

RESEARCH ARTICLE

UNDERSTANDING GROUP DYNAMICS: THEORIES, PRACTICES, AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Amir Khushk*, Zhang Zengtian, Yang Hui, Cynthia Atamba

University of Science and Technology China.

*Corresponding Author Email: amir65378@gmail.com; zhzt@ustc.edu.cn

This is an open access journal distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License CC BY 4.0, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited

ARTICLE DETAILS

Article History:

Received 10 November 2021
Accepted 18 December 2021
Available online 23 December 2021

ABSTRACT

The importance of groups in a business cannot be underestimated because working as a team is the most efficient way to find solutions to specific problem. This review paper aimed to provide a comprehensive view of the group and group dynamics in light of diverse theories from the past to the present by exploring how significant components of dynamics are entrenched in contemporary group literature. An extensive literature review was performed to examine 55 articles collected from various databases such as Web of Science and Scopus and published between 2000 and 2020. In social science, understanding group values is of particular importance because they determine what kinds of behavior are acceptable or unacceptable within the group. The study examined many constructs from past research, as well as key ideas from group-related theories. Moreover, research studies that have made significant contribution to management theories were explained with novel ideas in this paper along with future directions.

KEYWORDS

Group Dynamics, Team, Conflict, Social learning, Social Identity, Employee behavior

1. INTRODUCTION

The empirical study of the behavior of small number groups is referred to as group dynamics. It is comparatively a new discipline, with its origins in the 1940s but real growth beginning in the late 1950s and early 1960s. That's not a well-defined and well-integrated domain, but instead a practice within a variety of branches of the social sciences. It coincides with fields such as social, commercial, organizational, and cognitive psychology, neuroscience, anthropology, and social work because all of these domains include organizations of different kinds of as major elements for organizing interpersonal relationships. Humans are often interacting with other people both inside and outside of the community, and inside and with the team. That's why social scientists place such importance on social behavior. This research examined social interactions within the context among the most widely known ideas and hypotheses in the research, as well as global studies completed in this domain.

The themes in recent studies and fundamental principles in the theory were used to construct this analysis. Its first chapter of the study briefly discussed groups and the background of group analysis, and social norms. Furthermore, the effect of the individuals and social values on the participant, as well as the interactions between both the group and shifts in the individual's behavior, were discussed. Intergroup relationships and important theories related to groups were briefly covered in the second chapter, along with the number of variables covered by the researcher in the context of group dynamics. The third chapter of the report covers the discussion and future direction for the scholars, which are also validated by the current literature review.

1.1 Group Dynamics and Adherence

What exactly is "group dynamics"? It is derived from a Greek term that

means "force." It refers to the influences that operate within groups. The functional implementation of group interaction lies in the use of information about these forces to accomplish a goal (Adams and Sydie, 2014). A group is a collection of at least two members who join together for a certain reason, interact with one another, influence one another, and are reliant on one another (Robbins and Judge, 2015). Lewin became aware of society's pressing need for a practical method for analyzing social interactions or group interactions. To address people's needs, he founded the Research Facility for Group Processes in the 1990s. At that time, the Center has been working to further our knowledge and understanding of communities via experimental experiments, human trials, as well as the application of intervention research methods.

Lewin made important contributions to the development of group processes - beliefs and actions within small groups. In his group dynamics theory, he explains groups as accessible and complex structures of opportunities and threats that influence collective behavior. According to Kurt Lewin, groups are complex and strong entities with the ability to control people and cultures. The term "group dynamics" applies to improvements in some aspects of the group that causes behavior and responses in the organizational setting that influence group mates (Moreland, 1996). Scholars have investigated group dynamics in terms of competition, and the complexity of workforce organizations to use teams with complex, conflicting, and often disapproved borders. These characteristics are often not expressed in the manner we describe groups in our reasoning and theories are closely linked to the coherence of the team (Mortensen, 2012).

Those interested in multilevel constructs had resources for determining what characteristics of groups can change (Chen et al., 2004). If anyone is concerned with how groups adapt over time, on the other hand, offered methods for explaining how the transition occurs, and those who

Quick Response Code



Access this article online

Website:

www.myecommercejournal.com

DOI:

10.26480/mecj.01.2022.01.08

research system dynamics introduced time dependency and error handling to organizational behavior to better explain them (Ilgen et al., 2005; Reppenning, 2003). Group values are guidelines that determine what kind of conduct is acceptable or unacceptable within the group. These guidelines serve as a guide for group members' behavior and are followed by everyone in the group. Representatives who wish to remain with the group must comply with the rules; else, they will be forced out. Social standards are the elements of a collective that tie the participants together, monitor them, and help to form a cohesive and sustainable group.

A leader or other individual is in charge of developing the group standards. The collective, on the other hand, ensures the consistency of the rules and makes it impossible to alter those. Following the adjustment, norms are viewed as a kind of social coercion. When participants deviate from the standards, they are forced to experience it in several forms (Gençer, 2019). When highly identifiable participants believe that group norms could be detrimental to the group, their actions differ from group norms. Such participants increase their personal goals while missing the collective goals and do well for individual aims. Poorly established players, on the other hand, are forced to adhere to possibly lethal group expectations by changing their set objectives to unmotivated goal attainment.

This will decrease group effectiveness, and highly defined participants are more willing to quit the group as a result (Täuber and Sassenberg, 2012). Adherence can be defined as the willingness of individuals to become a part of the community. Group members with strong adherence are impressed with one another and encouraged to participate with the group.

Furthermore, people in such groups quickly follow standards and objectives, and they assist one another in accomplishing the common goals. Whereas groups are comprised of individuals that are not related to one another, the condition is entirely reversed. Furthermore, the decision-making process in these groups is of greater quality, more effective, and reliable than those in other groups (Bonner and Sillito, 2011; Heap and Zizzo, 2009; Valentine et al., 2011).

2. DEVELOPMENT OF GROUP AND RELATED STUDIES

The first experiments on groups were conducted in the 1850s. These experiments primarily concentrated on the idea of "group spirit," which remained influential until the 1930s. Nevertheless, because "group spirit" was regarded as a characteristic of realism, and it did not appear to be a suitable topic for experimental investigation. However, the concept of "group spirit" was rejected and the presented group express a change and improvement of human actions due to the participation of someone else. Similarly, other research has found that an individual's behavior varies when he is alone versus when he is in a group (Wildschut et al., 2003). Following the 1990s, with modernization, digital transformation, changing political structures, and outcome practices across many developed nations, new concepts such as cross-cultural disparities and influences, globalization, social position and identification, diverse cultures, leadership style, work success, engagement, dynamics in sports teams, organizational citizenship behavior, and morals values have been studied in the literature on individuals and group dynamics (see Table 1). The following group dynamics constructs were outlined based on three categories by (Cronin et al., 2011).

Table 1: Group dynamics constructs		
Constructs	Group Phenomena Studies	Authors Supported
Emergent Constructs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Conflict ○ Trust ○ Team member exchange ○ Psychological Safety ○ Group identification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ (Kozlowski and Klein, 2000) ○ (Anand et al., 2010) ○ (De Jong and Elfring, 2010) ○ (Cooper and Thatcher, 2010) ○ (Bunderson and Boumgarden, 2010) ○ (Shaw et al., 2011)
Cumulative Constructs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Gender disparities and Leadership ○ Group Conflict ○ Top Management Team ○ Learning Activities and Team performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ (Wu and Tusi, 2010) ○ (Jehn and Bendersky, 2003) ○ (Walters et al., 2010) ○ (Groysberg et al., 2011) ○ (Bresman, 2010)
Contextual Construct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cohesion in Small Group ○ Power Asymmetry (inequality) and Learning Teams ○ Repeat Collaboration and Team Creativity ○ Power and Intra-group competition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ (Menon and Phillips, 2011) ○ (Van der Vegt et al., 2010) ○ (Skilton and Dooley, 2010) ○ (Baer et al., 2010)

Source: Literature Survey

3. GROUP DYNAMIC THEORIES

Numerous theories describe group dynamics; however, merely three of the more generally known theories are: Social learning, Intergroup Conflict and Social Identity.

3.1 A Dynamic Theory of Personality

Personalistic psychologists went far to rely upon on individuality of a combination of inclinations; what an individual performs at any specified instant, psychologists conclude, can be understood by how his behavior matches into the framework of his specific personality trait (Lewin et al., 1936). Based on this theory experiments were conducted on small groups to observe the impact of group dynamics, personality, and influence of leadership style. There are several sources of aggression, according to the facts, though one main issue has become abundantly apparent. If we closely study the extent of offensive behavior and the number of troublemakers present in big groups, we can see that these traits can vary significantly from group to group, particularly through the various groups are largely made up of the same people.

A certain group of kids showed dramatically various kinds of disruptive behavior when subjected to different types of leadership throughout the recent classic studies on the impact of distinct leadership styles. It does not mean that an individual's actions could be completely explained by the environment and dynamics of the group interaction, but that is interesting how much a large, coherent group can regulate facets of a participant's conduct that were formerly considered to be indicative of lasting personal

attributes (Lewin et al., 1939). Previous studies have consistently shown that approaches of workplace environment and management that provide more obligation to contribute groups, enable for greater involvement in critical things, and enable group cohesiveness and the organization foundation for consideration for participant's concerns will significantly improve the effectiveness of workgroups (Coch and French, 1948; Recardo, 1995).

According to a study, we can approach groups in at least three distinct ways when considering how they reach the phase of transformation (Cartwright, 1951). According to the first point of view, the group is a center of power over its participants. Efforts to improve conduct may be helped or hindered by group influence on participants. The group itself becomes the focus of reform in the second viewpoint. To modify the behavior of people, the group's expectations, organizational culture, emotional environment, or inequality through groupings and power structures need to be altered. According to the third point of view, certain behavioral changes could only be driven on by coordinated actions of organizations participating as reform practitioners. A group to fight discrimination, a worker's union, or an employers' association to raise wages; any pressure group can be successful based on how well it is structured.

3.2 Social Information and Social Learning Theory

Our emphasis can be traced back to who emphasized how the analysis of groups can discuss the processes that generate behavioral responses in groups by recognizing that these patterns are multilevel as it includes both

the group as well as the individual participant that represent the group (Dorwin and Zander, 1968). Current studies that can better explain group dynamics as it is concerned with how we construct collective processes and how such process develops over time. In an evolving model, both individual and collective dimensions are adaptable and equally influential. Ever since the inception of Training Groups (T-Groups) in 1947, there has also been a gradual development in the use of group dynamics to improve learning and enable individual transformation (Goldberg, 1970).

Members share their perspectives with their colleagues to benefit from others' expertise and observations; such encounters happen via a range of mediums that we term together as social networks. Sometimes, people's perceptions of the genuine situation of the environment are contaminated by distraction. As a result, in a way to produce conclusions, organizations should select how to manage and combine the data which they collect. Further, an improved comprehension of social networks will also have a wide range of crucial and immediate consequences for cultural and professional policies. As per this theory, members of the group respond logically at the start of their contacts with one another; but, in subsequent decision periods, individuals depend on a problem-solving technique which applies a useful plan that is not assured to be ideal, that just repeats their first stage observations (Rahimian and Jadbabaie, 2016).

The idea of social learning is frequently used in the sense of diverse cultural challenges. It stresses the significance of applying insights from various backgrounds to find solutions to real problems. Social learning happens as a diverse group of members exchange their information in an immersive process to generate new information and confidence, which function as the foundation for coordinated efforts (Scholz et al., 2013). According to social learning theory, participant diversity in terms of experience, beliefs, desires, and priorities is a necessary condition for dealing with serious problems (Sol et al., 2013). Specific activities that produce the group level value are influenced by the collective level value in the following specified timeframe social information processing theory and social learning theory are two widely accepted frameworks that justify such an argument that can be relevant to the relationships, perceptions, and values that compose an evolving concept (Salancik and Pfeffer, 1978; Bandura, 1977). Social learning theory incorporates both cognitive and behavioral systems since learning includes perception, memory, and motivation.

3.3 Intergroup Conflict Theory

Sherif proposed the most well-known theory of intergroup conflict. One of the key causes of the dispute, he claims, is the inability to obtain scarce resources. In other terms, the consistency of ties between two parties is determined by the presence or absence of a potential disagreement. Where resources are limited, rivalry contributes to group prejudices. As a first consequence of the rivalry between group members, the groups' contact networks are hampered. The opposing party is then thrown into a pessimistic pattern as a result of the competing parties (Jex and Britt, 2011). According to the relationship between individual personality attributes and intergroup dynamics (Newheiser and Dovidio, 2012). Individual discrepancies in cognitive behaviors have been shown to affect intergroup prejudices and faulty interpretation, and hence result in an intergroup dispute. However, intergroup disputes can be mitigated by preventing and managing the source of the problem, growing contact among individuals and groups within these groups, and, most importantly, removing the success and failure pattern. A group researchers stated that groups have a higher propensity to remove disputes because they're more likely to eliminate conflicts quicker than individuals (McPherson and Parks, 2011). This can be viewed as yet another advantage of working in or with groups.

3.4 Social Identity Theory

Social identity theory is a conceptual model that recognizes the impact of our perceptions of someone else and oneself on their attributes as well as our participation in different groups. It also contrasts the other member to

other individual categories to assist them in defining precisely who they are (Tajfel, 1982). Self-identity refers to an individual's traits, which include appearance and personality. For example, height, weight, and so on. Social Identity refers to a group to which an individual belongs, such as a resident of a specific country or region, student of a specific educational institute, and so on. So, to better comprehend the SIT, we must first consider the three conceptual mechanisms involved in it. These are social classification, identification, and contrast. People act and judge themselves in light of the peer groups to which they affiliate. Several types of researches have shown that people with common social identities associate more quickly and comfortably. This research has found that people choose to favor in-group ties for positive behavior over out-group ties. Whereas, on the other side, least inclined to threaten in-group ties for misconduct. Besides that, people are on concerned about kickbacks than with incentives (Chen and Li, 2009).

3.5 Group Think Theory

Groupthink is the term given to a concept or framework that by thoroughly developed to explain flawed decision-making processes that can arise in teams as a consequence of influences that bind a team together (Janis, 1972; Janis, 1972). Irving proposes that, in addition to strong cohesiveness, the following conditions must exist for groupthink to occur. First, organizational flaws such as leadership style, a failure of structured policies, or an absence of social equity in group decision making; and second, a difficult decision atmosphere that could involve pressure from external challenges, time constraints, and ethical quandaries. When you are managing an important collaborative decision-making initiative, here are two research questions that will easily reveal if the group has fallen to herd mentality. They should be posed to all members of the group decision-making process. Which alternatives did you realize? Do you have proof or justification to back up your claim? Groupthink can create the idea of shared transparency, but once a group decision is unanimous, the leader must take responsibility to maintain successful group decision-making processes.

3.6 Theory of Cooperation and Competition

Collectivism and individualism concepts play key roles in fields like sociology, international business, leadership, and faith. The influence of beliefs on groups is also worth investigating, as teams are becoming extremely valuable in businesses. Organizations achieve success by the formation of teams, integrate and channel the implicit and explicit expertise of their representatives to encourage creativity Teams, with their strong commitments and control, are equivalent to authority (Leonard and Sensiper, 1998). Many workers, particularly professionals who have historically resented hegemony, could embrace teams as a much more appropriate form of social control (Ouchi, 1981). Great teams are dynamic, embedded skill that can be difficult to duplicate (Barney, 1991). The theory of cooperation and competition can be helpful in further understanding how beliefs affect group dynamics.

While the conventional study indicated that communitarian principles promote conflict resolution and collective efficacy, few, if there are any, experiments have used the philosophy of teamwork and competitiveness to explain the potential dynamics through which principles exert their influence (Tjosvold et al., 2003). Among the most significant contributions of theories related to organizations is a deep assessment of why organizations develop associations with each other and for what purposes (see Table 2). Several sectors, such as computers and telecommunications, have broadly dispersed infrastructure, and businesses are forced to establish organizational alliances in able to reach the resources that contribute to growth and innovation (Powell et al., 1996; Sytch and Tatarynowicz, 2014). Among the most prominent cases are the partnerships formed between Intel and Microsoft to grow the Wintel system and take dominance of the PC market (Casadesus-Masanell and Yoffie, 2007). Many areas of research have advanced in Groups, including:

Table 2: Theory of Cooperation and Competition

Author	Research Area	Theoretical Support
(Esakia et al., 2020)	Smart watches and Group Dynamics	Grounded theory
(Hacker et al., 2019)	Trust and Virtual Teams	Reflective theory Theory Y leadership Media synchronicity theory
(Pérez et al., 2018)	Group Decision Making Problems	Social choice theory Social decision scheme theory
(Davis, 2016)	Group Dynamics and Inter-organizational relationship	Network theory
(Waller et al., 2016)	Group and Team Dynamics	Theory of Emergence
(D’Innocenzo et al., 2016)	Leadership-Team Performance Relation	Social Network Theory Expectancy Theory
(Curry et al., 2012)	Representational Group	Representational group theory
(Täuber and Sassenberg, 2012)	Group Norms	Social identity theory Self-categorization theory
(Urlingame et al., 2012)	Change and Group Effectiveness	Confluence of theory Cognitive behavioral therapy theory Social learning theory Social identity theory Situational leadership theory
(Denis et al., 2012)	Leadership and Group Dynamics	Role theory Activity theory Actor-Network theory Grounded theory Relational leadership theory Complexity theory
(O’Neill and Allen, 2012)	Team Meeting Attitude	Action Theory
(Bonner and Sillito, 2011)	Group Decision Making	Social decision theory
(Dierdorff et al., 2011)	Power and Team Performance	Theory of compilation and performance Expectancy theory of motivation
(DeChurch and Mesmer-Magnus, 2010)	Teamwork and Cognition	Group dynamic theory
(Bresman, 2010)	External Learning and Team Performance	Social learning theory
(Van der Vegt et al., 2010)	Power Asymmetry(inequality) and Learning Teams	Control theory perspective
(Farh et al., 2010)	Conflict and Team Creativity	Minority dissent theory
(Farnsworth, 2010)	Group Dynamics and Focus Group	Focal conflict theory
(Xia et al., 2009)	Negative Group Dynamics	Realistic group conflict theory
(Bezrukova et al., 2009)	Workgroup fault lines and Group performance	Cross categorization theory Social identity theory
(Mathieu et al., 2008)	Team Effectiveness	Referent shift theory Group dynamic theory
(Lucas and Kline, 2008)	Group Dynamics and Organizational Change and Learning	Systems theory Social exchange theory
(Wilson et al., 2007)	Group Learning	Social learning theory Collaborative learning theory
(Murphy and McIntyre, 2007)	Performance and Group Dynamics	Attribution theory Social role theory Similarity/attraction theory Decision making theory Agency theory
(Sweet and Michaelsen, 2007)	Group Dynamics and Small Group Learning	Theory of equilibrium Vygotskian cognitive theory Social cognitive theory
(Hackman and Wageman, 2005)	Team Leaders	Theory of leadership effectiveness
(Van Knippenberg et al., 2004)	Work Group Diversity	Social identity theory and Self-categorization theory
(Frey and Sunwolf, 2004)	Symbols and Group Dynamics	Symbolic convergence theory Structuration theory Narrative theory of communication
(Zeidner et al., 2004)	Emotional Intelligence and Groups	Self-regulation theory Theory of emotional intelligence

Source: Literature Survey

4. DISCUSSION

Great teams are dynamic and difficult to duplicate (Foss and Saebi, 2017).

Groups predict the organization's creativity, innovation and general performance (Foss and Saebi, 2018; Tan, 2019). Given the importance of groups, researchers and practitioners are interesting in understanding group dynamics. A group researchers social information processing theory and Bandura's (1977) social learning theory are two widely accepted frameworks that justify such an argument (Salancik and Pfeffer's, 1978). They are relevant to the relationships, perceptions, and values that compose an evolving concept. Social information processing theory incorporates both cognitive and behavioral systems, and social learning theory includes perception, memory, and motivation. In fact, the relation between internal and external conflicts is widely discussed and many of them rely on the traditional research of work on group dynamics and conflicts among members (Simmel, 1898; Ross, 1957).

The majority of arguments indicated a strong relationship between the various conflicts. Among these, the 3 main points hold out. To begin, the "group maintenance" hypothesis proposes that member in groups could form hostile relationships now without group as a means of reducing internal conflict and increasing mutual trust (Ross, 1957; Simmel, 1898). Secondly, intra-group conflict promotes inter-group confrontation since it creates unfavorable attitudes and impressions of everyone else, de-individualization of others, as well as the formation of a null-group win-lose mindset (Pruitt and Kressel, 1985). In the same vein, internal team conflicts have been recommended as result of what has been termed as "cargo-effect," leading to further confrontation with external groups. Internal team disputes spread to certain other teams (Keenan and Carnevale, 1989). Third, some researcher observes members of the group should communicate with one another for choices and all these trends could be the basis for interactions with the others based on detailed in social identity theory (Mercer, 1995; Tjosvold and Sun, 2001). Collaboration processes are likely to produce more teamwork towards the opposing members, and conflict-related behavior towards the opposing team.

The theory of cooperation and competition can be helpful in further understanding how beliefs affect group dynamics. Personalistic psychologists suggest that individuality is essential in groups as it impacts group dynamics. Individuality is influenced by personality traits which vary significantly within heterogeneous groups (Lewin et al., 1936). In an experimental study, one group that consisted of children showed increased disruptive behavior when subjected to different types of leadership. Although the environmental dynamics of group interaction cannot exhaustively explain an individual's actions, it is fascinating to observe how groups regulate facets of a participant's (Lewin et al., 1939). A group researchers emphasized the processes that generate behavioral responses in groups (Nakauchi et al., 2017). They recognized that these patterns were multilevel and involved both the group and the group members. In an evolving model, both individual and collective dimensions are adaptable and equally influential.

The collective level value influences behaviors that produce the group-level value. While the conventional studies indicate that communitarian principles promote conflict resolution and collective efficacy, few studies have used the philosophy of teamwork and competitiveness to explain the potential dynamics through which principles exert their influence (Lee and Choi, 2020). Studies have also shown that contextual factors such as work environment and culture influence group behavior and performance. Cultural factors such as collectivism and individualism influence group beliefs (Lee and Choi, 2020). These studies have been examined in various contexts, such as sociology, international business, leadership, and faith. Research has found that people choose to favor in-group members more than those in the out-group. Whereas, on the other side, in-group members are less inclined to admonish their peers for misconduct (Amarantou et al., 2018; Lee and Choi, 2020). Organizational culture arises when teams are formed.

Organizations integrate and channel their representatives' implicit and explicit expertise to encourage creativity among teams. With their strong commitments and control, teams gain authority to make decisions (Ganguly et al., 2019). Many workers, particularly professionals who have historically resented hegemony, could embrace teams as a much more appropriate form of social control (Tan, 2019). Group conflict and resolution is also a critical area of study. Janis developed the Groupthink framework to explain the flawed decision-making processes in teams (Janis, 1972). Tetlock and colleagues' proposed three stages to be followed when evaluating scientific proof for groupthink theory: requiring potentially unbiased appraisers to use the Q-sort to characterize herd mentality and active groups; requesting evaluators to produce these Q-sorts while referencing the eight cases formerly investigated by Janis in 1982, and finally comparing the Q-sorts (Tetlock and colleagues', 1992). Further, Sheriff's well-known theory of intergroup conflict states that the

cause of the dispute is the inadequacy of resources.

The consistency of ties between two parties is determined by the presence or absence of a potential disagreement. Where resources are limited, rivalry contributes to group prejudices. As a first consequence of the rivalry between group members, the networks are hampered. The opposing party is then thrown into a pessimistic pattern due to the competing parties (Jex and Britt, 2011). As per study, the relationship between individual personality attributes and intergroup dynamics is influenced by individual discrepancies, intergroup prejudices and faulty interpretation (Leslie et al., 2020). However, intergroup disputes can be mitigated by strengthening contact among group members. It is also important to remove the success and failure patterns among the group members. A study stated that groups have a higher propensity to remove disputes than individuals (Böhm et al., 2020).

5. FUTURE DIRECTION

5.1 Group Emergence

The absence of focus within groups to a well time before this phase could be reflective of the hard issue of emergence. That is the challenge in defining the real process of emergence, whether in groups or other situations. As a result, we recommend that future studies should really go deeper into the process, consider participants' prior perceptions and knowledge, and move further away from presuming the individuality of emerging states within teams. As a result, we expect that our knowledge and representation of the factors that contribute to group dynamism will improve (Mitchell and Toroczka, 2010).

5.2 Team Learning

An increasing body of research on team learning in work structures demonstrates that teams perform much better if they are engaged in effective teamwork. It has even been proposed that effective teamwork is at the heart of organizational reform and reinvention. We believe that theorizing regarding the situations in which one type of structure might enhance, replace, or conflict with the other through impacting group learning processes is a promising direction for future study. Moreover, future study should focus on the interaction of settings and training processes in teams apart from self-managed groups tasked with no routine tasks (Bresman and Zellmer-Bruhn, 2013)

5.3 Group Conflict

Representational group theory highlights the complexities of the relationships between groups and individuals on the team, offers a valuable basis for recognizing the roots of the typical problems that occur in hybrid approaches groups, and helps distinguish these concerns from the extent of interpersonal disputes (Curry et al., 2012). Future studies should focus on the implementation of approaches based on this knowledge and existing literature, as well as the rigorous evaluation of the effect on team working and efficiency.

5.4 Team Meetings

We proposal to scholars that team members' affiliations influence team meeting attitude (TMA); although findings are partially compatible with such hypothesis, additional experimental research that can thoroughly study cause and effect correlations will be beneficial. Thirdly, team meeting attitude potential for significance is investigated. An approach like this may be beneficial. Sub-scales addressing meeting recurrence, completing tasks in discussions, session duration, and taking decisions in sessions will not be entirely connected (O'Neill and Allen, 2012).

5.5 Leadership-Team Relationship

A comprehensive examination of shared leadership, for example, will demonstrate that certain participants actively drive previous orders while others coordinate action stage operations. We further recommend researchers, if they are using collective or social network methodologies, index several meaningful characteristics of shared leadership and evaluate their results while taking into consideration underlying interdependencies (D'Innocenzo et al., 2016).

5.6 Hybrid Model

Promoting an evolving viewpoint related to the holistic/hybrid model can be useful through describing the finest aspects of group functioning utilizing conceptual structures based on social learning theory which includes three aspects such as: cognitive, affective, and behavioral (Jehn, 1995). This development necessarily involves the discipline

grappling with determining the necessary limits for undermining and separating practical situations through theoretically profound benefits and appealing structures thus retaining the comprehensive and broad picture of the context.

6. CONCLUSION

This research aimed to provide a comprehensive view of the group dynamics fundamental concepts in light of diverse theories from the past to the present by exploring how significant components of dynamics are entrenched in contemporary group literature. Therefore, extensive literature review was performed using various databases such as Web of Science and Scopus. A number of group aspects were discussed in detail (such as trust, conflict, adherence, and group identification) and theories (such as social learning, personality theory, social exchange, social identity, and intragroup conflict) are highlighted in the literature. Teamwork has historically increased productivity and efficiency in the workplace. It is because members of the group and those who are not members of the group constantly interact with each other and find solutions.

REFERENCES

- Adams, B., Sydie, R., 2014. Society, Self, and Mind: Cooley, Mead, and Freud. In *Classical Sociological Theory*, pp. 310–341. SAGE Books. <https://sk.sagepub.com/books/classical-sociological-theory/n13.xml>
- Amarantou, V., Kazakopoulou, S., Chatzoudes, D., Chatzoglou, P., 2018. Resistance to change: an empirical investigation of its antecedents. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 31 (2), Pp. 426–450. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-05-2017-0196>
- Anand, S., Vidyarthi, P.R., Liden, R.C., Rousseau, D.M., 2010. Good citizens in poor-quality relationships: Idiosyncratic deals as a substitute for relationship quality. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53 (5), Pp. 970–988.
- Baer, M., Leenders, R., Oldham, G., Vadera, A., 2010. Win or lose the battle for creativity: The power and perils of intergroup competition. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53 (4), Pp. 827–845. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.52814611>
- Bandura, A., 1977. Social learning theory. In *Group & Organization Studies*. Prentice-Hall.
- Barney, J., 1991. Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17 (1), Pp. 99–120.
- Bezrukova, K., Jehn, K.A., Zanutto, E.L., Thatcher, S.M.B., 2009. Do workgroup fault lines help or hurt? A moderated model of faultlines, team identification, and group performance. *Organization Science*, 20 (1), Pp. 35–50. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1080.0379>
- Böhm, R., Rusch, H., Baron, J., 2020. The psychology of intergroup conflict: A review of theories and measures. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 178, Pp. 947–962. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2018.01.020>
- Bonner, B.L., Sillito, S.D., 2011. Leveraging member knowledge in group decision-making: Expertise, extroversion, and feedback. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 15 (3), Pp. 233–245. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022735>
- Bresman, H., 2010. External learning activities and team performance: A multimethod field study. *Organization Science*, 21 (1), Pp. 81–96. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1080.0413>
- Bresman, H., Zellmer-Bruhn, M., 2013. The structural context of team learning: Effects of organizational and team structure on internal and external learning. *Organization Science*, 24 (4), Pp. 1120–1139. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1120.0783>
- Bunderson, J.S., Boumgarden, P., 2010. Structure and learning in self-managed teams: Why “bureaucratic” teams can be better learners. *Organization Science*, 21 (3), Pp. 609–624. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1090.0483>
- Burg, R., 2009. Deliberative business ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 88(SUPPL. 4), Pp. 665–683. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0332-5>
- Cartwright, D., 1951. Achieving Change in People: Some Applications of Group Dynamics Theory. *Human Relations*, 4 (4), Pp. 381–392. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872675100400404>
- Casadesus-Masanell, R., Yoffie, D.B., 2007. Wintel: Cooperation and conflict. *Management Science*, 53 (4), Pp. 584–598. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1060.0672>
- Chen, Y., Li, S.X., 2009. Group identity and social preferences. *American Economic Review*, 99 (1), Pp. 431–457. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.99.1.431>
- Christ, O., Hewstone, M., Schmid, K., Green, E.G.T., Gollwitzer, M., 2017. Advanced multilevel modeling for a science of groups: A short primer on multilevel structural equation modeling. *Group Dynamics*, 21 (3), Pp. 121–134. <https://doi.org/10.1037/gdn0000065>
- Coch, L., French, J.R.P., 1948. Overcoming Resistance to Change. *Human Relations*, 1 (4), Pp. 512–532. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872674800100408>
- Cooper, D., Thatcher, S., 2010. Identification in organizations: The role of self-concept orientations and identification motives. *Academy of Management Review*, 35 (4), Pp. 516–538. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2010.53502693>
- Cronin, M.A., Weingart, L.R., Todorova, G., 2011. Dynamics in groups: Are we there yet? *Academy of Management Annals*, 5 (1), Pp. 571–612. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2011.590297>
- Curry, L.A., O’Cathain, A., Clark, V.L.P., Aroni, R., Fetters, M., Berg, D., 2012. The Role of Group Dynamics in Mixed Methods Health Sciences Research Teams. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 6 (1), Pp. 5–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689811416941>
- D’Innocenzo, L., Mathieu, J.E., Kukenberger, M.R., 2016. A Meta-Analysis of Different Forms of Shared Leadership–Team Performance Relations. *Journal of Management*, 42 (7), Pp. 1964–1991. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314525205>
- Davis, J.P., 2016. The Group Dynamics of Interorganizational Relationships: Collaborating with Multiple Partners in Innovation Ecosystems. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 61 (4), Pp. 621–661. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839216649350>
- De Jong, B.A., Elfring, T., 2010. How does trust affect the performance of ongoing teams? the mediating role of reflexivity, monitoring, and effort. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53 (3), Pp. 535–549. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.51468649>
- DeChurch, L.A., Mesmer-Magnus, J.R., 2010. The Cognitive Underpinnings of Effective Teamwork: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95 (1), Pp. 32–53. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017328>
- Denis, J.L., Langley, A., Sergi, V., 2012. Leadership in the Plural. *Academy of Management Annals*, 6 (1), Pp. 211–283. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2012.667612>
- Dierdorff, E.C., Bell, S.T., Belohlav, J.A., 2011. The Power of “We”: Effects of Psychological Collectivism on Team Performance Over Time. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96 (2), Pp. 247–262. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020929>
- Dorwin, C., Zander, A., 1968. *Group Dynamics: Research and Theory* (3rd ed.). Harper & Row. <https://www.worldcat.org/title/group-dynamics-research-and-theory/oclc/437148>
- Esakia, A., Mccrickard, S., Harden, S., Horning, M., Ramalingam, N., Tech, V., 2020. Using Smartwatches to Facilitate a Group Dynamics-Based Statewide Physical Activity Intervention. *International Journal of Human - Computer Studies*, 142, Pp. 102501. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2020.102501>
- Farh, J.L., Lee, C., Farh, C.I.C., 2010. Task Conflict and Team Creativity: A Question of How Much and When. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95 (6), Pp. 1173–1180. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020015>
- Farnsworth, J., 2010. Analysing group dynamics within the focus group. *Qualitative Research*, 10 (5), Pp. 605–624. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794110375223>

- Foss, N.J., Saebi, T., 2017. Fifteen Years of Research on Business Model Innovation. *Journal of Management*, 43 (1), Pp. 200–227. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316675927>
- Foss, N.J., Saebi, T., 2018. Business models and business model innovation: Between wicked and paradigmatic problems. *Long Range Planning*, 51 (1), Pp. 9–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2017.07.006>
- Frey, L. R., Sunwolf, 2004. The Symbolic-Interpretive Perspective on Group Dynamics, 35 (3), Pp. 277–306. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496404263771>
- Ganguly, A., Talukdar, A., Chatterjee, D., 2019. Evaluating the role of social capital, tacit knowledge sharing, knowledge quality and reciprocity in determining innovation capability of an organization. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 23 (6), Pp. 1105–1135. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-03-2018-0190>
- Gençer, H., 2019. Group dynamics and behavior. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 7 (1), Pp. 223–229. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2019.070128>
- Goldberg, C., 1970. Encounter: Group Sensitivity Training Experience. In *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 32 (3). Science House Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1086/267636>
- Greenlee, B.J., Karanxha, Z., 2010. A Study of Group Dynamics in Educational Leadership Cohort and Non-Cohort Groups. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 5 (11), Pp. 357–382. <https://doi.org/10.1177/194277511000501101>
- Groysberg, B., Polzer, J.T., Elfenbein, H.A., 2011. Too many cooks spoil the broth: How high-status individuals decrease group effectiveness. *Organization Science*, 22 (3), Pp. 722–737. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1100.0547>
- Hacker, J., Johnson, M., Saunders, C., Thayer, A.L., 2019. Trust in Virtual Teams: A Multidisciplinary Review and Integration. *Australasian Journal of Information Systems*, 23, Pp. 1–36. <https://doi.org/10.3127/ajis.v23i0.1757>
- Hackman, J.R., Wageman, R., 2005. When and How Team Leaders Matter. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 26 (04), Pp. 37–74. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085\(04\)26002-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085(04)26002-6)
- Hannan, M.T., 1992. Aggregation and Disaggregation in the Social Sciences | Stanford Graduate School of Business. *Organizational Behavior*. <https://www.gsb.stanford.edu/faculty-research/books/aggregation-disaggregation-social-sciences>
- Heap, S.P.H., Zizzo, D.J., 2009. The Value of Groups. *American Economic Association*, 99 (1), Pp. 295–323.
- 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, Pp. 517–543. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070250>
- Janis, I., 1972. Group Think and Group Dynamics: A Social Psychological Analysis of Defective Policy Decision. *Policy Studies Journal*, 2 (1), Pp. 19–25.
- Jehn, K.A., 1995. A Multimethod Examination of the Benefits and Detriments of Intragroup Conflict. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40 (2), Pp. 256. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393638>
- Jehn, K.A., Bendersky, C., 2003. Intragroup Conflict in Organizations: a Contingency Perspective on the Conflict-Outcome Relationship. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 25 (03), Pp. 187–242. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085\(03\)25005-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085(03)25005-X)
- Jex, S.M., Britt, T.W., 2011. Organizational psychology: a scientist-practitioner approach. In *Nature* (2nd ed., Vol. 480, Issue 7378). <https://doi.org/10.1038/480463b>
- Keenan, P.A., Carnevale, P.J.D., 1989. Positive Effects of Within-Group Cooperation on Between-Group Negotiation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 19 (12), Pp. 977–992. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1989.tb01233.x>
- Kozlowski, S.W.J., Klein, K.J., 2000. A multilevel approach to theory and research in organizations: Contextual, temporal, and emergent processes. *Multilevel Theory, Research and Methods in Organizations: Foundations, Extensions, and New Directions*, Pp. 3–90.
- Lau, V.P., Wong, Y.Y., 2009. Direct and multiplicative effects of ethical dispositions and ethical climates on personal justice norms: A virtue ethics perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 90 (2), Pp. 279–294. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0042-z>
- Lee, H., Choi, H.S., 2020. Independent self-concept promotes group creativity in a collectivistic cultural context only when the group norm supports collectivism. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/gdn0000129>
- Leonard, D., Sensiper, S., 1998. The role of tacit knowledge in group innovation. *Managing Knowledge Assets, Creativity, and Innovation*, 40 (3), Pp. 301–323. https://doi.org/10.1142/9789814295505_0013
- Leslie, L.M., Bono, J.E., Kim, Y. (Sophia), Beaver, G.R., 2020. On melting pots and salad bowls: A meta-analysis of the effects of identity-blind and identity-conscious diversity ideologies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 105 (5), Pp. 453–471. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000446>
- Lewin, K., 1951. *Formalization and progress in society*, in Cartwright, D. (Ed.), *Field Theory in Social Science*. Harper.
- Lewin, K., Adams, D., Zener, K., 1936. A Dynamic Theory of Personality. *Mind New Series*, 45 (178), Pp. 246–251. <https://doi.org/10.1093/mind/xxiii.1.165>
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., White, R.K., 1939. Patterns of Aggressive Behavior in Experimentally Created “Social Climates”. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 10 (2), Pp. 269–299.
- Lucas, C., Kline, T., 2008. Understanding the influence of organizational culture and group dynamics on organizational change and learning. *Learning Organization*, 15 (3), Pp. 277–287. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09696470810868882>
- Mathieu, J., Maynard, T.M., 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), Pp. 410–476. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308316061>
- McGrath, J.E., Arrow, H., Berdahl, J.L., 2000. The study of groups: Past, present, and future. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4 (1), Pp. 95–105. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327957PSPR0401_8
- McPherson, S., Parks, C.D., 2011. Intergroup and Interindividual Resource Competition Escalating into Conflict: The Elimination Option. *Group Dynamics*, 15 (4), Pp. 285–296. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024938>
- Menon, T., Phillips, K.W., 2011. Getting even or being at odds? Cohesion in even- and odd-sized small groups. *Organization Science*, 22 (3), Pp. 738–753. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1100.0535>
- Millar, C.C.J.M., Ju, C.C., 2009. Networks, Social Norms and Knowledge Sub-Network. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 90, Pp. 565–574. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0607-x>
- Mitchell, M., Toroczka, Z., 2010. Complexity: A Guided Tour. *Physics Today*, 63 (2), Pp. 47–48. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.3326990>
- Moreland, R.L., 1996. Lewin’s legacy for small-groups research. *Systems Practice*, 9 (1), Pp. 7–26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02173416>
- Mortensen, M., 2012. Boundary Multiplicity: Rethinking Teams and Boundedness in the Light of Today’s Collaborative Environment. *Ssrn*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1980698>
- Murphy, S.A., McIntyre, M.L., 2007. Board of director performance: A group dynamics perspective. *Corporate Governance*, 7 (2), Pp. 209–224. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14720700710739831>
- Nakauchi, M., Washburn, M., Klein, K., 2017. Differences between inter- and intra-group dynamics in knowledge transfer processes. *Management Decision*, 55 (4), Pp. 766–782. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-08-2016-0537>
- Newheiser, A.K., Dovidio, J.F., 2012. Individual differences and intergroup bias: Divergent dynamics associated with prejudice and stereotyping. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 53 (1), Pp. 70–74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.02.024>

- O'Neill, T.A., Allen, N.J., 2012. Team meeting attitudes: Conceptualization and investigation of a new construct. *Small Group Research*, 43 (2), Pp. 186–210. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496411426485>
- Pérez, I.J., Cabrerizo, F.J., Alonso, S., Dong, Y.C., Chiclana, F., Herrera-Viedma, E., 2018. On dynamic consensus processes in group decision making problems. *Information Sciences*, 459, Pp. 20–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2018.05.017>
- Powell, W.W., Koput, K.W., Smith-Doerr, L., 1996. Interorganizational collaboration and the locus of innovation: Networks of learning in biotechnology. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41 (1), Pp. 116–145. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393988>
- Rahimian, M.A., Jadbabaie, A., 2016. Group decision making and social learning. 2016 IEEE 55th Conference on Decision and Control, CDC 2016, Cdc, Pp. 6783–6794. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CDC.2016.7799314>
- Robbins, S.P., Judge, T. A., 2015. *Organizational Behavior*. Pearson. <https://www.pearson.com/us/higher-education/product/Robbins-Organizational-Behavior-16th-Edition/9780133507645.html?tab=contents>
- Rogelberg, S.G., A. Allen, J., Shanock, L., Scott, C., 2010. Employee satisfaction with meetings: A contemporary facet of job satisfaction. *Human Resource Management*, 49, Pp. 149–172. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm>
- Scholz, G., Dewulf, A., Pahl-Wostl, C., 2013. An Analytical Framework of Social Learning Facilitated by Participatory Methods. *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, 27 (6), Pp. 575–591. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11213-013-9310-z>
- Shaw, J.D., Zhu, J., Duffy, M.K., Scott, K.L., Shih, H.A., Susanto, E., 2011. A Contingency Model of Conflict and Team Effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96 (2), Pp. 391–400. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021340>
- Skilton, P.F., Dooley, K.J., 2010. The Effects of Repeat Collaboration on Creative Abrasion. *Academy of Management Review*, 35 (1), Pp. 118–134. https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prosporo/display_record.php?RecordID=46445%0Ahttp://essay.utwente.nl/70829/1/Reuvekamp_MA_BMS.pdf
- Sol, J., Beers, P. J., Wals, A.E.J., 2013. Social learning in regional innovation networks: Trust, commitment and reframing as emergent properties of interaction. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 49, Pp. 35–43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2012.07.041>
- Sweet, M., Michaelsen, L.K., 2007. How group dynamics research can inform the theory and practice of postsecondary small group learning. *Educational Psychology Review*, 19 (1), Pp. 31–47. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-006-9035-y>
- Sytch, M., Tatarynowicz, A., 2014. Exploring the locus of invention: The dynamics of network communities and firms' invention productivity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57 (1), Pp. 249–279. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.0655>
- Tan, B.S., 2019. In search of the link between organizational culture and performance. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 40 (3), Pp. 356–368. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-06-2018-0238>
- Täuber, S., Sassenberg, K., 2012. The impact of identification on adherence to group norms in team sports: Who is going the extra mile? *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 16 (4), Pp. 231–240. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028377>
- Tjosvold, D., Law, K.S., Sun, H.F., 2003. Collectivistic and Individualistic Values: Their Effects on Group Dynamics and Productivity in China. *Group Decision and Negotiation*, 12 (3), Pp. 243–263. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023383200180>
- Tjosvold, D., Sun, H.F., 2001. Effects of influence tactics and social contexts in conflict: An experiment on relationships in China. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 12 (3), Pp. 239–258. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb022857>
- Valentine, S., Godkin, L., Fleischman, G.M., Kidwell, R., 2011. Corporate Ethical Values, Group Creativity, Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention: The Impact of Work Context on Work Response. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 98 (3), Pp. 353–372. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0554-6>
- Van der Vegt, G.S., de Jong, S.B., Bunderson, J.S., Molleman, E., 2010. Power asymmetry and learning in teams: The moderating role of performance feedback. *Organization Science*, 21 (2), Pp. 347–361. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1090.0452>
- Waller, M.J., Okhuysen, G.A., Saghafian, M., 2016. Conceptualizing Emergent States: A Strategy to Advance the Study of Group Dynamics. *Academy of Management Annals*, 10 (1), Pp. 561–598. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2016.1120958>
- Walters, B.A., Kroll, M., Wright, P., 2010. The impact of TMT board member control and environment on post-ipo performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53 (3), Pp. 572–595. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.51468968>
- Wilson, J.M., Goodman, P.S., Cronin, M.A., 2007. Group learning. *Academy of Management Review*, 32 (4), Pp. 1041–1059. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2007.26585724>
- Wu, J.B., Tusi, A.S., 2010. Consequences of differentiated leadership in Groups. *Academy Of Management Journal*, 53 (1), Pp. 90–106.
- Xia, L., Connie Yuan, Y., Gay, G., 2009. Exploring negative group dynamics: Adversarial network, personality, and performance in project groups. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 23 (1), Pp. 32–62. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318909335416>

