

# An Examination of the Impact of Individual Team Member Characteristics on Team Performance and Member Satisfaction

*“The results suggest that individuals who are somewhat impulsive, intrinsically motivated and prone to use an integrative conflict resolution style are more likely than others to be satisfied in a team-based environment.”*

*The purpose of this research was to examine the relationship between various personality characteristics and individual's propensity to work in a team-based environment. The impact of seven independent variables on team satisfaction and team performance was examined. The results suggest that individuals who are somewhat impulsive, intrinsically motivated and prone to use an integrative conflict resolution style are more likely than others to be satisfied in a team-based environment. However, the prior performance of the individual team members, rather than their personality characteristics, appears to be the best predictor of team performance.*

Self-managed work groups, team work and empowered employees are among the common buzzwords in management circles in the 1990s. The popularity of work teams is due in part to their motivational aspects, reduction in labor costs and increase in productivity (Williams, 1994). Many companies having heard about the benefits have started to implement teams. In fact, 68 percent of Fortune 1000 companies reported the use of self-managed or high performance work teams (Dumaine, 1994). Further investigation revealed that only 10 percent of the workers actually participated in such teams (Dumaine, 1994). This may be due in part to some of the problems that accompany the use of teams as noted by Boeing President Philip Conte and executives at Eaton Corporation. Conte noted that not all tasks nor all workers are suitable for teams. Rather, he believes some workers are loners, or creative types, and those individuals aren't necessarily better off in a team (Dumaine, 1994).

Officials at Eaton Corporation have drawn similar conclusions about their Small Forge Plant in South Bend, Ind. (Dumaine, 1994). Although the non-union plants' employees are highly involved in team-based efforts, it has one of the highest turnover rates of all Eaton facilities. Senior officials believe much of this turnover is attributable to some workers' reluctance to engage in high involvement work activities.

These experiences suggest the "people problems" associated with teams are often problematic and may hamper the attainment of organizational objectives. Therefore, organizations will need to find a way to identify individuals who have the desire and propensity to work

on teams before hiring them into a team-based organization. Failure to do so can result in the hiring of individuals who are unable to function well in teams, increasing turnover, and the lowering of morale on the part of other team members.

Most studies examining group effectiveness and design have concentrated predominantly on organizational or task characteristics. For example, recent studies by Campion, Medsker and Higgs (1993), and Campion, Papper and Medsker (1996), looked at the relationship between work team characteristics and effectiveness. Stevens and Campion (1994), proposed several knowledge, skill and ability requirements needed to foster team work, with a focus on those attributes that can be influenced by the organization.

While these studies addressed knowledge, skills and abilities as personal characteristics, they did not look at the role of personality characteristics or the impact of group design on team member satisfaction, both of which are important contributors to work group effectiveness as documented by McGrath (1964), Hackman (1987), and most recently Stewart, Manz and Sims (1999).

Little attention has been given in the literature to the identification of personality characteristics that may impact an individual's desire and propensity to work in a team-based environment. In light of this, the purpose of this study is to develop a parsimonious set of individual characteristics that will help predict both task performance and team member satisfaction. The identification of such characteristics may provide valuable insight into the traits of those individuals who are most likely to function well in a team-based work environment.

## Theoretical Framework

According to Heneman, Heneman and Judge (1997), successful employee selection depends on two factors. The first factor is an organization's ability to match the responsibilities and requirements of the job to the knowledge, skills and abilities of the employee. The second factor is the organization's ability to match the organization's values and attributes with the individual's values and attributes. This matching between the organization and the individual is consistent with the corporate culture literature, which suggests that finding individuals who have values and attributes consistent with those of the organization is extremely important to organizational effectiveness (Trice and Beyer, 1993). It is also consistent with research suggesting that employees should be hired for the organization rather than the job (Bowen, Ledford and Natham, 1991). These research results suggest that work-team based organizations must select employees who not only can do the job, but also have personal characteristics that will allow them to operate effectively and comfortably in a team setting.

The literature suggests that outcome measurements in team-based organizations should incorporate a multi-dimensional perspective, taking both team performance and team member satisfaction into account (Hackman, 1987; Stewart, Manz and Sims, 1999). While most studies focus solely on team performance, it is the satisfaction that members glean from their team experience which will determine if they will continue to work in that capacity or seek employment elsewhere. If an individual chooses to leave the team, costs will accrue to both the team and the organization in terms of productivity and turnover.

An in-depth literature review was conducted as a first step in developing a parsimonious set of individual characteristics that contribute to team performance and satisfaction. This review revealed the existing research examining linkages between personality traits and job performance have mixed reviews. Barrick and Mount (1991), and Tett, Jackson and Rothstein (1991) have found some modest relationships between personality and selection systems. The strongest support in the literature seems to be for a linkage between knowledge, skills, abilities and objective performance (Stevens and Campion, 1994). While these studies address individual characteristics and individual performance, they

do not take into consideration how personality characteristics may be related to the individual's propensity to perform well in a team-based environment. For instance, in a team-based environment, it is imperative that an individual have the desire and disposition to operate in small groups as well as the skills to do the job.

While empirical research is sparse, several traits that are desirable for individuals who work in teams have been suggested. Kinlaw (1991) and Varney (1989) suggest that such attributes as initiative, trust, openness, helpfulness, flexibility and supportiveness are desirable for individuals who work in teams. Barrick, Stewart, Neubert and Mount (1998) suggest that extroversion, agreeableness, emotional stability and the individuals' conflict resolution style would impact team effectiveness. Still another avenue of research by Wagner and Moch, (1986) and Wagner (1995) suggest that an individual's orientation toward collectivism versus individualism and sense of shared responsibility may impact the manner in which individuals operate on teams.

The work of Varney (1989), Kinlaw (1991), and Barrick et al. (1998) seems to reveal some central themes in the body of knowledge. For instance, Varney (1989) and Kinlaw's (1991) research used terminology describing an individual's ability to start action (initiative), receptiveness to new ideas (openness), propensity to lend aid or assistance (helpfulness), adaptability (flexibility), likeliness to provide aid or take an interest in others (supportiveness), and belief in and reliance upon someone else (trust). Barrick et al. (1998), cite cooperation and caring (agreeableness), extroversion, freedom from stress (emotional stability), and conflict resolution style.

It must be noted that extroversion is generally seen as a positive trait in a team-based environment. However, a recent study by Barry and Stewart (1997) found that too many extroverts can harm team performance, suggesting that the desirability of extroversion may be limited by the number of extroverts found within a group. In this light, it may be that other characteristics such as friendliness and responsiveness may be more universally associated with team performance and satisfaction.

As can be seen from a literature review, some research uses terms that are consistent with the Big Five Personality Index (Barrick et al. 1998) while others do not. This study will use terms that are based on the 16PF (16 Personality Factor Questionnaire) from the Institute for Personality and Ability Testing,

Champaign, Ill. This is an objectively scored test devised by Raymond Cattell using standard psychological research procedures. The 16PF variables of interest to this study are boldness, impulsivity, suspiciousness, intrinsic motivation, work ethic, self-rated anxiety, integrating conflict resolution style and collectivism.

Boldness refers to the adventurous, responsive, friendly, impulsive, emotional and carefree nature of an individual and is highly associated with extroversion as defined by Karson and O'Dell (1976). Another variable associated with extroversion in the 16PF is impulsivity, or the degree to which an individual is talkative, cheerful and happy-go-lucky. Jobs in which enthusiasm are required may be appropriate for people who are strong in impulsivity (Karson and O'Dell, 1976). Boldness and impulsivity are similar to extroversion as suggested by Barrick et al. (1999), and openness as suggested by Kinlaw (1991) and Varney (1989). This is consistent with Barrick et al. (1999) who suggest that individuals who are high in extroversion contribute to the socio-emotional inputs that underlie team members' satisfaction. Therefore, it would be expected that individuals who are high in boldness and impulsivity would positively impact team members' overall satisfaction with their teams.

Kinlaw (1991) and Varney (1989) also cite trust as an important factor influencing team effectiveness. Since trust of team members is built over time, this variable would have to be indirectly tapped by addressing an individual's propensity to trust or the degree of suspiciousness a person possesses. Karson and O'Dell (1976), describe individuals with both low and high levels of suspiciousness. They suggest that a person with a high level of suspiciousness would have greater propensity for being jealous and dogmatic, to dwell upon frustration, and to be tyrannical. Those scoring low on suspiciousness are likely to be more trusting, pliant to changes, unsuspecting of hostility, ready to forget difficulties, understanding, permissive and tolerant. Those scoring high on suspiciousness would be difficult people with whom to get along (Karson and O'Dell, 1976). Kinlaw (1991) and Varney (1989) found that similar characteristics such as openness (pliancy to change), and flexibility (ability to adapt) contribute to team success. Barrick et al. (1998) similarly found that agreeableness (degree of cooperation and caring) contributes to team success. The above discussion suggests that people scoring

high on suspiciousness would negatively impact team member satisfaction, while those scoring low would contribute to team satisfaction.

Most of the variables used in this study have been linked to either team performance or satisfaction by previous research. This study goes beyond previous research by adding intrinsic motivation and work ethic to the independent variables that have already been examined.

Intrinsic motivation is the degree to which a person is motivated to perform well because of some subjective rewards or feelings he expects to receive or experience as a result of performing well (Lawler, 1969). An individual who is intrinsically motivated can be expected to take action to complete the team task. This concept is similar to initiative as defined by Kinlaw (1991) and Varney (1989). Previous research reveals a significant and positive relationship between intrinsic motivation and job satisfaction and between intrinsic motivation and certain perceived job characteristics such as responsibility (Hackman and Oldham, 1975; Oldham, Hackman and Pearce, 1976; Wall, Clegg and Jackson, 1978). This suggests that individuals with a high level of intrinsic motivation may be expected to experience more team satisfaction than individuals with lower scores.

An individual's work ethic may be an important characteristic that reduces the propensity of the individual to "free ride." However, the relationship between work ethic and team member effectiveness has not been examined. Research suggests a causal relationship between effort expenditure and success (Mirels and Garrett, 1971). Other research has found a statistically significant relationship between participation in decision-making and various aspects of job satisfaction, especially intrinsic features of the job (Siegel and Ruh, 1973; Weissenberg and Gruenfeld, 1968). Given this, it is expected that individuals who have high work ethics will contribute to team member satisfaction by carrying their share of the workload and seeing the task to completion.

Collectivism is an analytical dimension in which people place a high degree of emphasis on the interests of the group, sometimes even at the expense of their individual interests. Individualists, on the other hand, place greater emphasis on their own interests, even if it means sacrificing the interests of the group (Wagner 1995). Research has shown that collectivists, as compared to individual-

ists, are generally more cooperative and less likely to "free ride" (Cox, Lobel and McLeod, 1991; Early 1989, 1993). Evidence also suggests that individualists are more likely than collectivists to feel independent and self-reliant. Therefore, people who are team-oriented or collectivist in nature appear more likely to engage in cooperative behavior and to place more importance on group interests. Conversely, people with individual orientations can be expected to place greater importance on their own personal interests (Wagner and Moch, 1985; Wagner, 1995).

Evidence also suggests that team members' satisfaction with their work teams may be contingent on the degree to which the individual needs of team members are met (Stewart et al., 1999). The more the cooperativeness among the team members, the higher the satisfaction that can be expected. In essence, it seems reasonable to believe the degree to which an individual is collectivist in nature will be positively correlated with team satisfaction.

A strong body of evidence points to the importance of resolving conflict among team members. Research suggests that those individuals with integrative conflict resolution skills contribute to the socio-emotional inputs of the team (Stevens and Campion, 1994; Barrick et al., 1998). Similarly, their review of the literature led Stewart et al. (1999) to suggest that integrative conflict resolution skills contribute to team member satisfaction.

Self-rated anxiety is the degree to which a person reports anxiety about salient features of his or her life (Warr, Cook and Wall, 1979). Research has shown that individuals who are experiencing anxiety or stress in their lives can suffer both physical and emotional effects. Some of the physical effects include serious health problems such as high blood pressure and increased risk of heart attack as well as milder conditions such as depression and fatigue. Such physical maladies, in turn, lead to higher levels of absenteeism and reductions in productivity.

While high levels of anxiety can contribute to lower levels of productivity, they do not necessarily reduce team member satisfaction. When a person is experiencing anxiety in life, fellow team members may exhibit a certain level of empathy and understanding for the situation rather than holding it against the individual or the team. This reasoning is reinforced by Barrick et al. (1998) who looked at emotional well-being and found a positive relationship with team

effectiveness. In sum, it would be expected that individuals with higher levels of anxiety would detract from team performance, but not significantly impact team satisfaction.

Still another variable of interest in this study is past performance. While past performance may or may not be an indicator of individuals' propensity to contribute to team satisfaction, it would definitely have an impact on their ability to do the required work. In keeping with traditional selection literature, we view past performance as an indicator of future performance (Heneman and Heneman, 1998). For purposes of our research, we consider students' grade point averages to be indicators of their ability to contribute to their team's academic performance.

The relationship between team satisfaction and team performance is the last to be examined. Seashore (1954) was one of the first to look at teams and productivity. He found that productivity was not always high in cohesive teams where interpersonal attraction binds the team members together. Rather, he found that actual productivity levels were influenced by the productivity norms within each group. Other researchers have also looked at the relationship between job satisfaction and productivity. Results from a meta-analysis that examines this relationship indicates there is no simple direct relationship (Iaffaldano and Muchinsky, 1985).

Based on the above arguments, the following hypotheses will be tested:

- H1: The variables boldness, impulsivity, suspiciousness, intrinsic motivation, work ethic, collectivism and integrating (conflict resolution style) will account for a significant proportion of the variance in team member satisfaction.
- H2: Students' grade point averages and self-rated anxiety will account for a significant proportion of the variance in team performance.
- H3: Team satisfaction and team performance will not significantly influence one another.

## Method

The sampling procedure used in the research is discussed next, followed by a description of the measures employed.

**Sample**—The population for this study was comprised of upper-level business students from a mid-sized university in the Midwestern region of the United States. The students were enrolled in either a graduate marketing course or a senior-level management

course. Throughout the semester, each of the courses used a team-based structure that was designed to simulate an organization as closely as possible. In the beginning of the semester, all students filled out application forms to apply for either team manager or team worker positions. The professors selected the team managers and the team managers, in turn, selected their team members based on the completed application and a subsequent interview. The teams remained intact throughout the semester and met both in and out of class to complete assignments. Of the 103 students enrolled in the classes, all responded to the survey.

Of the respondents, 55 percent were male and 45 percent were female. Forty-one percent of the students were below the age of 25; 36 percent were between 25 and 30; 13 percent were between 31 and 35; five percent were between 36 and 40; five percent were between 41 and 50; and one percent were between the ages of 51 and 60. Eighty-five percent of the respondents were Caucasian, four percent African-American, four percent Indian, six percent Asian and one percent Indonesian.

**Measures**—The demographic variables age, gender, race and grade point average were obtained through direct single questions. Boldness, impulsivity and suspiciousness were measured using the 16PF (16 Personality Factor Questionnaire) from the Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, Champaign, Ill.

**Team Satisfaction**—The scale measuring team satisfaction was adapted from the job satisfaction scale developed by Warr, Cook and Wall (1979). The wording on the items were modified to reflect a team-based environment. Respondents were asked "To what extent are you satisfied with: 1) your team leader; 2) the amount of responsibility you are given; 3) the relationship between the team leader and team members; 4) the way your team is managed; and 5) the attention paid to suggestions you make. In all, there were 11 items measuring team satisfaction with responses based on a seven point Likert-type scale. Cronbach's Alpha for this measure was .91, indicating a high level of internal consistency among the 11 items.

**Team Performance**—Team performance was measured by averaging the team assignments for the individual team members. All team projects received a team grade. Team managers evaluated the performance of their team members and made necessary adjustments to

reflect the individual team member's input. Team members also evaluated their team leader's contribution and were able to adjust the team leader's score if the leader did not do a satisfactory job.

**Intrinsic Motivation**—Intrinsic motivation was assessed using the seven point Likert-type scale developed by Warr, Cook and Wall (1979). The scale items included: 1) I feel a sense of personal satisfaction when I contribute to the team's effort; and 2) my opinion of myself goes down when I do not contribute to the team's efforts. Cronbach's Alpha was .83.

**Work Ethic**—The 20-item scale developed by Mirels and Garrett (1971) was used to tap this variable. Responses were indicated on a seven point Likert-type scale. Some of the items included: 1) most people spend too much time in unprofitable amusements; 2) our society would have fewer problems if people had less leisure time; and 3) I feel uneasy when there is little work for me to do. Cronbach's Alpha for this scale was .80.

**Collectivism**—The collectivism variable was measured using Wagner's (1995) 20-item individualism and collectivism scale. The scale consists of five subscales: personal independence and self-reliance, competitive success, value attached to working alone, subordination of personal needs to group interests, and effects of personal pursuits on group productivity. The responses to these subscales were also based on a seven point Likert-type scale. Cronbach's Alpha for each subscale, taken in the order listed, is: .77, .78, .88, .86, .77.

**Integrating Conflict Resolution**—The degree to which an individual engages in an integrative conflict resolution style was tapped using Rahim's (1995) seven-item scale. Responses were based on a five point Likert-type scale. Cronbach's Alpha for this measure was .85.

## Data Analysis

Our examination of previous research led to the identification of seven independent variables and two dependent variables. The independent variables were boldness, impulsivity, suspiciousness, intrinsic motivation, work ethic, collectivism and integrating (conflict resolution style), and the dependent variables were team satisfaction and performance. The purpose of this study was to look at the relationship among the independent variables and their relationship to the dependent variables. All items were subjected to a factor analysis to ensure the factors were distinct. Several of the work ethic factors

cross-loaded, leading us to discard eight items. Two items from the team satisfaction scale were also discarded. The remaining items loaded cleanly on distinct factors. A correlation analysis was used to test the first two hypotheses. A regression analysis was used to test the last two hypotheses. The results of the data analysis are reported below.

## Results

The means, standard deviations and correlations for all variables are presented in Table 1 (see page 38). As can be seen, only intrinsic motivation and integrating conflict resolution style are positively and significantly related to team satisfaction. Work ethic was found to have a significant and negative relationship to team satisfaction. Boldness and impulsivity are significantly and negatively related to team grade while self-rated anxiety and grade point average are significantly and positively related to team satisfaction.

Table 2 (see page 39) shows the results of four sets of regression analyses. Part A of Table 2 shows the results derived when the nine independent variables were regressed against team satisfaction. Part B shows the results of regressing the nine variables against team performance. In part C, the nine independent variables and team grade are regressed against team satisfaction. The nine variables and team satisfaction are regressed against team performance in part D. A significant level of .05 (two-tailed test) was used for purposes of the analyses.

As indicated in table 2A, 43 percent of the variance in team satisfaction was significantly accounted for by boldness, impulsivity, suspiciousness, intrinsic motivation, work ethic and integrating conflict resolution style. Therefore, all elements of hypothesis one are supported, except for the relationship between collectivism and team member satisfaction. Collectivism did not account for a significant variance in team satisfaction.

Table 2B shows the results obtained when the nine independent variables were regressed against team performance. As hypothesized, the only significant variables are GPA and self-rated anxiety with 31 percent of the variance accounted for by the model.

Table 2C contains the results of regressing the nine independent variables and team grade (performance) against team satisfaction. Forty-five percent of the variance is accounted for by the model. Boldness, impulsivity, intrinsic motivation, work ethic and integrating conflict resolution style are significant

**TABLE 1**  
Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations

Variables	Means	S.D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Team Satisfaction	5.69	0.85	--										
2. Team Grade	90.87	3.66	.25	--									
3. Boldness	15.61	5.80	-.10	-.25*	--								
4. Impulsivity	16.08	4.86	-.02	-.28*	.64**	--							
5. Suspiciousness	7.77	3.16	-.16	-.14	.35**	.17	--						
6. Intrinsic Motivation	6.01	0.90	.33**	.08	.14	-.03	-.06	--					
7. Work Ethic	4.28	0.83	-.36**	.04	-.09	-.06	.07	.04	--				
8. Collectivism	4.76	0.61	.16	.08	-.06	.09	-.01	.19	-.15	--			
9. Integrating	4.14	0.55	.49**	.13	.02	-.18	-.01	.50**	-.19	.09	--		
10. Self-rated Anxiety	3.09	0.93	-.27	.22*	.02	.18	.29**	.06	.33**	-.12	-.13	--	
11. GPA	3.26	0.58	.02	.38**	-.17	-.33**	-.12	-.13	.07	-.19	.16	-.01	--

\*  $p < .05$

\*  $p < .01$

predictors of team satisfaction. Suspiciousness and team grade were considered insignificant with  $p$ -values of .10 and .08, respectively. As hypothesized (H3), past performance, as measured by grade-point average, did not prove to be a significant predictor of team satisfaction.

Finally, the nine independent variables and team satisfaction were regressed against team performance. The results of that analysis are presented in Table 2D. Of the variables examined, the only significant predictor of team performance was past performance as measured by grade point average. Self-rated anxiety, work ethic and team satisfaction, with  $P$ -values of .08 each, were not considered significant predictors of team performance. [It should be noted that self-rated anxiety was a significant predictor of team performance before team satisfaction was included in the model (see Table 2B).] Therefore, as hypothesized (H3), team satisfaction was not found to significantly impact team performance.

## Discussion

The purpose of this paper was to provide insight into the ability of individual characteristics to predict task performance and team member satisfaction. The nine variables used in the regression analyses explained 43 percent of the variance for team satisfaction and 31 percent of the variance for team performance. These are considered acceptable, since task and organizational characteristics were not included in this analysis. As postulated, boldness, impulsivity, intrinsic motivation, work ethic and integrating (conflict resolution) style accounted for a significant level of variance in team satisfaction.

Surprisingly, collectivism did not

significantly influence team satisfaction. Collectivism refers to the importance an individual places on group interests. On a prima facie basis, it would seem reasonable to believe that an individual who considers group interests to be important would be likely to be satisfied with the team. However, this relationship was not supported in our research, suggesting that considering group interests to be important and being satisfied with the group are two distinct constructs.

It is also interesting to note that boldness and work ethic were significant indicators of team satisfaction, but not in the expected direction. A possible explanation may lie in the profiles of individuals who hold these attitudes. For instance, individuals demonstrating high boldness may not feel comfortable working within the constraints set by fellow team members. Similarly, their challenging, impulsive, carefree nature may not allow them to see danger signals, resulting in group dysfunction (Karson and O'Dell, 1975).

Work ethic was hypothesized to influence team satisfaction by reducing the potential for free riding or social loafing. The results indicate that people who score high on the work ethic dimension may feel less satisfaction with their team. Perhaps these people are highly task oriented. If so, they may be frustrated by the need to devote time to the socio-emotional inputs considered important by other team members. If so, such people may feel the group uses time inefficiently.

As expected, of the nine independent variables, both self-rated anxiety and grade point average significantly influenced team performance. However, only grade point average was significant after

satisfaction was added to the analysis. The reason for self-rated anxiety's shift from significance to insignificance is a matter of conjecture. For example, it may be postulated that, when team satisfaction is high, the less anxious team members may respond to their teammates' anxiety by increasing their level of contribution to the team effort.

The relationship between team satisfaction and team performance was also insignificant as hypothesized. These results are consistent with previous studies which indicate that productivity norms and reward structure intervene between satisfaction and performance (Seashore, 1954; Iaffalduno and Muchinsky, 1985). This suggests that it is important for organizations to establish reward systems that motivate employees as well as contribute to their overall satisfaction. It also underscores the importance of developing an organizational culture in which appropriate productivity norms can develop and flourish.

## Implications

The results of the study suggest that team performance (measured in terms of the team grade) may not be a particularly good predictor of team satisfaction. Conversely, team satisfaction does not appear to be a particularly good predictor of team performance. Therefore, satisfaction with a work team may be largely dependent on the personal characteristics of the individual team member. People who are most likely to be satisfied with a team-based environment appear to be those who are somewhat impulsive, intrinsically motivated and prone to use an integrative conflict resolution style. People with high levels of boldness and a particularly strong work ethic may not be

as well-suited to working in teams as people with mid-range scores on those dimensions.

The most striking observation emanating from this research may be that the best predictor of team performance is the individual's prior performance (measured in terms of grade-point-average in this study). Obviously, organizations may want to recruit and hire those individuals who have a prior record of success and accomplishment.

In the final analysis, the results of this study indicate that past performance is the best predictor of future performance. Consequently, most organizations will do well to give past performance heavy consideration in hiring decisions. However, performance and satisfaction do not necessarily go hand-in-hand. In a team-based environment, employee satisfaction appears to be related to the personality characteristics of the individual. Therefore, the accurate matching of personalities to work environment is appropriate and necessary if high levels of satisfaction are to be attained.

**Future Research**

Several avenues are available for future research. First, future research may more closely examine boldness and work ethic as they relate to team satisfaction. It may also be desirable to gain a better understanding of the relationship between collectivism and team satisfaction, since the relationship we discovered was somewhat counter-intuitive. Future research may also focus on the relationship between the demographics of individual team members and their satisfaction with the team experience. Finally, the scope of this study may be extended to address employee skills and knowledge, task characteristics and organization structure as they relate to team performance and team member satisfaction.

**References**

Appel, T. (1997). Not all workers find idea of empowerment as neat as it sounds. *Wall Street Journal*, September 8, A1.

Algera, J.A. (1983). Objective and perceived task characteristics as a determinant of reactions by task performers. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 56, 95-107.

Armour, Stephanie (1997). Team efforts, technology add new reasons to meet, *USA Today*, Monday, December 8, pp. 1A, 2A.

Barrick, M.R. and Mount, M.K. (1991), The Big Five personality dimensions and

**TABLE 2**  
**Results of the Regression Analysis**

**A. Dependent Variable = Team Satisfaction**

Variable	Beta	p <
Boldness	-.3478	.008
Impulsivity	.3531	.01
Suspiciousness	-.1938	.06
Intrinsic Motivation	.2235	.04
Work Ethic	-.2245	.03
Collectivism	-.0585	ns
Integrating	.3599	.002
Self-Rated Anxiety	-.1570	ns
GPA	-.1750	ns

r<sup>2</sup> = .43      F = 5.8810      d.f. = 9,71      p < .00001

**B. Dependent Variable = Team Performance**

Variable	Beta	p <
Boldness	-.0911	ns
Impulsivity	.0030	ns
Suspiciousness	-.1211	ns
Intrinsic Motivation	.0495	ns
Work Ethic	-.1541	ns
Collectivism	-.1603	ns
Integrating	.0510	ns
Self-Rated Anxiety	-.2474	.03
GPA	-.3994	.004

r<sup>2</sup> = .31      F = 3.6594      d.f. = 9, 75      p < .0008

**C. Dependent Variable = Team Satisfaction**  
**(Team Grade is included as an independent variable)**

Variable	Beta	p <
Boldness	-.3213	.01
Impulsivity	.3476	.01
Suspiciousness	-.1694	.10
Intrinsic Motivation	.2308	.03
Work Ethic	-.2527	.02
Collectivism	-.0813	ns
Integrating	.3505	.002
Self-Rated Anxiety	-.1110	ns
GPA	-.0988	ns
Team Grade	-.1942	.08

r<sup>2</sup> = .45      F = 5.7858      d.f. = 10, 70      p < .00001

**D. Dependent Variable = Team Performance**  
**(Team Satisfaction is included as an independent variable)**

Variable	Beta	p <
Boldness	-.0570	ns
Impulsivity	.0524	ns
Suspiciousness	-.0816	ns
Intrinsic Motivation	.0883	ns
Work Ethic	.1959	.08
Collectivism	.1402	ns
Integrating	-.0341	ns
Self-Rated Anxiety	-.2009	.08
GPA	.4227	.0002
Team Satisfaction	.2286	.08

r<sup>2</sup> = .36      F = 3.8640      d.f. = 10, 70      p < .0003

- job performance: A meta-analysis, *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 1-23.
- Barrick, M.R., Stewart, M., Neubert, and Mount, M.K. 1998. Relating member ability and personality to team processes and team effectiveness, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83: 377-391.
- Barry, B. and Stewart, G. (1997). Composition, Process and Performance in Self managed Groups: The role of personality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, pp 62-78.
- Bowen, D.E., Ledford, G.E., and Nathan, B.R. (1991). Hiring for the organization, not the job. *Academy of Management Executive*, 5, 35-
- Campion, M.A. (1988). Interdisciplinary approaches to job design: A constructive replication with extensions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 464-481.
- Campion, M.A., McClelland, C.L. (1991). Interdisciplinary examination of the costs and benefits of enlarged jobs: A job design quasi-experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 186-198.
- Campion, M.A., Medsker, G., and Catherine Higgs (1993). Relations between work group characteristics and effectiveness: implications for designing effective work groups. *Personnel Psychology*, 46 (4), 823-850.
- Campion, M.A., Papper, E.M., and Medsker, G., (1996). Relations between work team characteristics and effectiveness: a replication and extension. *Personnel Psychology*, 49 (2), 429-452.
- Costa, Paul T. Jr. and Thomas A. Widiger (1994), *Personality Disorders and the Five-Factor Model of Personality*, Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Cox, T.H., Lobel, S.A., and McLeod, P.L. 1991. Effects of ethnic group cultural difference on cooperative and competitive behavior on a group task. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34: 827-847.
- Digman, J.M. (1990), Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model, *Annual Review of Psychology*, 41, 417-440.
- Dumaine, B. (1994). The trouble with teams. *Fortune*. Sept. 5, v130 (5), p86(5).
- Early, P.C. 1989. Social loafing and collectivism: A comparison of the United States and the People's Republic of China. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 34: 565-581.
- Early, P.C. 1993. East meets West meets Mideast: Further explorations of collectivistic and individualistic work groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36: 319-348.
- Goodman P., Ravlin, E.C., Schminke, M. (1987). Understanding groups in organizations. In Staw, B.M., Cummings, L.L. (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 9, pp. 121-173). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Hackman Jr. (1987). The design of work teams. In Lorsch JW (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational behavior* (pp. 315-342). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hackman, J.R. and Oldham, G.R. 1975. Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60: 159-170.
- Heneman III, H.G., Heneman, R.L., and Judge, T.A. 1997. *Staffing Organizations*, 2nd edition. Middleton, WI: Mendota House Publishing.
- Hirsh, S.K. (1992). *MBTI Team Building Program*, Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Hirsh, S.K. and Kummerow, J.M. (1990). *Introduction to Type in Organizations*, 2nd ed. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Iaffaldano, M.T. and Muchinsky, P.M. 1985. Job satisfaction and job performance: A meta analysis, *Psychological Bulletin*, 97:251-273.
- James, L.R. (1982). Aggregation bias in estimates of perceptual agreement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67, 219-229.
- Karson, S., and O'Dell, J.W. 1976. *Clinical use of the 16PF*. Champaign, IL: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing.
- Kinlaw, D.C. (1991). *Developing superior work teams: Building quality and the competitive edge*. San Diego, Ca: Lexington Books.
- Kroeger, O. and Thuesen, J.M. (1992). *Type Talk at Work*. New York: Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing.
- Lawler, E.E. 1969. Job design and employee motivation. *Personnel Psychology*, 22: 426-435.
- McGrath J. E. (1964). *Social psychology: A brief introduction*. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Mirels, H.L. and Garrett, J.B. (1971). The protestant ethic as a personality variable. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 36, 40-44.
- Oldham, G.R., Hackman, J.R. and Pearce, J.L. 1976. Conditions under which employees respond positively to enriched work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61: 395-403.
- Roberts, K.H., Hulin, C.L., Rousseau, D.M. (1978). *Developing an interdisciplinary science of organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Seashore, S.E. 1954. *Group cohesiveness in industrial work groups*. Ann Arbor MI, University of Michigan.
- Siegel, A.L. and Ruh, R.A. 1973. Job involvement, participation in decision making, personal background and job behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 9: 318-327.
- Staw, B. M. (1979), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, vol. 1, Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press, Inc.
- Staw, B. M. and Cummings, L., (1980), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, vol. 2, Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press, Inc.
- Stevens, M.J., and Campion, M.A. (1994). The knowledge, skill and ability requirements for teamwork: Implications for Human Resource Management. *Journal of Management*, 20, 503-530.
- Stewart, G.L., Manz, C.C., and Sims, H.P. (1999). *Team work and group dynamics*. New York: Wiley and Sons.
- Tett, R.P., Jackson, D.N., and Rothstein, M. (1991). Personality measure as predictor of job performance: A meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology*, 44:703-742.
- Trice, H.M. and Beyer, J.M. (1993). *The cultures of work organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Van de Ven, A.H., Ferry, D.L. (1980). *Measuring and assessing organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Varney, G. H. (1989), *Building Productive Teams: An Action Guide and Resource Book*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Wall, T.D., Clegg, C.W. and Jackson, P.R. 1978. An evaluation of the job characteristics model. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 51: 183-196.
- Wagner, J.A. 1995. Studies of Individualism-collectivism: Effects on cooperation in groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38: 152-172.
- Wagner, J.A. and Moch, M.K. 1986. Individualism-collectivism: Concept and measure. *Group and Organization Studies*, 11:280-303.
- Warr, P., Cook, J., and Wall, T. 1979. Scales for the measurement of some work attitudes and aspects of psychological well-being. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 52:129-148.
- Weissenberg, P. and Gruenfeld, L.W. 1968. Relationship between job satisfaction and job involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 52:469-473.
- Williams, M.(1994). Some plants tear out long assembly lines, switch to craft work. *Wall Street Journal*, October 24, A1, A4.