteman (1991), for example, states that levels of satisfaction will increase if team members are able to criticize and evaluate tasks, creating new ideas, promoting discussion of objectives and demonstrating results orientation. The author refers to activities that we can find in the reflexivity construct, which may lead us to assume that teams with high levels of reflexivity will have high levels of group satisfaction (Gast, 2012).

Indeed, as already referred, some authors suggest that reflexivity may be a good predictor of group satisfaction. West (1996), for example, states that team satisfaction, as well as team viability and well-being, may be influenced by reflexivity. In the same

² According to Marks, Mathieu and Zaccaro (2001), emergent states “describe cognitive, motivational, and affective states of teams, as opposed to the nature of their member interaction” (p.357). They argue that emergent states are constructs that are of dynamic nature and are more pliable to vary as a function of team processes, inputs, context or results. In this way they differ from group processes, since these refer to interactions between members, while emergent states are shared cognitive, affective and motivational states, and not represent interactions.

sense, Schippers et al., (2003) in a study involving 54 teams from 13 organizations, found that the reflexivity effect on satisfaction was positive. The authors found a positive association between reflexivity and group satisfaction, which points to the idea that the teams that reflect and communicate about group's objectives and processes are expected to be more satisfied.

Thus, as already mentioned, despite the studies in this domain are still scarce, the literature points out that teams with high levels of reflexivity will also have high levels of satisfaction.

The mediating role of team affective commitment in the relationship between team reflexivity and team satisfaction

Over the last few years, many studies have focused on organizational commitment as a central topic within organizations (Farnese & Livi, 2016). According to Meyer and Herscovitch (2001), most definitions of commitment involve the fact that it is a stabilizing or facilitating force, which is experienced as a mental picture or psychological state that guides behaviors.

The basis of commitment refers to a psychological state that brings the individual closer to the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Meyer and Allen (1991) use the term commitment as a psychological state that characterizes the relationship of an individual to the organization to which he belongs and influences the decision whether or not to continue to belong to it. Although there are many definitions of commitment, they reflect three general themes or dimensions: affective attachment to the organization, perceived costs associated with leaving the organization, and obligation to remain with the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

The first dimension, affective commitment, is characterized by a strong emotional component, a high involvement and identification with the goals and values of the organization and the desire to continue to belong to the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991). On the other hand, the instrumental commitment refers to the members' awareness of the costs and difficulties associated with leaving the organization. In this type of commitment there is an evaluation of the personal investments related to the current employment, the availability of work alternatives and also the amount of time invested in that organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Finally, regarding to normative commitment, this is demonstrated by the obligation that

individuals feel in maintaining their employment and remaining in the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991). Moreover, in this type of commitment, there is a moral duty involved, as if it were a debt to a leader, to a member of the team or even to the organization itself (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001).

In this study, we focus on affective commitment, the most studied component of commitment and, also, the component which shows the most relevant empirical evidences of the positive relation of commitment with retention's behaviors, based on the idea that a strong bond, both to teams and to organizations, increases employee's motivation to stay in their organization (Hallberg & Schaufeli, 2006, Kim, Eisenberger & Baik, 2016).

Although the literature focuses mostly on the study of organizational commitment and studies about commitment with the team are scarcer, it is important to take into account that this construct can also be approached at the group level (Neininger et al., 2010).

At a group level, this construct can be considered from an emergent state with great influence on the success of teams and their organizations (Gilson, Maynard, Young, Vartiainen, & Hakonen, 2015) and, according to Pearce and Herbig (2004), refers to the psychological attachment that members feel towards their team. In this way, the commitment with the team (and also the affective commitment, which is object of study in this paper) is similar to the organizational commitment, only differing on the connecting element, since it is the team rather than the organization in a broader sense.

It is also noted that bounds related to group level tend to be stronger than those established with the organization (Ricketta & Van Dick, 2005), emphasizing those of affective nature (and, therefore, affective commitment) created between the elements of the team (Bishop, Scott, Goldsby, & Cropanzano, 2005).

Some studies suggest that reflective team practices influence affective commitment (e.g., Farnese & Livi, 2016; Schippers et al., 2003; Sol, van der Wal, Beers & Wals, 2017; Tjosvold et al., 2004). In fact, although not always directly, the studies in this domain highlight the importance of group reflection practices on team functioning, namely on team commitment. Members who review and discuss regularly their ways of working, communicate about group goals, with the purpose of improving their team (Tjosvold et al., 2004), may feel the problems of the group as their own, by connecting emotionally to the team (Batarseh, Usher, & Daspit, 2017).

The study conducted by Schippers et al. (2003), contributes to the literature which conceives team reflexivity as an antecedent of team commitment, showing that reflexivity is significantly associated with team commitment (and also with team satisfaction and team performance). In the same way, Farnese and Livi (2016) also emphasize this relationship by mentioning that reflexivity, expressed as the concern for process development, revision of objectives and change/improvement of methods influences the feelings of team members, in which they identify and share group values and goals, making them more affectively committed with their team.

The literature also points out the commitment of the members to the team as one of the factors related to a positive team outcomes (Carter & West, 1998; Schippers et al., 2003; Tjosvold et al., 2004), which even led Gilson et al. (2015) to state that commitment to the team is one of the key predictors of team success, since the way people feel about each other can determine how a team works.

Indeed, over the years, many studies have evidenced the positive effects of affective commitment, such as the decrease of absenteeism and turnover, and the increase of performance, team collaboration, participation, well-being and satisfaction (e.g. Batarseh et al., 2017; Bishop & Scott, 2000; Meyer & Allen, 1991; Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001; Meyer & Maltin, 2010; Pearce & Herbik, 2004).

Regarding team satisfaction, Mysen, Svensson and Payan (2011) state that satisfaction as an affective member's response to the team includes the relations established between the elements. Accordingly, a high commitment is expected to result in a positive effect for satisfaction. Some studies found in the literature tend to support that relationship showing that commitment appears to be an antecedent of satisfaction (e.g., Farrelly & Quester, 2005; Riketta & Van Dick, 2005).

Synthesizing, overall the literature points to the fact that group reflexivity is positively related to affective commitment and it also suggests that affective commitment is positively associated with group satisfaction. Thus, in the present study, we can expect that affective commitment mediates the relationship between team reflexivity and group satisfaction.

Objective, Model under Analysis and Research Hypotheses

The present research aims to contribute to a better understanding of the effects of group reflexivity on group satisfaction in an organizational context, while considering

group affective commitment as a mediating variable. Therefore, the main objective of this study is to analyze the mediator role of team members' affective commitment in the relationship between group reflexivity and group satisfaction.

Based on the IMOI model proposed by Ilgen et al. (2005) and Kozlowski and Ilgen (2006)³, we will test a mediation model including group reflexivity as the input variable, group satisfaction as the output variable and the group affective commitment as the mediating variable (Fig. 1).

Based on the previous literature presented, the following hypotheses are proposed, which are also represented in figure 1:

H1: Group reflexivity is positively related to group satisfaction;

H2: Group reflexivity is positively related to group affective commitment;

H3: Group affective commitment is positively related to group satisfaction;

H4: Group affective commitment mediates the relationship between group reflexivity and group satisfaction.



Figure 1. Model under analysis (based on Ilgen et al., 2005).

Method

Sample

Data were collected from 136 teams, and questionnaires were administered to 136 leaders and 576 members from 85 organizations. However, due to the non-fulfillment of criteria required for inclusion in the sample, 24 teams were excluded, since the percentage of respondent members per team was less than 50% or the

³ The general I-P-O model (input, processes, output) could also be an option to fit the present paper. However, the fact that we are studying the relationship between a team process (team reflexivity) and an emergent state (team affective commitment), contributes to putting ourselves in the context of this type of models. In any case, taking into account the cross-sectional nature of this research, we are aware that we will not explore the full potential of this approach.

minimum number of members per team (three minimum) was not respected. Thus, the sample was composed by of 513 members and 112 leaders, which corresponds to 112 valid teams.

Then, as recommended in the literature (Bryman & Cramer, 2005) participants who had a non-response frequency superior than 10% (one leader and 14 members) were eliminated from the sample. Therefore, our study sample consisted of 111 leaders / teams and 499 members from 72 organizations.

The organizations where the teams of the present study are integrated belong to different sectors of activity, in which the most represented sector is commerce and services (63.60%), followed by the associative (20%) and, finally, the industrial sector (16.40%). It should also be noted that the small organization class (up to 10 employees) is the most represented in the sample with 32.10%.

The teams are from different areas/departments, such as services (39.40%), associative (22%), commercial (16.50%), project (8.30%), administrative (6.40%), management (3.70%) and production (3.70%).

The average of the team tenure is 8.47 years ($SD = 9.13$), ranging from three months to 46 years approximately. The number of members per team varies between three and 22, with an average per team of approximately six members ($SD = 3.84$).

With regard to the members of the teams, these individuals are aged between 18 and 67 ($M = 35.98$; $SD = 16.02$), of whom 38.30% are male and 61.70% are female. The tenure of each member in the team to which he belongs varies between 1 month and 43 years ($M = 5.55$, $SD = 6.63$) and, in the organization, between 1 month and 50 years ($M = 9.68$, $SD = 9.96$). According to the education level, the highest percentage of members reported having a degree (41.10%) or a grade equal to or less than the 12th grade (41.10%), while 55% said they had training in teamwork.

Procedure

The selection of the teams that were included in the sample, had as criterion the group definition adopted by the present research team. In other words, the teams selected had to be constituted by a minimum of three individuals, which are perceived by themselves and are perceived by others as a team, and who interact regularly and in an interdependent way, to accomplish a common goal (Lourenço et al., 2014). As an additional criterion, the leader of those teams had to be formally recognized.

The sample data were collected in the 2017/18 and 2018/19 academic years, between October and December⁴, through the convenience sampling method, based on the use of a network of formal or informal relationships of the researchers (Hill & Hill, 2012). The data of the members and leaders were collected through questionnaire⁵ surveys.

The first contact was established, in person and/or via e-mail, with the representatives of the organizations that corresponded to the needed requirements to be an integral part of the present study, through a letter of presentation of the research project (cf. Appendix A). Then, the research project was presented to the organizations that showed interest in collaborating, highlighting the main objectives, the team responsible for carrying out the studies, the variables under analysis, the sample and the participation steps of the organizations, the collecting method of information and the expected time, as well as the rights and obligations of the research team.

The questionnaires were answered in person or through their online version⁶. However, whenever possible, the questionnaires were answered in person and with the presence of a member of the research team, to explain possible questions or doubts. In the cases where this was not possible, the team leader was asked to distribute and collect the questionnaires, filled out by the members of the respective group.

In both cases, the ethical assumptions of the research were assured, more specifically the informed consent from the participants, as well as the anonymity and the guarantee of confidentiality. Finally, it should be noted that all the data obtained were analyzed at the group level, and therefore no individual results were used in this study.

Measures

In order to measure these study's variables - group reflexivity, team affective commitment and group satisfaction -, as mentioned in the previous subsection, the

⁴ The data were collected by the research team, constituted by national and international researchers, integrating the students Clara Campelo, Daniela Lopes, Inês Carvalho, Liliana Bastos, Lúcia Silva, Mariana Sousa and Susana Santos in the academic year of 2017/2018 and in 2018/2019 seven other colleagues - Adriana Moreira, Ana Rita Bravo, Catarina Gouveia, Catarina Senra, Helena Baptista, Joana Dinis and Sara Silva - all of them to carry out their master's research.

⁵ The questionnaire is an appropriate technique for this study, since it allows the collection of a considerable amount of data in a short period of time, reaching a large number of people and covering a wider geographical area (Mitchell & Jolley, 2010).

⁶ The online questionnaire was built using the site: www.limesurvey.org. It should be noted that 246 respondents (187 members and 59 leaders) completed the questionnaire through the online version.

questionnaire survey method was used. The questionnaire involves several scales that aim to measure a set of variables⁷, including those present in the model to be tested in this research. They also include a part regarding demographic data (such as age, gender, education level, tenure in the team and in the organization, team size, organization/team sector of activity).

It should be noted that all scales have been applied in their Portuguese version and have shown, in previous studies with samples similar to the present study, evidences of validity. The scales measuring the main constructs of our research (team reflexivity, group affective commitment and group satisfaction) were applied to team members (cf. Appendix C). Team leaders provided demographic data regarding their teams and organization (cf. Appendix B).

1) *Team Reflexivity*: This construct was measured through the Portuguese version of the scale proposed by Tjosvold et al. (2004), adapted from Carter and West (1998). The Portuguese version of this scale was developed within the framework of our research team, by Campelo (2018). This scale is used in order to perceive how individuals think about their objectives and working methods and how the team analyzes their objectives, strategies and processes, as well as how to adapt to the circumstances of the environment.

The scale of Tjosvold et al. (2004) is composed by nine items with a Likert scale of 5 points (from 1 - I totally disagree to 5 - I totally agree). In the study conducted of those authors, a Cronbach's alpha of .88 was obtained.

Regarding the research done by Campelo (2018), the dimensionality and reliability of the scale were analyzed. More specifically, dimensionality was studied through an Exploratory Factorial Analysis using the Principal Axis Factorization (PAF) method, pointing to a one-dimensional structure, composed by 8 items out of 9 from the original scale. Two examples of items present on the scale are: “Team members identify the strengths of their work as well as the areas that need improvement” and “The team reviews their goals frequently”. The solution obtained explains 52.59% of the variance. As for the internal consistency, Campelo (2018) obtained a Cronbach alpha value of .90.

⁷ Because it is part of a larger project, the present study involves a measuring instrument that includes scales that measure other constructs, beyond those that we studied in this study. Since they are not relevant to this study, these scales will not be mentioned here.

2) *Group Affective Commitment*: This variable was measured through the scale proposed by Batarseh et al. (2017), which, in turn, is based on the work of Han and Harms (2010). The scale is composed by four items adapted from Allen and Meyer's (1990) affective commitment scale, and later modified by Han and Harms (2010), in order to analyze the group level. At the same time, the authors reversed three items of the scale, making all items in the positive sense.

The Portuguese version that was applied results from the translation and adaptation carried out by our research team (cf. Bastos, 2018; Campelo, 2018)⁸, and it is composed by the following items: "Members have a strong feeling of belonging to the team"; "The members feel the problems of the team as their own"; "Members feel emotionally attached to the team" and "The team members feel like being part of the same family". Each item was scored by team members on a 5-point Likert scale (from 1 - Totally disagree to 5 - Totally agree).

It should also be noted that in the study by Batarseh et al. (2017) Cronbach's alpha was .91, while in Han and Harms' study (2010) was .87. The studies conducted by our research team (cf. Bastos, 2018; Campelo, 2018) regarding the dimensionality and the reliability of the scale also pointed to good psychometric qualities. In fact, in terms of dimensionality, in these studies, based on an Exploratory Factor Analysis using the Principal Axis Factorization (PAF) method, emerged a one-dimensional structure, as expected, explaining 59.41% of the variance. Regarding reliability, the internal consistency analysis pointed to a Cronbach alpha value of .85.

3) *Group Satisfaction*: In the present study the *Satisfaction Scale with the Working Group* (ESAGT) of Dimas, Lourenço and Rebelo (2018) was used in order to measure team members' satisfaction with their team. This scale is composed by seven items that evaluate the satisfaction of the members regarding several aspects of the group (task-related and social-related): performance, how the team works, how the leader organizes and coordinates team activities, relationships among team members, relationships between team members and the leader, role played by each team member and team environment. The members' responses are provided on a Likert type rating scale (1 = totally dissatisfied to 7 = totally satisfied).

To evaluate the psychometric qualities of ESAGT, Dimas et al. (2018) carried out three studies with groups of different organizations. Regarding dimensionality of the

⁸ Both studies used the same sample.

scale, those studies (using Exploratory Factor Analysis and Confirmatory Factor Analysis) pointed to a unidimensional structure composed of 6 of the 7 items of the original scale.

The reliability analysis of this scale has shown values higher than .90 for Cronbach's alpha, in the three studies, revealing that the scale has adequate reliability. Considering the studies of Dimas et al. (2018), the ESAGT version with 6 items was used in the analysis carried out in the study.

Control Variables

1) *Degree of Virtuality*: Considering the fact that the teams in our sample have some degree of virtuality⁹ (ranging between 2.13% and 77.53%, with an average of approximately 33.71%; $SD = 16.02$), and also considering that the literature shows that the degree of virtuality affects group emergent processes/states and team outcomes (e.g., De Guinea, Webster, & Staples, 2012; Gilson et al., 2015), the degree of virtuality was included as control variable.

In order to measure the degree of virtuality an indicator based on the work developed by De Jong, Schalk and Cursçeu (2008) was used. The indicator considers the frequency, the richness, and the degree of synchronization of the communication media used. The data related to this control variable were measured through the questionnaires filled out by the members of the teams, as they were considered more representative of what happens inside the team in terms of communication processes among members.

2) *Team size*: This variable was included as a control variable, since several studies show that team size affects group emergent processes/states and team outcomes (e.g., Hülshager, Anderson & Salgado, 2009). The teams' size was obtained from the teams' leaders.

Data analysis procedures

As mentioned in the Sample section, the teams that were not valid were excluded. Subsequently, the distribution of the missing values, still present in the

⁹ “In order to be considered virtual, a team must have members who do not work in either the same place and/or at the same time, and therefore cannot collaborate face-to-face all of the time” (Schweitzer & Duxbury, 2010, p.274). In this paper, the terms virtual teams and teams with some degree of virtuality are used in an undifferentiated way.

sample, was studied with the intention of replacing them. For this purpose, the Little's MCAR Test was conducted for each scale or dimension. Therefore, the missing values from the team reflexivity scale and the satisfaction scale were replaced by the mean. The affective commitment scale with the team did not have missing values.

Subsequently, the psychometric qualities of the scales were evaluated. Since the three scales used in the present research - group reflexivity, team affective commitment and team satisfaction - have previous studies showing good psychometric qualities, we only analyzed their reliability¹⁰.

Then, the data was aggregated for the team level, since this research is at the group level and the data had been collected at the individual level. As a way to justify the aggregation, the values of rwg were calculated (James, Demaree & Wolf, 1984), as well as the values of Intraclass Correlation Coefficients ICC (1) and ICC (2) (Bliese, 2000). In order to perform these indicators, the Excel 2007 Tool for Computing Interrater Agreement (IRA) & Interrater Reliability (IRR) Estimates for Consensus Composition Constructs, prepared by Biemann and Cole in 2014 and designed to complement the work published by Biemann, Cole and Voelpel (2012) was used.

Adopting a uniform null distribution model, which is used often when there is no theory or data suggesting the application of another distribution (Cohen, Doveh, & Nahum-Shani, 2009), the mean values obtained for the rwg were .92 for team reflexivity, .88 for affective commitment with the team, and .92 for team satisfaction. Considering that the recommended value for rwg is at least .70 (Lance, Butts, & Michels, 2006), the values presented at all scales are higher than the threshold, so it can be inferred that there is a strong agreement between team members on their respective scales (Brown & Hauenstein, 2005).

The ICC (1) values obtained were .41 for the team reflexivity scale, .33 for the scale of affective commitment with the team, and .29 for the group satisfaction scale. Regarding to ICC (2), values of .75 for the reflexivity of the team, .69 for affective commitment with the team, and .65 for group satisfaction was obtained.

The values obtained are in conformity with the values considered acceptable in the literature (e.g., Bliese, 2000; Klein & Kozlowski, 2000). In this way, overall, the values found in both the Rwg and in the ICCs support the aggregation of data at the group level.

¹⁰ The analysis of the missing values, the psychometric qualities of the instruments, as well as the assumptions of the regression analysis were made using IBM SPSS (version 22.0).

To test hypotheses H1, H2 and H3, a correlation analysis among the studied variables – team reflexivity, affective commitment with the team and team satisfaction - was carried out. In the correlation analysis, the virtuality degree and the team size were also included.

Then, the assumptions of the regression analysis technique were tested, namely the absence of uni and multivariate outliers, absence of multicollinearity, normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity of residuals (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). There was no violation, so all cases and variables were maintained for the analysis to be performed.

Finally, hypothesis H4 was tested through simple mediation using PROCESS¹¹. This tool allows the use of the bootstrapping method to construct 95% confidence intervals (in the case of the present study, 1000 bootstrap estimates were used to construct the intervals) for the indirect effects. The indirect effect in simple mediation is calculated by the product of the coefficients from the independent variable to the mediator and from the mediator to the dependent variable. The indirect effect is statistically significant, when zero is not included between the lower and upper bound of the 95% confidence intervals generated by PROCESS.

Results

Psychometric qualities of measuring instruments

Reliability studies were carried out to analyze the psychometric properties of the scales (group reflexivity, team affective commitment and group satisfaction), through the analysis of the internal consistency.

The team's reflexivity scale presented a Cronbach alpha value of .91, the scale of team affective commitment a Cronbach alpha value of .90, and the group satisfaction scale a Cronbach alpha value of .91. Thus, we can infer that all scales have a very good internal consistency (reliability), according to the classification proposed by DeVellis (2003).

Hypotheses testing

In order to test the hypotheses H1, H2 and H3, the correlations between group reflexivity, affective commitment and the group satisfaction were analyzed. As

¹¹ Macro developed for SPSS by Hayes (2013).

previously mentioned, the virtuality degree and the size of the team were also included as control variables.

Table 1 shows the results of the correlation analysis, as well as the means and standard deviations of the variables under study. Supporting Hypothesis 1, team reflexivity had a significant, positive correlation with group satisfaction ($r = .69, p < .001$). Supporting Hypothesis 2, team reflexivity had a significant, positive correlation with team affective commitment ($r = .69, p < .001$). Supporting Hypothesis 3, team affective commitment had a significant, positive correlation with group satisfaction ($r = .74, p < .001$). According to Cohen's (1988) specifications, the correlations between these variables are of a large magnitude ($r > .50$).

It should also be noted that the control variables did not correlate with none of the other variables under study. In this way, following Becker's (2005) recommendations, both the degree of virtuality and the size of the team were eliminated from all subsequent analyzes.

Table 1. Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations of the Study Variables.

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1. Team size	6.10	3.84	-				
2. Virtuality degree	33.71	16.02	0.04	-			
3. Team reflexivity	3.75	.55	-.04	.14	-		
4. Team affective commitment	3.84	.54	-.17	.03	.69***	-	
5. Group satisfaction	5.57	.64	-.16	.05	.69***	.74***	-

Note. $N = 111$. *** $p < .001$.

Hypothesis 4 stated that team affective commitment would mediate the relationship between group reflexivity and group satisfaction. This hypothesis was tested using the PROCESS macro in SPSS, Model 4.

As seen in Table 2, team reflexivity was significantly related to team affective commitment ($a = .68, SE = .07, p < .001$), and explained 47% of the variance ($R^2 = .47, F(1,109) = 97.178, p < .001$). Together, team reflexivity and team affective commitment

explained 61% of the variability in group satisfaction ($R^2 = .61$, $F(2,108) = 84.779$, $p < .001$). The relationship between team affective commitment and group satisfaction ($b = .60$, $SE = .10$, $p < .001$) was significant after controlling for the effect of team reflexivity. Team reflexivity also showed a statistically significant positive direct effect on group satisfaction ($c' = .38$, $SE = .10$, $p < .001$) after controlling for team affective commitment.

Finally, the analysis of the indirect effect of team reflexivity on group satisfaction via team affective commitment, through the bootstrapping method, revealed a bootstrap confidence interval that did not include the zero value. Therefore, the indirect effect is statistically significant ($a*b = .41$, $boot SE = .08$, 95% IC [.26, .59]).

Given the direct effect and indirect effect, the effects of team reflexivity on team satisfaction are partially mediated by team affective commitment. These results support Hypothesis 4.

Table 2. Mediation regression analysis for model 4 tested (Hypothesis 4).

DV / Predictor	B	95% CI			R ²
		SE	LL	UL	
Team affective commitment					.47***
<i>Team reflexivity</i>	.68***	.07	.55	.82	
Group satisfaction					.61***
<i>Team affective commitment</i>	.60***	.10	.41	.79	
<i>Team reflexivity</i>	.38***	.10	.19	.57	
Interaction	.41	.08	.26	.59	

Note. $N = 111$. DV = dependent variable. b = non-standardized regression coefficient. SE = standard error. CI = confidence intervals. LL = lower limit. UL = upper limit. Interaction = mediated regression effect.

*** $p < .001$, two-tailed.

Discussion

The main objective of the present research was to analyze the relationships among team reflexivity, team affective commitment and group satisfaction and, particularly, the mediating role of team affective commitment in the relationship

between team reflexivity and group satisfaction. In order to fulfill that objective, a set of hypotheses were formulated based on the literature and a mediation model was tested.

As suggested by hypothesis 1, we verified the existence of a positive relationship between team reflexivity and group satisfaction. These results converge with what was argued by West (1996), which states that teams where there is reflection on work, strategic discussion and analysis of solutions, present high levels of satisfaction. In the same way, they reinforce the study developed by Schippers et al., (2003), in which it was found a positive effect of reflexivity on group satisfaction. In this sense, team members who are able to criticize and evaluate tasks, create new ideas, encourage discussion of objectives and demonstrate results orientations will show higher levels of satisfaction (Witteman, 1991).

Based on the literature, it was possible to verify that several studies (e.g., Farnese & Livi, 2016; Schippers et al., 2003) suggest a significant positive relationship between team reflexivity and affective commitment with the team. In our research, this relationship was predicted in hypothesis 2 and received empirical support. Thus, our results suggest that the higher the level of team reflexivity, the greater the level of affective commitment with the team, reinforcing the literature that points that reflexivity constitutes an antecedent of affective commitment in the context of work teams. Therefore, the results obtained allow us to affirm, as in previous studies (e.g., Farnese & Livi, 2016; Sol, van der Wal, Beers & Wals, 2017; Tjosvold et al., 2004), that reflexivity, expressed through the concern with the development of group objectives and processes, as well as through their improvement, has an influence on the feelings of the team members and their identification with the group to which they belong, thus making them more affectively committed to their team.

Regarding the relationship between team affective commitment and group satisfaction, we verified that there is a positive and statistically significant relationship, as predicted by hypothesis 3. According to Aubé and Rousseau (2005), when teams are highly committed to reaching their shared goals, they tend to motivate their fellow team members to build and maintain positive relationships with each other, satisfying rather than frustrating their individual needs. They will also be more satisfied with their teams and may experience a lesser feeling of frustration (Omar & Ahmad, 2014). Thus, the results of this research support the evidence found in several studies that analyze the relationship between team affective commitment and group satisfaction (e.g., Farrelly & Quester, 2005; Omar & Ahmad, 2014; Riketta & Van Dick, 2005).

Finally, regarding the mediation hypothesis (H4), the results have statistical evidence that allows to support that team affective commitment acts as mediator in the relationship between team reflexivity and group satisfaction. In this way, team reflexivity seems to act indirectly on group satisfaction through team affective commitment, that is, groups that reflect and discuss about the objectives, strategies and their processes, that allow them to adapt to the different circumstances and phases of change, tend to generate in its members a high level of commitment to the team which, in turn, increases the levels of satisfaction with the group. However, this is a partial mediation, since we also observed a direct statistically significant effect of team reflexivity on group satisfaction. This means that team reflexivity presents a direct and indirect relationship (via team affective commitment) with group satisfaction. In other words, if team reflexivity directly contributes to increase group satisfaction, it also contributes, indirectly, through the influence that exerts on team affective commitment.

Conclusions

It is clear the increasing use of work teams in organizations, due to the increasing of their complexity. Working in group provides individuals more motivation and productivity than if they worked alone (Weber & Hertel, 2007), being one of the most frequent ways to organizing work.

Based on the IMOI model, the main objective of the present study was to analyze the influence of team reflexivity on group satisfaction, considering team affective commitment as a mediating variable.

Considering that the reviewed literature supports the model that we set out to study and also the establishment of our research hypotheses, an empirical study was conducted to analyze the objective already mentioned. The study has theoretical and empirical relevance, and the results found have practical implications for the organizations, since it contributes to the knowledge about group functioning.

First, our results, showing that team reflexivity is positively related to group satisfaction, reinforce the literature that has been dedicated to analyze the relationship between these variables (e.g., Gast, 2012; Schippers et al., 2003; West, 1996), and, at an intervention level, emphasizes the benefits of team leaders to stimulate reflexive practices with their teams, namely if they want to increase satisfaction among team members. Leaders can develop reflexive habits, discussions and debates about group's

strategies, goals and processes, in order to improve team practices and increase team members' satisfaction.

Second, team reflexivity also revealed to be an antecedent of the affective commitment with the team. This result converges with other studies (e.g., Farnese & Livi, 2016; Schippers et al., 2003; Sol, van der Wal, Beers & Wals, 2017; Tjosvold et al., 2004), regarding the relationship between these constructs. It also proposes that team leaders can develop reflexive practices on their team, as review and discussion about group goals, in order to help team members feel emotionally more committed with the group.

Third, our results also support that the team affective commitment is positively related to the group satisfaction, reinforcing the results found in other studies (e.g., Farrelly & Quester, 2005; Riketta & Van Dick, 2005). These results are important in the sense that, in order to have more involved and satisfied members, to make efforts to promote a high affective commitment from team members can be a good strategy. This can be accomplished by encouraging greater levels of collaboration, sharing and acceptance of ideas within the group.

Finally, in the present study, the results pointed that team affective commitment is a mediator of the relationship between group reflexivity and group satisfaction. Considering the fact that we found a partial mediation, team reflexivity increases group satisfaction, both directly and indirectly, via affective commitment.

The fact that this study was carried out with work teams that work in the field, in the context of productive organizations, using a sample size with more than 100 teams constitutes a strength of this study.

There are, also, some limitations and recommendations that need to be presented. In future studies, it would be pertinent to relate some of the variables in the present study with others that also have relevance in the context of work teams (e.g., team members well-being, intragroup conflict or leadership styles). It would also be pertinent to adopt the original scale of Carter and West (1998), since in the present study we only focused on task reflexivity. In addition, using different sources of information (team members, team leaders or even members of other groups which are related to the groups under analysis) for measuring the variables under study is a strategy to adopt in future studies, in order to reduce the probability of results bias. It would also be important to use a multi-method approach and more objective measures

to evaluate some variables (e.g., team reflexivity) to reduce possible errors regarding the method used.

Although the literature review has made it possible to establish, from the conceptual point of view, the causal sense of the relationships analyzed, the cross-sectional design of the study constitutes an obstacle to the inference of empirical causality among the variables. This leads us to affirm that, in the future, it will be desirable to replicate this study by adopting a longitudinal design.

Also, the fact that was used the method of sampling for convenience or accessibility implies that the generalization of the results should be done carefully. Plus, the fact that the sample consists only of Portuguese organizations prevents us from concluding that the results obtained would be the same as in other cultures or countries.

Finally, the use of the method of self-administered questionnaire may have caused the phenomenon of social desirability or contamination, since the information was collected from members, based on their perceptions of their group. Therefore, their responses may reflect a desire to transmit a positive image of the team. The fact that data from the variables under analysis in the model to be tested come from a single source of information (team members), as well as the filling of some questionnaires online (participants might not be familiar with the electronic platform), may have led to the bias of the common method variance, so a systematic error or contamination may occur due to the method used (Conway, 2002). However, it should be noted that the fact that the analysis was carried out at the group level, may have reduced the aforementioned problems (Conway, 2002).

References

- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(1), 1-18. doi:10.1111/j.20448325.1990.tb00506.x
- Aubé, C., & Rousseau, V. (2005). Team Goal Commitment and Team Effectiveness: The Role of Task Interdependence and Supportive Behaviors. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 9(3), 189–204. doi:10.1037/1089-2699.9.3.189
- Bastos, L. (2018). *O papel mediador do comprometimento afetivo com a equipa na relação entre a confiança e a inovação em equipas com algum grau de virtualidade*. (Dissertação de mestrado não publicada). Faculdade de Psicologia e de Ciências da Educação, Coimbra.
- Batarseh, F. S., Usher, J. M., & Daspit, J. J. (2017). Collaboration capability in virtual teams: examining the influence on diversity and innovation. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 21(6), 1750034 -129.
- Becker, T. E. (2005). Potential problems in the statistical control of variables in organizational research: A qualitative analysis with recommendations. *Organizational Research Methods*, 8(3), 274-289.
- Biemann, T., Cole, M. S., & Voelpel, S. (2012). Within-group agreement: On the use (and misuse) of rWG and rWG(J) in leadership research and some best practice guidelines. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23, 66-80. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.11.006
- Bishop, J. W., & Scott, K. D. (2000). An examination of organizational and team commitment in a self-directed team environment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(3), 439-450. doi:10.1037//0021-9010.85.3.439
- Bishop, J. W., Scott, K. D., Goldsby, M. G., & Cropanzano, R. (2005). A construct validity study of commitment and perceived support variables: A multifoci approach across different team environments. *Group & Organization Management*, 30(2), 153-180. doi:10.1177/1059601103255772
- Bliese, P. D. (2000). Within-group agreement, non-independence, and reliability: Implications for data aggregation and analysis. In K. J. Klein, & S. W. J.

- Kozlowski (Eds.), *Multilevel Theory, Research, and Methods in Organizations* (pp. 349-381). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Brayfield, A. H., & Rothe, H. F. (1951). *An index of job satisfaction*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 35(5), 307–311. doi:10.1037/h0055617
- Brown, R. D., & Hauenstein, N. M. (2005). Interrater agreement reconsidered: An alternative to the rwg indices. *Organizational Research Methods*, 8(2), 165-184. doi:10.1177/1094428105275376
- Bryman, A., & Cramer, D. (2005). *Quantitative data analysis with SPSS 12 and 13: A guide for social scientists* (1st ed.). London: Routledge.
- Campelo, C. (2018). *Como promover o comprometimento afetivo para com a equipa: o papel da reflexividade e do envolvimento* (Dissertação de mestrado não publicada). Faculdade de Psicologia e de Ciências da Educação, Coimbra.
- Carter, S. M., & West, M. A. (1998). Reflexivity, effectiveness, and mental health in BBC-TV production teams. *Small group research*, 29(5), 583-601
- Cohen, A., Doveh, E., & Nahum-Shani, I. (2009). Testing agreement for multi-item scales with the indices rWG(J) and ADM(J). *Organizational Research Methods*, 12(1), 148-164. doi:10.1177/1094428107300365
- Cohen, S. G., & Bailey, D. E. (1997). What makes teams work: Group effectiveness research from the shop floor to the executive suite. *Journal of management*, 23(3), 239-290. doi:10.1016/S0149-2063(97)90034-9
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Conway, J. M. (2002). Method variance and method bias in industrial and organizational psychology. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Handbook Of Research Methods in Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 344-365). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Costa, A. C., Roe, R. A., & Taillieu, T. (2001). Trust within teams: The relation with performance effectiveness. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10, 225–244. doi:10.1080/13594320143000654

- Dayan, M., & Basarir, A. (2009). Antecedents and consequences of team reflexivity in new product development projects. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 25(1), 18–29. doi:10.1108/08858621011009128
- De Guinea, A. O., Webster, J., & Staples, D. S. (2012). A meta-analysis of the consequences of virtualness on team functioning. *Information & Management*, 49(6), 301-308. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2012.08.003>
- De Jong, R., Schalk, R., & Cursçeu, P. L. (2008). Virtual communicating, conflicts and performance in teams. *Team Performance Management*, 14(7/8), 364-380. doi:10.1108/13527590810912331
- DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (2^a ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Dimas, I. (2007). *(Re)pensar o conflito intragrupal: Níveis de desenvolvimento e eficácia* (Dissertação de Doutoramento não publicada). Faculdade de Psicologia e de Ciências da Educação da Universidade de Coimbra, Coimbra.
- Dimas, I. D., Alves, M. P., Lourenço, P. R., & Rebelo, T. (2016). *Equipas de trabalho: Instrumentos de avaliação* (pp. 99-105). Lisboa: Edições Sílabo.
- Dimas, I. D., Lourenço, P. R., & Rebelo, T. (2018). Escala de satisfação com o grupo de trabalho (esagt): construção e estudos de validação. *Avances en Psicología Latinoamericana*, 36(1), 197-210. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12804/revistas.urosario.edu.co/apl/a.5400>
- Farnese, M. L., & Livi, S. (2016). How reflexivity enhances organizational innovativeness: The mediation role of team support for innovation and individual commitment. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, 14(4), 525-536. doi:10.1057/kmrp.2015.13.
- Farrelly, F. J., & Quester, P. G. (2005). Examining important relationship quality constructs of the focal sponsorship exchange. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 34(3), 211–219. doi:10.1016/j.indmarman.2004.09.003
- Gabelica, C., Van den Bossche, P., Segers, M., & Gijsselaers, W. (2014). Dynamics of Team Reflexivity after Feedback. *Frontline Learning Research*, 2(3), 64-91.

- Gast, I. (2012). *Individual work engagement and team work engagement: (new) antecedents and consequences* (Dissertação de Mestrado). University of Twente, Enschede
- Geister, S., Konradt, U., & Hertel, G. (2006). Effects of process feedback on motivation, satisfaction, and performance in virtual teams. *Small group research*, 37(5), 459-489. doi:10.1177/1046496406292337
- Gilson, L. L., Maynard, M. T., Young, N. C. J., Vartiainen, M., & Hakonen, M. (2015). Virtual teams research: 10 years, 10 themes, and 10 opportunities. *Journal of Management*, 41(5), 1313-1337. doi:10.1177/0149206314559946
- Hallberg, U. E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). "Same same" but different? Can work engagement be discriminated from job involvement and organizational commitment?. *European Psychologist*, 11(2), 119-127. doi:10.1027/1016-9040.11.2.119
- Han, G. H., & Harms, P. D. (2010). Team identification, trust and conflict: A mediation model. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 21(1), 20-43. doi:10.1108/10444061011016614
- Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Hill, M. M., & Hill, A. (2012). *Investigação por questionário* (2nd Rev. ed.). Lisboa: Edições Sílabo.
- Hoegl, M., & Parboteeah, K. (2006). Team reflexivity in innovative projects. *R And D Management*, 36(2), 113-125.
- Hülshager, U. R., Anderson, N., & Salgado, J. F. (2009). Team-level predictors of innovation at work: A comprehensive meta-analysis spanning three decades of research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(5), 1128-1145. doi:10.1037/a0015978
- Ilgen, D. R., Hollenbeck, J. R., Johnson, M., & Jundt, D. (2005). Teams in organizations: From input-process-output models to IMO models. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56, 517-543. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070250.

- James, L. R., Demaree, R. G., & Wolf, G. (1984). Estimating within-group interrater reliability with and without response bias. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69*(1), 85-98. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.69.1.85
- Judge, T. A., Heller, D., & Mount, M. K. (2002). Five-factor model of penonwty and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 530-541.
- Judge, T. A., & Klinger, R. (2007). Job Satisfaction: Subjective Well-Being at Work. In M. Eid & R. Larsen (Eds.), *The Science of Subjective Well-Being* (pp. 393-413). New York: Guilford Publications.
- Kim, K. Y., Eisenberger, R., & Baik, K. (2016). Perceived organizational support and affective organizational commitment: Moderating influence of perceived organizational competence. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 37*(4), 558-583.
- Klein, K. J., & Kozlowski, S. W. (2000). From micro to meso: Critical steps in conceptualizing and conducting multilevel research. *Organizational Research Methods, 3*(3), 211-236. doi:10.1177/109442810033001
- Kozlowski, S. W., & Ilgen, D. R. (2006). Enhancing the effectiveness of work groups and teams. *Psychological science in the public interest, 7*(3), 77-124.
- Lance, C. E., Butts, M. M., & Michels, L. C. (2006). The sources of four commonly reported cutoff criteria: What did they really say?. *Organizational Research Methods, 9*(2), 202-220. doi:10.1177/1094428105284919
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297–1349). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Lourenço, P. R., Dimas, I. D., & Rebelo, T. (2014). Effective workgroups: the role of diversity and culture. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 30*, 123-132. doi:10.1016/j.rpto.2014.11.002
- MacCurtain, S., Flood, P. C., Ramamoorthy, N., West, M. A., & Dawson, J. F. (2010). The Top Management Team, Reflexivity, Knowledge Sharing and New Product Performance: A Study of the Irish Software Industry. *Creativity and Innovation Management, 19*(3), 219–232. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8691.2010.00564.x

- Marks, M. A., Mathieu, J. A., & Zaccaro, S. J. (2001). A temporally based framework and taxonomy of team process. *Academy of Management Review*, 26, 356–376. doi:10.5465/amr.2001.4845785
- Mathieu, J. E., Hollenbeck, J. R., Van Knippenberg, D., & Ilgen, D. R. (2017). A Century of work teams in the Journal of Applied Psychology. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102, 452–467.
- Meier, L. L., & Spector, P. E. (2015). *Job Satisfaction*. In Wiley encyclopedia of management (pp. 1–3). Chichester, West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. doi:10.1002/9781118785317
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61–89. doi:10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-z
- Meyer, J. P., & Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the workplace: toward a general model. *Human Resource Management Review*, 11(3), 299–326. doi:10.1016/s1053-4822(00)00053-x
- Meyer, J. P., & Maltin, E. R. (2010). Employee commitment and well-being: A critical review, theoretical framework and research agenda. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77(2), 323–337. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2010.04.007
- Mitchell, M. L., & Jolley, J. M. (2010). *Research design explained* (7th ed.). USA: Cengage Learning.
- Morrison, R. L. (2008). Negative relationships in the workplace: Associations with organisational commitment, cohesion, job satisfaction and intention to turnover. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 14(04), 330–344. doi:10.1017/s1833367200003126
- Mysen, T., Svensson, G., & Payan, J. M. (2011). Causes and outcomes of satisfaction in business relationships. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 29(2), 123–140. doi:10.1108/02634501111117584

- Neininger, A., Lehmann-Willenbrock, N., Kauffeld, S., & Henschel, A. (2010). Effects of team and organizational commitment—A longitudinal study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 76*(3), 567-579. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2010.01.009
- Omar, Z., & Ahmad, A. (2014). Factors Contributing to Research Team Effectiveness: Testing a Model of Team Effectiveness in an Academic Setting. *International Journal of Higher Education, 3*(3). doi:10.5430/ijhe.v3n3p10
- Pearce, L., & Herbig, A. (2004) Citizenship Behavior at the Team Level of Analysis: The Effects of Team Leadership, Team Commitment, Perceived Team Support, and Team Size. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 144*(3), 293-310. doi: 10.3200/SOCP.144.3.293-310
- Rico, R., Hera, C. M. A., & Taberero, C. (2011). Work team effectiveness, a review of research from the last decade. *Psychology in Spain, 15*(1), 57-79.
- Riketta, M., & Dick, R. V. (2005). Foci of attachment in organizations: A meta-analytic comparison of the strength and correlates of workgroup versus organizational identification and commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 67*(3), 490–510. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2004.06.001
- Schippers, M. C., Den Hartog, D. N., Koopman, P. L., & Wienk, J. A. (2003). Diversity and team outcomes: The moderating effects of outcome interdependence and group longevity and the mediating effect of reflexivity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior, 24*(6), 779-802.
- Schippers, M. C., Edmondson, A. C., & West, M. A. (2014). Team reflexivity as an antidote to team information-processing failures. *Small Group Research, 45*(6), 731-769.
- Schippers, M. C., 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
- Schippers, M. C., Homan, A. C., & van Knippenberg, D. (2012). To reflect or not to reflect: Prior team performance as a boundary condition of the effects of

- reflexivity on learning and final team performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(1), 6–23. doi:10.1002/job.1784
- Schippers, M. C., West, M. A., & Dawson, J. F. (2015). Team reflexivity and innovation: The moderating role of team context. *Journal of Management*, 41(3), 769-788.
- Schneider, B., & Dachler, H. P. (1978). *A note on the stability of the Job Descriptive Index*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63(5), 650–653. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.63.5.650
- Schweitzer, L., & Duxbury, L. (2010). Conceptualizing and measuring the virtuality of teams. *Information Systems Journal*, 20(3), 267-295. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2575.2009.00326.x
- Sol, J., van der Wal, M. M., Beers, P. J., & Wals, A. E. J. (2017). *Reframing the future: the role of reflexivity in governance networks in sustainability transitions*. *Environmental Education Research*, 1–23. doi:10.1080/13504622.2017.1402171
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Tjosvold, D., Tang, M. M., & West, M. (2004). Reflexivity for team innovation in China: The contribution of goal interdependence. *Group & Organization Management*, 29(5), 540-559.
- Weber, B., & Hertel, G. (2007). Motivation gains of inferior group members: A meta-analytical review. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93, 973–993.
- West, M. A. (1996). Reflexivity and work group effectiveness: A conceptual integration. In M. A. West (Ed.), *Handbook of work group psychology* (pp. 555–579). Chichester, UK: Wiley
- West, M. A. (2002). Sparkling fountains or stagnant ponds: An integrative model of creativity and innovation implementation in work groups. *Applied Psychology*, 51(3), 355-387. doi:10.1111/1464-0597.00951

- Widmer, P. S., Schippers, M. C., & West, M. A. (2009). Recent Developments in Reflexivity Research: A Review. *Journal Psychologie des Alltagshandents*, 2(2), 2-11.
- Wiiteman, H. (1991). *Group Member Satisfaction*. *Small Group Research*, 22(1), 24–58. doi:10.1177/1046496491221003
- Wilson, J. M., Goodman, J. S., & Cronin, M. A. (2007). Group learning. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 1041–1059.

APPENDIXES

Appendix A

Carta de Apresentação às organizações Portuguesas

(Presentation Letter to Portuguese Organizations)



Coimbra, ___ de _____ de 201_

Exmo/a. Senhor/a Doutor/a _____

Dirigimo-nos a V. Exa. na qualidade de estudantes de mestrado da Universidade de Coimbra.

No âmbito dos projetos de investigação de mestrado que estamos a realizar na área de Psicologia do Trabalho e das Organizações, sob a orientação da Prof.^a Doutora Isabel Dórdio Dimas (Univ. Aveiro), Prof. Doutor Paulo Renato Lourenço (Univ. Coimbra) e Prof.^a Doutora Teresa Rebelo (Univ. Coimbra), na Faculdade de Psicologia e de Ciências da Educação da Universidade de Coimbra, propomo-nos estudar alguns processos de funcionamento dos grupos/equipas de trabalho virtuais ou com algum grau de virtualidade.

Para levar a cabo esta investigação pretendemos aplicar, em diferentes organizações e em dois momentos distintos, um questionário a vários grupos/equipas de trabalho e aos respetivos líderes. O primeiro momento decorrerá entre os meses de outubro e novembro de 2018 e o segundo durante os meses de dezembro de 2018 e janeiro de 2019. O tempo estimado para o preenchimento de cada questionário ronda os 20 minutos para os membros e os 7 minutos para os líderes.

Às organizações participantes nesta investigação fica garantido o direito ao anonimato e à confidencialidade dos dados, bem como a entrega, após a conclusão dos mestrados, de uma cópia das teses. Caso manifestem o desejo de obter informação sobre os resultados referentes à vossa organização em particular, disponibilizamo-nos, igualmente, para facultar esse *feedback*. Consideramos que o benefício poderá ser mútuo, na medida em que, por um lado, a organização de V. Exa. promove a investigação em Portugal e, por outro, beneficia de informação em retorno, assente no tratamento e análises de dados com rigor metodológico e cientificamente fundamentados.

Gostaríamos de poder contar com a colaboração da vossa organização para este estudo. Neste sentido, e para uma melhor apreciação da investigação e da colaboração solicitadas, teremos todo o gosto em explicar este projeto, de forma mais detalhada, através do meio de comunicação que considerem mais adequado.

Desde já gratas pela atenção dispensada, aguardamos o vosso contacto.

Com os melhores cumprimentos,

(P'la equipa de investigação)

Contactos |

Adriana Moreira

adrianamoreira214301@gmail.com

912790459

Ana Rita Bravo

arbravo00@gmail.com

969396906

Catarina Gouveia

catarina.gouveia94@gmail.com

969600649

Catarina Senra

ca.ty.4@hotmail.com

926747043

Joana Dinis

joanamargarida.26@gmail.com

965553132

Sara Liliana Silva

saralilianasilva@gmail.com

9618303

Appendix B

Questionnaire for the leaders

Cód. Organização:

Cód. Equipa:

Cód. Individual:

O presente questionário insere-se num estudo sobre os processos e os resultados dos grupos de trabalho em contexto organizacional. As questões que se seguem têm como objetivo conhecer a forma como avalia a sua equipa de trabalho, em função de um conjunto de critérios.

Todas as respostas que lhe solicitamos são rigorosamente anónimas e confidenciais. Responda sempre de acordo com aquilo que pensa, na medida em que não existem respostas certas ou erradas.

Leia com atenção as instruções que lhe são dadas, certificando-se de que compreendeu corretamente o modo como deverá responder. Certifique-se que respondeu a todas as questões.

Muito obrigado pela colaboração!

Declaração de consentimento informado (Participante)

Declaro que tomei conhecimento e fui devidamente esclarecido/a quanto aos objetivos e procedimentos da investigação a realizar. Foi-me garantida a possibilidade de, em qualquer altura, recusar participar neste estudo sem qualquer tipo de consequências. Desta forma, aceito participar neste estudo e permito a utilização dos dados que, de forma voluntária, forneço, confiando nas garantias de confidencialidade e anonimato que me são asseguradas pela equipa de investigação, bem como na informação de que não serão tratados de forma individual e de que apenas serão utilizados para fins de investigação.

Confirmo

_____, ____ de _____ 2018

[Tempo estimado de preenchimento: cerca de 7 minutos]

PARTE 1

(Dados demográficos - para fins exclusivamente estatísticos)

Idade: _____ Sexo: M F

Habilitações literárias: _____

Há quanto tempo trabalha nesta organização? Indique, por favor, o número de anos e meses ou de meses e semanas (por exemplo: 1 ano e 3 meses). _____

Informação relativa à organização:

Nº. de trabalhadores da organização: Até 10 11- 49 50 – 249 250 ou mais

Sector de atividade da organização: _____

Informação relativa à equipa:

Há quanto tempo se formou a sua equipa? Indique, por favor, o número de anos e meses ou de meses e semanas (por exemplo: 1 ano e 3 meses). _____

Há quanto tempo lidera esta equipa? Indique, por favor, o número de anos e meses ou de meses e semanas (por exemplo: 1 ano e 3 meses). _____

Nº de elementos da sua equipa (considere somente os elementos da equipa, não se incluindo a si próprio): _____

Qual é a principal atividade da sua equipa? [assinale a resposta]

- Produção Comercial Serviços Projeto
- Administrativa Gestão Outra. Qual? _____

Tendo em conta que este estudo prevê dois momentos de recolha de dados, insira, por favor, **as iniciais do seu nome completo**, de forma a podermos efetuar a correspondência da informação recolhida nos dois momentos (reforçamos que este dado será exclusivamente utilizado para fins de investigação).

Iniciais do seu nome completo: _____

Appendix C

Questionnaire for members

Cód. Organização:

Cód. Equipa:

Cód. Individual:

O presente questionário insere-se num estudo sobre os processos e os resultados dos grupos de trabalho em contexto organizacional. As questões que se seguem têm como objetivo conhecer as opiniões e atitudes dos elementos de cada equipa no que diz respeito a algumas situações que podem acontecer no seio das mesmas.

Todas as respostas que lhe solicitamos são rigorosamente anónimas e confidenciais. Responda sempre de acordo com aquilo que faz, sente ou pensa, na medida em que não existem respostas certas ou erradas.

Leia com atenção as instruções que lhe são dadas, certificando-se de que compreendeu corretamente o modo como deverá responder. **Note que as instruções não são sempre iguais.** Antes de dar por finalizado o seu questionário, certifique-se de que respondeu a todas as questões.

Muito obrigado pela colaboração!

Declaração de consentimento informado (Participante)

Declaro que tomei conhecimento e fui devidamente esclarecido/a quanto aos objetivos e procedimentos da investigação a realizar. Foi-me garantida a possibilidade de, em qualquer altura, recusar participar neste estudo sem qualquer tipo de consequências. Desta forma, aceito participar neste estudo e permito a utilização dos dados que, de forma voluntária, forneço, confiando nas garantias de confidencialidade e anonimato que me são asseguradas pela equipa de investigação, bem como na informação de que não serão tratados de forma individual e de que apenas serão utilizados para fins de investigação.

Confirmo

_____, ____ de _____ 2018

[Tempo estimado de preenchimento: cerca de 20 minutos]

PARTE 1

(Dados demográficos - para fins exclusivamente estatísticos)

Idade: _____ Sexo: M F

Habilitações literárias: _____

Já teve formação em trabalho de equipa? Sim Não

Há quanto tempo trabalha nesta organização? Indique, por favor, o número de anos e meses ou de meses e semanas (por exemplo: 1 ano e 3 meses). _____

Há quanto tempo trabalha nesta equipa? Indique, por favor, o número de anos e meses ou de meses e semanas (por exemplo: 1 ano e 3 meses). _____

Tendo em conta que este estudo prevê dois momentos de recolha de dados, insira, por favor, **as iniciais do seu nome completo** de forma a podermos efetuar a correspondência da informação recolhida nos dois momentos (reforçamos que este dado será exclusivamente utilizado para fins de investigação)

Iniciais do seu nome completo: _____

PARTE 2

De forma a garantir uma maior validade dos dados recolhidos, pedimos que responda a todos os itens apresentados abaixo pensando na sua **equipa formal como um todo**.

Indique-nos, por favor, qual o tipo de comunicação estabelecida entre si e os outros membros da sua equipa **no último mês**. Distribua 100% pelos diversos tipos, considerando que as percentagens mais elevadas correspondem aos meios de comunicação que mais frequentemente utiliza para comunicar com os restantes membros da sua equipa:

TIPOS DE COMUNICAÇÃO UTILIZADOS	Percentagem
1. Presencial.	___%
2. Através de <i>videoconferência</i> (comunicação à distância com som e imagem – por exemplo <i>skype</i> com som e imagem).	___%
3. Através de <i>teleconferência</i> (comunicação à distância somente com som – por exemplo <i>telefone/telemóvel</i> ou <i>skype</i> somente com som).	___%
4. Através de um serviço de <i>chat</i> (comunicação à distância, somente escrita e em tempo real – por exemplo, <i>whatsApp</i> ou <i>messenger do facebook</i>).	___%
5. Através de <i>rede social</i> ou <i>forum</i> (comunicação à distância somente escrita, sem ser em tempo real – por exemplo, <i>facebook</i> sem chat).	___%
6. Através de <i>e-mail</i> .	___%
7. Através de <i>plataforma eletrónica</i> de partilha de documentos ou gestão de agenda (por exemplo, <i>dropbox</i> ou <i>google drive</i>).	___%
8. Através de <i>memorandos</i> ou <i>relatórios</i> .	___%
9. Outro: Qual? _____	___%
TOTAL	100%

Satisfação com a equipa

Indique o seu grau de satisfação ou de insatisfação com cada um dos seguintes aspetos relativos à sua equipa de trabalho:

Totalmente insatisfeito	Bastante insatisfeito	Moderadamente Insatisfeito	Nem satisfeito nem insatisfeito	Moderadamente satisfeito	Bastante satisfeito	Totalmente satisfeito
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Clima existente na equipa de trabalho.							
2. Forma de trabalhar da equipa.							
3. Forma como o líder organiza e coordena as atividades da equipa.							
4. Resultados alcançados pela equipa de trabalho.							
5. Relações entre os membros da equipa e o líder.							
6. Relações entre os membros da equipa de trabalho.							
7. Papel que cada membro desempenha na equipa.							

Reflexividade da equipa

Solicitamos-lhe que nos indique em que medida as afirmações seguintes acontecem na sua **equipa de trabalho**, assinalando com uma cruz (x) o valor que melhor se adequa a cada afirmação, utilizando a seguinte escala:

1 Discordo fortemente	2 Discordo	3 Não concordo nem discordo	4 Concordo	5 Concordo fortemente
------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------------------

	1	2	3	4	5
1.A equipa revê os seus objetivos com frequência.					
2.Discutimos regularmente em que medida a equipa está a trabalhar de forma eficaz.					
3.Os métodos utilizados pela equipa para realizarem o trabalho são frequentemente debatidos na equipa.					
4.Nesta equipa, alteramos os nossos objetivos em função das circunstâncias.					
5. Discutimos regularmente em que medida transmitimos a informação entre nós de uma forma adequada.					
6. Esta equipa revê com frequência a forma como faz o seu trabalho					
7.Os membros da equipa identificam os pontos fortes do seu trabalho, assim como as áreas que precisam de melhorias.					
8.Os membros da equipa estão comprometidos com a melhoria contínua da equipa.					
9.Os membros da equipa estão abertos a melhores formas de trabalhar.					

Comprometimento com a Equipa

O conjunto das seguintes afirmações tem como objetivo continuar a **caracterizar a sua equipa de trabalho**. Neste sentido, diga, por favor, em que medida cada uma delas se aplica à equipa onde trabalha. Assinale com uma cruz (x) o valor que melhor se adequa ao que lhe é apresentado em cada afirmação, utilizando a seguinte escala:

1 Discordo fortemente	2 Discordo	3 Não concordo nem discordo	4 Concordo	5 Concordo fortemente
------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------------------

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Os membros têm um forte sentimento de pertença à equipa.					
2. Os membros sentem os problemas da equipa como sendo seus.					
3. Os membros sentem-se emocionalmente ligados à equipa.					
4. Os membros da equipa sentem-se como fazendo parte da “mesma família”.					