Use of Teams to Accomplish Radical Organization Change:
Examining the Influence of Team Cognitive Style and Leader Emotional Intelligence

Alice Marie Cahill

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy under the Executive Committee of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
2011
ABSTRACT

Use of Teams to Accomplish Radical Organization Change:
Examining the Influence of Team Cognitive Style and Leader Emotional Intelligence

Alice Marie Cahill

As organizations continue to experience external pressures and uncertainties regarding their future viability, they are increasingly choosing to engage in some form of inter-organizational restructuring in order to survive (Burke, 2011; Campbell, 2009; Kohm & LaPiana, 2003). Mergers, the combination of two separate organizations into a single new entity, are occurring more often, especially in the non-profit sector. A merger represents a radical, transformational change for each of the organizations involved and success requires careful planning and implementation, a significant amount of time and energy, and attention to the profound loss and emotional reactions experienced by organization members. The use of teams within organizations to address these requirements and accomplish the merger implementation has been recommended by organizational scholars (Marks & Mirvis, 2001), but the conditions necessary for teams to be successful in this type of situation are not clear. However, it is expected that the composition of merger teams and the ability of the leader to create conditions that support the team members and their work together are critical to the success of a merger as a radical change strategy. Based on adaption-innovation theory (Kirton, 1976) and the ability-based theory of emotional intelligence (Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 1991), this study proposed that teams that are heterogeneous and innovative with respect to cognitive style will be most successful in accomplishing a merger implementation and that the emotional intelligence of the
team leader has a direct effect on the team’s success. Using data collected from 26 parish merger teams in a large Catholic diocese, support was found for hypotheses relating to the composition of the team with respect to cognitive style, but not for hypotheses related to leader emotional intelligence. Results of regression analyses testing the predicted relationships confirmed that teams that were more diverse and innovative were more effective in accomplishing a merger implementation; however, the predictions related to leader emotional intelligence were not supported. In contrast, analysis of qualitative data provided support for the critical influence of the team leader, specifically with respect to relationship-oriented leader behavior and its effect on team work processes and outcomes. Implications for the use of teams to accomplish mergers as well as future research are discussed.
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Chapter I
INTRODUCTION

Overview of Research Problem

In this era of turbulent economic and social change, organizations of all types are contemplating their future viability and seeking strategies that will enable them not only to survive, but to thrive. Various forms of inter-organizational restructuring have emerged as potential solutions to the challenges organizations face (Burke, 2011; Campbell, 2009; Kohm & La Piana, 2003; Marks & Mirvis, 2001). However, corporate combination, the merger of two or more separate organizations into a single new entity, is increasingly being considered and chosen as the strategic approach for enhancing an organization's value and strengthening its effectiveness (Marks & Mirvis, 2001; Zhou, Shin & Cannella, 2008). By creating the opportunity to share resources, leverage competencies and gain flexibility, mergers provide organizational decision-makers with a restructuring option that can potentially provide numerous benefits, the most critical being the organization's survival.

But mergers are not magic, nor are they simple. A merger represents a major organization change - a transformation of each organization's personality, style, beliefs, and culture (Giffords & Dina, 2003). A merger erases the separate identities of the merging organizations and melds them into one single entity that will need to create its own new organizational culture. Organizational theorists Weick and Quinn (1999) would describe a merger as an "episodic change", an infrequent but radical type of change that causes major transformation and leads to a divergence from the current state. Others use the terms discontinuous or gamma change, revolutionary change, reorientation, and re-
creation (Gersick, 1991; Golembiewski, Billingsley, & Yeager, 1976; Greiner, 1972; Tushman & Romanelli, 1985) to explain that this type of transformation affects the deep structure of an organization and, therefore, significantly alters its culture. Gersick (1991) warns that during this type of major change, temporary disarray ensues as the deep structure is dismantled and this disorganization continues until organizational patterns are reconfigured and a new culture emerges.

The short and long-term implications of a decision to pursue this type of transformational change must be carefully considered by organizational leaders. Despite the potential benefits that a merger offers, organizational researchers have found that very few mergers occurring in the corporate sector actually achieve their intended objectives (Burke & Biggart, 1997; Marks & Mirvis, 2001; Stahl & Voight, 2008). While many factors may contribute to these merger failures, the significant amount of time and energy required to create the new organizational culture is often underestimated. Additionally, the profound loss experienced by members of each of the merging organizations may be unexpected and often impedes progress towards mutual support of a common organizational mission and vision (Elias, 2009; Stahl & Voigt, 2008). Organizational researchers consider a merger situation the trickiest type of corporate combination because each of the merging entities must undergo a complete fundamental change in order to join forces and operate as one (Marks & Mirvis, 2001).

Although the success rate of mergers occurring in the corporate setting has been disappointing, mergers are increasingly being considered as opportunities for organizations in the non-profit sector (Campbell, 2009; Giffords & Dina, 2003). The continuously evolving, challenging environment in which non-profit organizations
currently operate is requiring fundamental changes in the way they do business. In order for non-profit organizations to sustain themselves and the services they provide, "inter-organizational restructuring" in the form of collaborations, alliances, networks, and mergers is becoming more prevalent and widely accepted as a sound management strategy (Campbell, 2009).

Kohm and LaPiana (2003) studied the strategic intentions of organizations across the non-profit sector, including those in the human service, educational, religious, cultural, environmental, and civic arenas, and found that they are rethinking the basic structures of their operations and considering ways they can combine resources and expertise with other organizations in order to survive. This dissertation study addressed the management of a radical change in a large religious institution within the non-profit sector, specifically focusing on the use of a team approach for the implementation of parish mergers.

Despite the increasing interest in mergers as a strategy among organizations in the non-profit sector, there is little research or reliable information available about the implementation and impact of mergers in this context. The few studies that have been published focus on the expected benefits and challenges of non-profit mergers and the pre-planning phase (Cortez, Foster, & Milway, 2009; Halbein, Devers, McNamara, Carpenter, & Davison, 2009; Kohm & LaPiana, 2003; Salamon, 1997; Scheff & Kotler, 1996). The benefits identified include financial savings, improvement in services, sharing of expertise, and enhanced reputation. The challenges that were noted include the significant amount of time that must be invested in the planning and implementation
phases, the unexpected costs, low morale of the organization members, culture differences, identity issues, and leadership ineffectiveness (Kohm & LaPiana, 2003).

Some scholars have outlined the stages or phases of a merger process and have placed emphasis on the due diligence required in the pre-combination or planning phase, when the strategic decision to merge is explored and negotiated (Campbell, 2009; Giffords & Dina, 2003; Marks & Mirvis, 2001; Kohm & LaPiana, 2003). But the decision to merge is only the beginning; the work of real change is in the implementation stage and involves the psychological preparation of the stakeholders affected by this change, the commitment to forging a new identity, strategy and structure, and the accomplishment of a myriad of internal and external tasks to dismantle the existing structures and establish the new organizational entity.

Giffords and Dina (2003) claim that the guidance available to leaders and organizational stakeholders engaged in this stage of a merger is typically focused on the "hard organizational dimensions" - the fiscal, operational, and staffing issues. What is often missing, yet crucial to the success of this type of radical, transformational change is the help in addressing the "soft organizational dimensions" of culture, attitudes, and satisfaction.

Based on many years of work with merging companies, Marks and Mirvis (2000) have shared their insights into what makes this critical stage of a merger successful. They focus specifically on the need to create a transition structure, a temporary system for coordination and support of the work entailed in joining the two previously independent organizations into one. This transition structure takes the form of a dedicated change management team that is populated by key members from each of the merging
organizations, those who are nearer to the action and know the nuances and details that will need to be addressed. The team creates a venue where combination decisions can be made by individuals who will have the opportunity to think and work with their counterparts from the other organization. It allows for knowledge sharing and relationship building. By working together on common problems to arrive at agreed upon solutions for implementation, differences in style or culture will surface and can be used to begin to better understand one another and build trust (Kohm & LaPiana, 2003; Marks & Mirvis, 2001).

Teams are frequently used as a way to increase an organization's ability to handle difficult and complex situations (Koslowski, Gully, Salas & Cannon-Bowers, 1996) and may be especially useful in implementing a major organization change such as a merger. Because teams can be a rich source of information and resource diversity, numerous studies have supported a team approach as the best vehicle to effectively deal with organizational change (Manz & Sims, 1987; Sundstrom, 1999; West, Hirst, Richter, & Shipton, 2004). Team members are expected to engage in frequent interaction and cooperative problem-solving and decision-making activities; therefore, a team's ability to work together effectively will be critical for success, especially when the task involves effecting a major organizational change. Many scholars have proposed that a diverse team is needed to address successfully complex issues, but they caution that this diversity must be managed carefully in order to capitalize on the potential benefits afforded by the team approach (Earley & Mosakowski, 2000; Halfhill, Sundstrom, Lahner, Calderone, & Nielsen, 2005; Horwitz, 2005; Kirton, 2003; Kristof-Brown, Barrick, & Stevens, 2005). The composition of a merger implementation team and the type of diversity represented
may have a significant effect on its ability to accomplish the objective of radical organizational change.

Some scholars have suggested that the success of teams in accomplishing these types of organizational objectives is dependent upon the fit among team members as well as the fit between the team and the demands of the task (Kristof-Brown, Barrick & Stevens, 2005). Fit among team members is based on similarities and shared perspectives, especially related to values, goals, and personality. Congruence in these areas is believed to lead to positive outcomes for individuals and groups, including ease in interpersonal interaction, facilitation of communication, and reduced role conflict (Barrick, Stewart, Neubert & Mount, 1998; Harrison, Price & Bell, 1998; Kristof-Brown & Stevens, 2001; O'Reilly, Caldwell & Barnett, 1989; Mount, Barrick & Stewart, 1998; Schneider, Smith, Taylor & Fleenor, 1998). Despite these benefits, a homogeneous team may be too similar and a lack of diversity on these characteristics may result in diminished creativity and narrow problem-solving capability (Schneider, Goldstein, & Smith, 1995). Despite the long standing premise that the existence of differences among members in a group has a negative impact on group functioning, studies with groups that were diverse with respect to age, sex, and personality showed that over time these heterogeneous groups became more effective than homogeneous groups in problem-solving and decision-making (Harrison, Price, & Bell, 1998). When heterogeneous teams took the time to create team processes and strategies and develop shared norms, communication and cooperation increased and team conflict was diffused. Capitalizing on the differences enables synergistic problem-solving and ensures a systems-thinking orientation within a team (Earley & Mosakowski, 2000; Werbel & Johnson, 2001).
In a merger situation, the fit between the team and the demands of the task may entail a mix of individuals who can deal with both breaking out from old structure and recreating new structure. Transition teams that are engaged in implementation of mergers may benefit from diversity that is based not only on original organization affiliation, but also on characteristics such as age, sex, technical expertise, and personality. One specific personality characteristic, cognitive style, which is an individual's preference for using or breaking structure when problem-solving, may be worth investigating as an important variable in team success. While there is very little organizational research addressing the use of the team approach to accomplish a merger, studies specifically exploring the relationship of team diversity with respect to problem-solving style and the successful implementation of major organizational change, such as a merger, do not exist. The current study focused on team composition with respect to cognitive style and its influence on team outcomes.

Cognitive style is one's preferred approach to problem-solving, decision-making, and creativity and determines the way in which an individual approaches problems and manages change (Kirton, 1976). Some individuals naturally look within current systems and structures using them to help solve problems, while others prefer to break outside of the existing framework and see the established system as part of the problem. By its nature, a merger incorporates both the need to understand and create frame-breaking change with the need to design and establish a new set of systems, structures, and processes for future organizational success. Team diversity with respect to cognitive style may be especially useful when the team is responsible for the implementation phase of an organizational merger.
While a team that is diverse with respect to cognitive style may have increased potential to successfully accomplish a major transformational change, this diversity will be difficult to manage (Kirton, 2003). If not managed well, the natural differences in cognitive style within a team can lead to conflict, divisiveness, and distrust, already a critical concern when an organization is undergoing a merger. The strong feelings associated with the loss of identity and culture experienced in this type of radical change can impair problem-solving and decision-making ability. Therefore, another significant influence on a team's ability to accomplish the work necessary to transform from two separate organizations into one may be the behavior of the merger team leader, specifically his or her ability to effectively facilitate opposing viewpoints, contradictions, complex situations, and strong emotions.

Emotional intelligence, a concept that has become increasingly important in the leadership arena, may be an individual difference variable that captures these behaviors and makes a significant difference in the success of teams managing a merger. Defined as the set of abilities and skills that enables an individual to perceive emotions, use emotions in thought, understand emotions, and manage emotions (Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2004), emotional intelligence is suggested to be critical in the relationship-oriented, often emotion-laden processes inherent in leadership (George, 2000). The current focus on the need for a leader to be able to manage complex social and personal dynamics, demonstrate interpersonal skills, and balance competing demands has led to claims that emotional intelligence is requisite for effective leadership (Barbuto & Burbach, 2006). Emotional intelligence may be related to the ability to engage in the transformational behaviors identified by Bass and Avolio (1990) and demonstrated by
leaders who effectively provided the emotional force behind major organizational change (Hinduan, Wilson-Evered, Moss & Scannell, 2009). Particularly given the emotional context in which a merger occurs, a merger team’s success may be related to the emotional intelligence level of the team's leader.

Despite the practical recommendations in the literature for chartering transition teams to manage mergers (Marks & Mirvis, 2000), there is very little research available that has examined the effectiveness of using a team approach for implementation of a radical organizational change such as a merger. Additionally, empirical studies demonstrating the effects of the emotional intelligence of a leader on both individual and team level outcomes are scarce. Studies that would provide evidence for both the team approach to a merger and the importance of the emotional intelligence of a team leader would contribute to the organizational and leadership literature.

**Purpose of this Dissertation Study**

This dissertation study attempted to address some of the gaps in the literature related to teams responsible for major transformational change, focusing on mergers occurring in non-profit organizations. Specifically, using teams engaged in the emotionally-laden task of effecting a merger, this work was intended to shed light on the relationship between the diversity level of teams with respect to cognitive style, the emotional intelligence of the team leader, and the results of both team satisfaction and successful organizational outcomes. An exploration of previous research conducted in each of these areas has led this investigator to posit that when radical change is required and a team has been assembled to manage that change, the emotional intelligence level of
the team leader, the cognitive style of the team, and the diversity of the team with respect to cognitive style affect the outcomes of team satisfaction and accomplishment of the change.

Therefore, the research question being explored was: Under what conditions does the use of teams to effect a radical organization change, such as a merger, lead to successful outcomes for the team and the organization?

The model proposed for this study specified the expected relationship between the predictor variables of team cognitive style, team cognitive style diversity, leader emotional intelligence, and team interactions and the outcome variables of team satisfaction and merger implementation success.

Although the concept of emotional intelligence has been defined in the literature (Salovey & Mayer, 1990), measures of emotional intelligence have been developed (Bar-On, 1997; Boyatzis, Goleman, & Rhee, 2000; Carson, Carson, & Birkenmeier, 2000; Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, & Sitarenios, 2003) and claims have been made that emotional intelligence is necessary for effective leadership (George, 2000; Goleman, 1998; Huy, 1999), this dissertation was among the first studies to test directly the effects of a leader's emotional intelligence on team and organizational outcomes in the context of a major organization change. Additionally, this dissertation provides information regarding the effect of team composition with respect to cognitive style on the team dynamics, work processes, and strategies employed to accomplish a major organizational transformational change and the outcomes that result from these teams.

There is also potential for a contribution to organization development practitioners and organizational leaders, specifically in the areas of the use of the team
approach for radical change initiatives, such as merger implementations in the non-profit setting, the recognition and development of emotional intelligence as a leadership competency, and the understanding of team diversity with respect to problem-solving style - including the importance of recruiting for this diversity and managing it for success.

This dissertation includes five chapters beginning with the introduction to the areas of scholarly and practical interest. The second chapter provides a review of the literature on organization change, non-profit sector mergers, team composition with respect to cognitive style, team work processes and strategies, and emotional intelligence. This review provides the framework for the model that identifies the proposed relationships between the variables of team cognitive style, team diversity with respect to cognitive style, leader emotional intelligence, team interactions, and outcomes. The second chapter also includes the proposed model and the hypotheses derived from the literature review. The third chapter presents the methodology for this study, including sample description, data collection procedures, operational definitions and measurement of constructs, and the approach used for data analysis and for testing the hypothesized relationships. Chapter Four provides the results of the data analysis and the hypotheses tests. Chapter Five, the final chapter, discusses the possible meaning that can be derived from the study results and acknowledges the study limitations, implications for practice, and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview

This chapter provides a review of the relevant theory and research pertaining to organization change, mergers as an example of radical organization change, change processes necessary for organization change, and the use of teams to accomplish organization change initiatives. Additionally, current theory and research in the areas of team composition with respect to the personality characteristic of cognitive style, emotional intelligence of leaders, and team processes necessary for effective performance are reviewed. A conceptual model is then presented that proposes the links between the cognitive style of a team charged with effecting radical organization change, the emotional intelligence of the team leader, the team processes employed, and the outcomes of team performance and team satisfaction. Arguments for the proposed influence of the emotional intelligence of the team leader and the team composition with respect to cognitive style on team outcomes are presented and formal hypotheses are provided.

Organization Change

An impressive body of scholarly literature in the area of organization change accumulated throughout the twentieth century and has continued to grow, especially within the last several decades. Since Lewin (1958) began to focus on organization change as a dynamic process, scholars and practitioners have continued to build on his
work, as well that of so many others, in an attempt to understand and predict the antecedents and consequences of the organization change experience. Areas of focus for scholarly study have been the content, the context, and the processes inherent in organizational change (Porras & Robertson, 1992), resulting in numerous theoretical and research articles. Reviews of organization change theory and research has occurred on a somewhat regular basis and has provided insight into the nature of change within organizations over time (Armemakis & Bedeian, 1999; Friedlander & Brown, 1974; Pasmore & Fagans, 1992; Porras & Robertson, 1992; Sashkin & Burke, 1987; Woodman, 1989). The ongoing changes occurring in the environments in which organizations of all types must exist guarantees that organization change will continue to be a relevant and important topic for scholars and practitioners, not only in the organization science field, but in most other disciplines as well.

Types of Organization Change

Organization change has been described and categorized in several different ways based on its content, how it presents, and the type of adjustments it requires. As a result of their review of organization change research and theory, Porras and Robertson (1992) made a distinction between planned and unplanned change and between first-order and second-order change. While unplanned change usually occurs in an organization as a response to unanticipated environmental influences, planned change involves deliberate strategy and actions to improve, modify, or alter the organization in some way (Burke, 2011). First-order change refers to changes that occur within an existing system, but the system itself remains unchanged. In first-order change, alterations or modifications to the existing system result in a change in "condition". Second-order change involves a change
in the existing system, the deep structure itself, and is a more fundamental change, a
change in "state" (Burke, 2011; Golembiewski, Billingsley, Yeager, 1976).

Because of the dramatic differences in impact on an organization, many other
organization change scholars have also focused on the distinction between these two
types of change and the importance of being able to distinguish a "change in condition"
from a "change in state" (Gersick, 1991; Rajagopalan & Spreitzer, 1996; Tushman &
as either "continuous change", which entails ongoing, evolving, small adjustments in
strategy or practices, or "episodic change", which is infrequent and more radical, causing
transformation and a divergence from the current state. Continuous change is also termed
"evolutionary" because it is incremental in nature. On the other hand, episodic change is
"revolutionary" because by nature it is discontinuous and, therefore, more radical (Burke,
organization change as "chaos" due to the change initiative's dramatic and simultaneous
shifts of content and processes that are difficult to control.

**Punctuated Equilibrium Theory**

Organizations experience both types of change as they evolve and grow over
time, moving through periods of equilibrium as well as periods of transition or
transformation (Gersick, 1991). Gersick (1991) uses the term "deep structure" to refer to
the highly stable patterns and systems that are built and reinforced during periods of
equilibrium. Tushman and Romanelli (1985) had earlier described a model of
organizational evolution that depicts organizations experiencing stable, convergent
periods eventually disrupted by periods of discontinuity and reorientation wherein
"strategy, power, structure and controls are fundamentally transformed" (p.171). During the convergent periods, the established patterns of culture, norms, and ideologies result in an inertia that can support only incremental change at most. However, attention to environmental threats and opportunities can lead to a significant reorientation that results in strategic change, a fundamental difference in the form or state of an organization (Rajagopalan & Spreitzer, 1996).

This model of "punctuated equilibrium" is experienced by all organizations; both evolution and revolution must occur for organizations to pass through developmental stages and grow (Greiner, 1972). The fate of an organization depends on the abilities of the leaders to act appropriately. Insightful balancing of organizational responses that represent distinctly different approaches to change plays a major role in an organization's success (Van de Ven, 1995). Lawler & Worley (2006) claim that existing theory and practice in organizational design causes organizations to seek stability, alignment, equilibrium, and predictability, but caution that today's organizations should be creating conditions that allow both ongoing adaptation and transformative reorientation based on the external demands of the environment.

During periods of equilibrium, the system's basic organization and activity patterns remain the same; therefore, maintaining the system or making minor adjustments or refinements using an incremental approach is appropriate (Tushman & Romanelli, 1985). During discontinuous periods, the deep structure of the organization is affected and fundamental shifts occur as the current patterns or practices are dismantled. Temporary disarray ensues until organizational patterns are reconfigured (Gersick, 1991).
Nadler, Shaw and Walton (1995) argued that organizational effectiveness requires that organizations recognize the need for different types of change and manage each type accordingly. Assessments of the need for change and the management of the frequently opposing forces for both incremental and discontinuous change often fall to leaders within the organization as they choose between attempting to maintain equilibrium and stability or initiate reorientation (Nadler, Shaw & Walton, 1995; Tushman & Romanelli, 1985). An organization's leaders play a critical role in the early interpretation of change, reducing uncertainty and resistance, and crafting the focused agenda for change management.

*Pressure for Radical Change*

Pressures in the current economic and social environment have forced many organizations to consider the various ways they can adapt in order to maintain their legitimacy and the resources they need to stay viable. Many organizations are being forced to consider revolutionary, radical change initiatives. Radical change in organizations is difficult and risks are often high (Huy, 2002). However, an increasingly common strategy for survival of various types of organizations, including businesses and non-profits, is some form of inter-organizational collaboration, the most radical being an organizational merger (Campbell, 2009; Druckman, Singer, & VanCott, 1997; Kohm & LaPiana, 2003). In a merger, each of the original entities is dissolved and a new organization is created, developing one new identity with its own structure, strategy, and culture. For each of the organizations involved, a merger represents a clear "change in state" with the challenge to terminate the old "deep structures" and initiate a new one.
Organization Mergers as an Example of Radical Change

Organizational theorists refer to a merger as an example of "inter-organizational strategic restructuring" (Campbell, 2009; Kohm & LaPiana, 2003) that is based on environmental uncertainty, resource dependence, and a need for efficiency (Campbell, 2009). Environmental uncertainty theorists see the development of inter-organizational relationships as an attempt by organizational leaders to gain control over environmental challenges that they could not manage on their own (Trist, 1983, Wood & Gray, 1991). Resource dependence theory suggests that the need for resources is the primary driver for combining organizations (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978), since when critical resources, such as human and financial services, cannot be secured independently, leaders look to linking with other similar entities to accomplish their goals and survive. Another motivation to pursue inter-organizational restructuring is the need for creating efficiencies in order to maintain viability. This leads to the attempt to reduce the cost of doing business by creating economies of scale and increased capacities in a combined organization (Kohm & LaPiana, 2003).

Research Related to Mergers

Whatever the motivation for this type of inter-organizational restructuring, a merger represents a radical, revolutionary change in state of each of the merging entities as the separate identities are erased and the merging organizations are melded into one (Giffords & Dina, 1999). LaPiana (2004) suggests that the degree of success of a merger depends upon how well the organization and its leaders can capitalize on intense and widespread change. Unfortunately, research has shown that the success rate of mergers is poor. It is estimated that only approximately one quarter of attempted mergers
accomplish the intended objectives (Burke, 2011; Burke & Biggart, 1997; Haleblian, Dever, McNamara, Carpenter, & Davison, 2009; Marks & Mirvis, 2001; Zhou, Shin & Cannella, 2008). Most of the research related to mergers that has been conducted in the last two decades has been generally focused on corporate mergers and acquisitions and generated by scholars in the management and financial disciplines (Haleblian, et al., 2009). Much of this work has involved studying the antecedents of acquisitions such as the opportunity for value creation through resource and efficiency improvements, environmental factors of uncertainty and regulation, and firm characteristics such as size and experience. Outcome measures in these studies were mostly financially driven in nature.

An analysis conducted by King, Dalton, Daily, and Covin (2004) showed that none of the commonly studied antecedents of corporate combination successfully predicted organizational performance and that, in fact, the anticipated synergies that led to combining were not achieved. Researchers in sociology, psychology, and organizational science are now more frequently turning to an examination of the change processes and the "softer dimensions" (Giffords & Dina, 2003) involved in inter-organizational combinations. There has been an increased focus on changing culture (Elias, 2009; Stahl & Voight, 2008; Zhou, Shin & Cannella, 2008), attending to critical change processes such as communication and participation (Rafferty & Restubog, 2009), using a transformational leadership approach (Hinduan, Wilson-Evered, Moss, & Scannell, 2009), and managing the emotions of organizational members (Huy, 2002) in order to effect a successful merger.
Although there have been fewer studies conducted regarding mergers in the non-profit setting, those that are available have also focused on similar topics - the reasons for considering inter-organizational restructuring (Campbell, 2009; Cortez, Foster & Milway, 2009), organizational culture (Gifford & Dina, 2003), and critical implementation processes such as developing a shared vision, building trust, and communicating effectively (Behrendt & Klein, 1997; Giffords & Dina, 2003; Kohm & LaPiana, 2003; Marks & Mirvis, 2001). Giffords and Dina (2003) found that while the pre-merger planning phase ranks high in importance to the success of a merger, it is during the implementation phase that the real work of change takes place and the effects of human relationships can have a major effect on success. More research is needed on the actual integration and implementation phases of mergers, in both the corporate and non-profit sectors. Marks and Mirvis (2000) have recommended that organizational leaders ensure that transition processes, such as merger teams, decision-making methods, training, communications, and conflict management be formally established and argue that these processes are essential to achieving the synergies which are the desired end state of the merger.

**Managing Radical Organization Change**

**Change Process Models**

The early work of Lewin (1958) describes change as a dynamic process consisting of successive phases, which he referred to as unfreezing, moving, and refreezing. Since that time organizational scholars have built on his work, describing similar models that
capture the progressive nature of the implementation of organizational change (Burke, 2011; Bridges, 1991; Galpin, 1996; Morris & Raben, 1995; Kotter, 1996; Nadler, 1980).

Nadler (1980) focuses on the implementation of change and refers to the challenge of "managing the transition". He describes this period as one of considerable uncertainty that must be managed with a great deal of care. The activities he recommends to manage this stage include building alignment around the message about the future state among all of the change stakeholders. He also recommends identifying and using multiple leverage points at all levels, both formal and informal, throughout the organization to bring about the necessary changes in behavior. This would include what Nadler (1980) described as "organizational arrangements" and Morris and Raben (1995) termed “transition devices”, such as a dedicated transition manager and a transition team comprised of people who are directly affected by the change outcomes.

Morris and Raben (1995) caution that organizations can underestimate the amount of time and effort required to design and implement a change. They suggest that the organization create and follow a transition plan with clear standards of performance, measurements, benchmarks, and feedback mechanisms that will help organize all of the vital components of the change initiative and keep the organization focused and on track.

Psychological Aspects of Organization Change

The work of Bridges (1991) focuses on the psychological process of organizational change experienced as the organization moves through the stages of letting go, navigating the neutral zone, and launching the new beginning. The letting go stage involves identifying who is losing what, acknowledging losses openly, accepting signs of grieving, providing constant information, clarifying what is over and what is not over,
marking the ending, and treating the past with respect. He claims that this stage is shortchanged by most organizations in their rush to achieve the ultimate results that are intended by the change.

*Navigating the neutral zone* entails managing the period between the old reality and the new. During this time, anxiety rises and motivation falls, and people feel disoriented. Bridges (2001) suggests that this time be used creatively and that temporary systems, such as transition teams, are established to help individuals participate and move productively to the new organization. *Launching a new beginning* is the stage that Bridges (1991) equates to the actual implementation of the new organization when the new way of working is in place. He warns that these stages will often overlap in a complex, radical change effort and that it is the transition period (neutral zone), when things are actually in flux, and how it is handled that predicts the success of the organizational change.

Burke (2011) presents an organizational change process consisting of pre-launch, launch, and post-launch stages and suggests certain activities that are appropriate for each phase. While the pre-launch phase involves critical activities such as establishing the need for change and providing clarity of vision, and the launch phase consists of communicating the change to all stakeholders and dealing with initial resistance, it is the post-launch phase where the real implementation work begins. During this stage the change process is likely to take on a life of its own (Burke, 2011; Giffords & Dina, 2003) and leadership actions that support people as they move from the old way to the new way are vital for success.
Other change process models exist that offer similar guidance and a stepwise approach to managing the expected phases or stages of change, but Weick and Quinn (1999) advise leaders that the path of any transformational change will be non-linear and complex in nature. They caution that organizations can underestimate the amount of time and effort required to design and implement a successful change.

*Use of Teams for Change in Organization Mergers*

Based on their considerable research and experience with organizations engaged in mergers, Marks and Mirvis (2000) recommend that the implementation phase of this type of major organization change include the creation of some form of a transition structure that will coordinate and support the change process. They specifically believe that in the case of inter-organizational restructuring, the combination works best when key people are dedicated to planning and implementing the myriad aspects of such a major change. These scholars state that the establishment of a transition team (e.g. a merger team) creates a venue where combination decisions can be made by individuals who will have the opportunity to think and work with their counterparts from the other organization. A team approach allows for knowledge sharing and relationship building.

Although the practice of using teams to get an organization's work accomplished has received considerable attention in the last decades, teamwork still poses both opportunities and threats to effective performance, especially when the team is diverse. Yet, by working together on the common problems involved in a merger to arrive at agreed upon solutions for implementation, differences will surface and can be used to
begin to better understand one another and build trust. This will require leaders who can effectively manage these differences.

**Organizational Teams - The Role of Team Diversity**

As a result of their potential benefits to enhance performance, teams are more frequently being used as a way to increase an organization's ability to handle difficult and complex situations (Koslowski, Gully, Salas, & Cannon-Bowers, 1996). Organizations create and use both permanent and temporary teams, combining people into groups to work on novel problems and to make critical decisions (Gersick, 1988). West, Hirst, Richter, and Shipton (2004) suggest that work teams embedded in organizations are the best vehicle to respond to changes in the organization's environment and should be used as a primary organizational strategy for managing change. Manz and Sims (1987) highlight the increase in use of self-managed work groups to deal with the complexity and uncertainty in modern organizations and Sundstrom (1999) describes these work teams as integral to organizational success in a global, fast-paced economy. The findings of many years worth of studies in this area support the use of a team approach for a major organization change, such as a merger, as a reasonable organizational strategy.

Members of work teams are expected to engage in frequent interaction and cooperative problem-solving and decision-making activities in order to accomplish results. Due to this nature of a team's work, scholars have argued that the success of teams in accomplishing an organization's objectives is dependent on the fit among the team members as well as the fit between the team and the demands of the task (Kristof-Brown, Barrick, & Stevens, 2005).
Team Composition: Supplementary Fit

A supplementary fit perspective has most often been used to study fit among members of a work team. Supplementary fit is based on similarities and shared perspectives, especially related to values, goals, and personality. Research has found that congruence in these areas leads to positive outcomes for individuals and groups (Kristof-Brown & Stevens, 2001; O'Reilly, Caldwell & Barnett, 1989). Harrison, Price, and Bell (1998) conducted a review of studies examining similarities in attitudes and values among group members and found evidence that similarity resulted in ease in interpersonal interaction, facilitation of communication, and reduced role conflict.

Other studies of supplementary fit have focused on personality variables, most frequently using dimensions from the Five Factor Model of personality (Barrick, Stewart, Neubert, & Mount, 1998; Mount, Barrick, & Stewart, 1998); findings have suggested that higher team levels of conscientiousness, agreeableness, and emotional stability lead to better team performance and team viability. Using results on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, Schneider, Smith, Taylor, and Fleenor (1998) demonstrated that modal personalities existed within organizations leading to more similarities than differences among the organization's members. Despite the benefits of similar preferences and personalities within a work team, too much similarity can cause a decrease in organizational performance. When team members think and act alike, creativity diminishes, adjustment to change is compromised, and groups stagnate (Schneider, Goldstein, & Smith, 1995). It can be argued that the creativity that comes from working through different points of view is essential to the success of any major organizational
change initiative, especially one as radical as a merger, and that these differences should exist in the teams that are used to implement the change.

*Team Composition: Complementary Fit*

A complementary fit perspective has also been used to study teams. Although initially a less common approach, there is a steady increase in the study of team diversity using this perspective. This type of fit involves considering characteristics that create an offsetting pattern or a "filling in" of opposite attributes that would otherwise be missing from the group (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987). Complementary fit is most often studied from a demands/abilities perspective, focusing on whether team members' skills and abilities balance or complement one another as they relate to the task. Many studies focus on job-related team diversity, which consists of differences in variables such as functional expertise, education or organizational tenure (Barry & Stewart, 1997; Barrick, Stewart, Neubert, & Mount, 1998; Guzzo & Dickson, 1996; van Knippenberg, De Dreu & Homan, 2004). Differences in these characteristics are more easily recognized as valuable to a work team engaged in problem-solving and task accomplishment within an organization.

Considerable research has also been conducted using demographic diversity variables such as age, gender, and race/ethnicity (Harrison, Price & Bell, 1998; Horwitz, 2005). Despite the fact that team diversity could refer to a considerable number of dimensions, these job related and demographic variables continue to be the most frequently studied when using the framework of complementary fit in teams (van Knippenberg, Dreu & Homan, 2004). It appears that there is still a belief among
researchers that the existence of differences on other characteristics among members in a group has a negative impact on group functioning.

Despite this prevailing belief about the problems associated with diverse teams, Harrison, Price and Bell (1998) found that although in the initial stages of work homogeneous groups do perform more effectively, as people in groups interact with one another over time, diverse groups become more effective than homogeneous groups in identifying problems and generating solutions. Earley & Mosakowski (2000) also reported results of a study of diverse teams that found that heterogeneity had an initial negative impact on performance; however, the opportunity to work together over time resulted in better outcomes as compared to homogeneous teams. Creation of team processes and shared norms increased communication and cooperation and diffused conflict within the heterogeneous teams.

**Team Composition and Personality**

Team heterogeneity with respect to personality characteristics may also contribute to enhanced team performance (Mount, Barrick, & Stewart, 1998). As mentioned, most studies have focused on team personality from a supplementary fit perspective; however, over time, a complementary fit on personality may result in better team dynamics and team functioning. Kristof-Brown, Barrick, and Stevens (2005) studied personality and teams focusing on the dimension of extraversion. Results demonstrated a complementary fit relationship between extraversion and attraction to the team and subsequent positive ratings of performance. Another study examining dissimilarity in personality was conducted with supervisor-employee dyads. This study focused on the personality dimension of control and found that dissimilarity within the dyad resulted in positive
outcomes related to employee satisfaction (Glomb & Welsh, 2005). Pearsall and Aleksander (2006) found that complementary fit with respect to team member assertiveness led to increased team performance and satisfaction.

Although there are very few studies of the relationship of team composition (with respect to personality) and team outcomes using a complementary fit approach, the effects of personality differences on the performance of teams is worthy of further investigation. If personality style differences within the team can lead to improved team problem-solving and better organizational outcomes, then studies that identify how these types of diverse teams manage these differences can add to organizational theory and practice. Werbel and Johnson (2001) argued that the types of problems encountered in organizations today require the complementary fit of work teams in order to ensure synergistic problem-solving and a systems-thinking orientation. When team members' personalities are diverse, each member can contribute unique attributes to the team. However, when teams have this rich diversity of perspective, members may not be able to use it well if they are too different in how they think and behave (Hackman, 2002). Therefore, this diversity must be carefully managed in order to result in the synergy that enables team members to capitalize on differences for the organization's benefit.

Based on the previous discussion, it can be argued that a team charged with accomplishing a major organization change, such as a merger, would benefit from a more heterogeneous composition. Diversity within a merger team, especially with respect to the personality construct of cognitive style, one's preferred approach to problem-solving, decision-making, and creativity, might be particularly relevant.
Team Diversity - The Role of Cognitive Style

Kirton Adaption-Innovation theory (Kirton, 1976) is well suited for use in studying the effects of similarity or differences with respect to personality within the context of work and may be especially useful for understanding what may be effective regarding organization change. This theory posits that an individual’s cognitive style, the preferred manner of perceiving and organizing information in order to solve problems and make decisions, is a stable characteristic that determines the way in which problems are approached and change is managed (Kirton, 1976). Individuals vary on this personality characteristic and are theoretically located on a value neutral continuum ranging from more adaptive to more innovative.

Both adaptors and innovators are considered creative because both solve problems and make change, but adaptors do so by working within current systems and structures while innovators break outside of the existing framework and see the established system as part of the problem. The approach that is preferred and the solutions that are posed differ since adaptors tend to embrace the generally accepted practices, structures, and procedures and use these to improve the current methods of doing things. Innovators prefer less structure, tend to ignore traditional boundaries, and are skilled at initiating changes based on doing things in a different way (Kirton & McCarthy, 1988).

Cognitive Fit in Organizations and Groups

Kirton and McCarthy (1988) first proposed the concept of Cognitive Fit as a dimension of Person-Environment fit. They examined studies that demonstrated that occupational groups tended to have a more adaptive or innovative orientation based on whether the demands of the job require working within the system or operating outside
established structures (Foxall, 1986; Gryskiewicz, Hills, Holt & Hills, 1987; Hayward & Everett, 1983; Holland, 1987). Chan (1996), describing person-organization fit as the congruence or match between some person variable and some work-situation or work-context variable, developed the construct of cognitive misfit and explained it as the degree of mismatch between an individual's cognitive style of problem-solving and the predominant style demands of the work context. Using a sample of entry-level engineers, he found that cognitive misfit occurring among either adaptors or innovators was associated with increased turnover (Chan, 1996). Puccio, Talbot and Joniak (2000) used a Person-Environment fit approach and cognitive style to predict employee level of creativity on the job and found that style match between the individual and the demands of the environment were associated with higher levels of product novelty. Chilton, Hardgrave and Armstrong (2005) used cognitive style in a Person-Job fit study of software developers and found that a mismatch between the individual and the demands of the job environment led to increased stress.

**Cognitive Style Diversity in Organizations and Groups**

Both adaptors and innovators have their own characteristic strengths and weaknesses which will respectively be both useful and harmful to an organization. All organizations need both types to achieve a balance in the styles of problem-solving and creativity that are available to address organizational issues. Both adaptors and innovators are necessary so that the organization survives, develops, and prospers regardless of the prevailing style called for by the changing environment (Kirton, 2003).

Foxall (1986) cautioned that when both adaptors and innovators are jointly faced with the need to change, conflict may occur due to their differences in problem-solving
approach. However, he suggested that training or experience focused on acknowledging, tolerating, and appreciating differences in cognitive styles can help diminish the potential for conflict. In a study of mid-career MBA students, he found that people can learn to become more comfortable and tolerant in situations or groups where the opposite style is required and that those experiences subsequently help individuals become more effective change agents (Foxall, 1986).

Much like the findings regarding team heterogeneity on other characteristics, there are opportunities and threats inherent in a work team that is diverse with respect to cognitive style. Kirton (2003) acknowledges that diverse teams can successfully address the many different types of problems faced in an organization, but this diversity will be difficult to manage. While there is potential for creative synergies, different perspectives can also lead to conflict, miscommunication, and lack of trust. However, if the diversity is successfully managed, the team will be able to deal with change across a more complex and wider range of situations. While diversity with respect to cognitive style is clearly beneficial for intact work teams working together within organizations over time, a team that is heterogeneous with respect to cognitive style may be especially useful for teams that are created to complete a specific, bounded project. The successful problem-solving and decision-making that is needed to accomplish a major organizational change, such as a merger, can occur within such a diverse team. However, success will require a leader who can productively manage the creative tension inherent in the diversity while effectively balancing the emotional responses inherent in radical change.
**Leading Teams - Creating Processes for Effectiveness**

Hackman (2005) suggests that the team leader's role is not to dictate the way to proceed, but to focus on identifying the conditions that will increase the likelihood that the group will naturally evolve and emerge as a high performing unit. Team managers must create the conditions that foster team members' motivation to develop processes and routines that are appropriate for their task and that ensure a mindful, deliberate processing of the events and outcomes that result from their work (Druskat & Wheeler, 2003; Gersick & Hackman, 1990). As already noted, this ability of a leader to create conditions that will enhance performance is especially important, perhaps even more critical, with heterogeneous teams.

Recent team research focuses on the role of the leader and his or her empowering behaviors that are directed toward the team to create a motivating climate (Chen, Kanfer, Kirkman, & Allen, 2007). Whereas traditional leaders may take a top-down approach, empowering team leaders influence more from the bottom-up or from the team's boundary and use "encouraging" or "consideration" behaviors as they clarify goals, manage conflict, and build the team (Druskat & Wheeler, 2003).

**Enabling Conditions for Successful Team Processes**

Eschewing the tendency of many leadership scholars to provide laundry lists of requisite leader behaviors and traits, Hackman (2002) presents a "simple rules" framework for team leadership. He outlines the enabling conditions that a leader must put into place in order to foster team effectiveness. The first of the recommended conditions is that a "real team" exists. A real team has stable members over a given period of time, a clear task, the authority to manage their own work processes, and clear boundaries.
Creating a real work team is a prerequisite for the remaining enabling conditions. Another condition is setting a clear direction for the team - one that is orienting, energizing, and engaging. Yet a third recommended condition is creating an enabling structure in which the team can work together to accomplish the desired outcomes. Recommendations for creating the enabling structure include (1) attending to the composition of the team, with an emphasis on establishing heterogeneous teams that have a small number of members, and (2) establishing team norms of conduct by specifying what is acceptable and unacceptable in the group (Hackman, 2002).

Creating enabling conditions is intended to support a work group’s ability to solve problems and make decisions on its own, control how the work is accomplished, and accept responsibility for work outcomes (Gersick & Hackman, 1990). Enabling conditions empower teams to develop work strategies and team processes that enable them to be more involved, flexible, and responsive. Team processes are defined as the interactions that occur between group members during goal accomplishment and are a critical connection between the team’s task and composition and its successful outcomes. Examples of effective team processes are described in terms of team member behaviors by Mohammed and Angell (2004) and include (1) shared leadership, which is the practice of initiating, clarifying, and summarizing, as well as drawing out information from other members, (2) cooperation, which entails encouraging participation and looking for middle ground, and (3) communication, which is providing constructive feedback, sharing feelings and involving all members in discussions.

Marks, Mathieu and Zacarro (2001) have also focused on the importance of team processes and describe them as the synergistic combination of individual efforts toward
collective outcomes. They claim that since much of the work in organizations is accomplished through teams, success depends on the processes employed by team members to interact with one another. These authors have developed a classification system of ten team processes organized into three categories: transition phase, action phase, and interpersonal processes. The transition phase includes planning and strategy formulation, the action phase consists of coordinating team member actions and monitoring team progress toward goals, and the interpersonal processes relate to conflict management and confidence building. All are essential for successful team outcomes.

*Team Coaching and Team Learning*

Hackman (2002) describes team coaching as another team process that the team leader must employ to help members of a heterogeneous team, especially one that is diverse on personality or perspective, find ways to learn from their differences and use these differences to their advantage in accomplishing their work. The leader's role in coaching to assist a team to learn together has also been studied from a team process perspective (Edmonson, 1999; Van Offenbeek, 2001) with findings that team learning results in greater understanding among the members and improved performance of the team as a whole (Edmonson, 1999).

Team learning behaviors include seeking and giving feedback, sharing information, discussing errors, and assessing the team's effectiveness in collaborating. Recent studies have found that team learning decreases the negative impact of team diversity and conflict and increases the effectiveness of team performance (Yeh & Chou, 2005). Kayes, Kayes and Kolb (2005) have also shown that teams can increase their effectiveness through an intentional focus on team learning by routinely reflecting on the
experiences within the team in order to integrate the different team members' perspectives.

Closely aligned with the idea of team learning is the recommendation for creating "habits" within the team that provide practices for dealing with change based upon purposeful discussions of current tasks and situations and possible alternative actions. These habits can allow heterogeneous groups to establish patterns of behavior that lead to effective team process behaviors and creative and appropriate responses to change (Gersick & Hackman, 1990).

**Team Cognitive Style Diversity and Organization Change**

Teams that are heterogeneous with respect to cognitive style may benefit from the deliberate processing practice suggested by Gersick and Hackman (1990) because it encourages teams to be mindful of their own processes and the way in which they handle differing points of view. When a team is dealing with organization change, the ability to deal effectively with conflicting perspectives through a deliberate exploration of opposing viewpoints may be essential for improving team creativity and decision-making (Tjosvold, 1991).

Earlier studies addressing team processes found that while active and explicit exploration of strategy alternatives and differences in preferred approach is optimal, team members often find such discussions to be uncomfortable or awkward (Hackman, Brousseau & Weiss, 1976). Team leaders can play an important role at this point, facilitating team processes of reflection, discussion, and negotiation that enable the team to deal with conflicting perspectives in a constructive manner and that lead to enhanced team performance.
As the use of teams for responding to different types of organizational change in organizations increases, team leaders must strive to create the conditions that will enable teams to work together successfully. Given the need to marshal all of the differences that exist in the team toward successful response to the changes, a leader's emotional intelligence may have a significant influence on a team’s ability to employ appropriate and effective work processes in the management of those organizational changes.

**Leading Teams for Organization Change: Leader Emotional Intelligence**

The study of emotional intelligence and its usefulness in the workplace is a new and growing area of behavioral research (Zeidner, Matthews & Roberts, 2004). The concept of emotional intelligence has quickly resonated within businesses and organizations where the importance of issues such as self-awareness, understanding others, and developing and maintaining relationships are vital to successful performance. Emotional intelligence has also been specifically linked to leadership in studies that demonstrate that leaders evoke emotional responses in the workplace and those who can manage their own and others' emotions will be more effective in their leadership role (Dasborough, 2006; George, 2000).

**History of Emotional Intelligence**

Emotional intelligence has its roots in the early work conducted by Thorndike (1921) in the area he termed "social intelligence" and explained as the ability to understand and manage different individuals and to act wisely in human relationships. Salovey and Mayer (1990) further explain Thorndike's (1921) conception of social intelligence as the ability to act based on perceiving the internal states, motives, and
behavior of self and others in interpersonal situations. Much later in the twentieth century, Gardner (1983) and Sternberg (1985) renewed the interest in social intelligence with their suggestions of a concept of "multiple intelligences".

In Gardner's theory of multiple intelligence, social intelligence is identified as one of seven intelligence domains and defined as a combination of interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences. His version of interpersonal intelligence related to understanding and managing oneself; his concept of intrapersonal intelligence referred to the ability to deal with others. Sternberg supported the idea of multiple intelligence and provided examples of how social intelligence benefited individuals in work settings. Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso (2004) consider emotional intelligence a subset of social intelligence and view it as one of the "hot" intelligences, referring to the fact that it deals with matters of personal and emotional importance to the individual.

Models of Emotional Intelligence

Two different models of emotional intelligence have emerged over the last decade, a model of emotional intelligence conceptualized as an "ability" (Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2004) and a "mixed model" that includes a combination of more diverse aspects of personality, emotional competencies, and personal qualities such as optimism, trustworthiness, adaptability, and empathy (Bar-On, 1997; Boyatzis, Goleman & Rhee, 2000; Goleman, 1998). The ability model consists of a well-defined set of emotion processing skills and uses a measure of emotional intelligence designed as an objective performance test. The "mixed model", which frequently taps into personality dimensions as well as emotional skills, has produced self-report methodologies for measuring the emotional intelligence construct.
Recent scholarly reviews of the theory and research regarding emotional intelligence have resulted in strong endorsements of the "ability" model and its accompanying measurement methodology over the mixed models. Severe criticisms of the claims made by advocates of the mixed models (e.g. Goleman, Boyatzis & McKee, 2002) have exposed the fact that many studies they have cited as evidence of emotional intelligence and its effects, especially its importance in the workplace, have been seriously flawed (Antonakis, Ashkanasay & Dasborough, 2009), leading to more hyperbole than fact and an over reliance on anecdotes, expert opinions, and unpublished surveys (Zeidner, Matthews & Roberts, 2004). Jordan, Ashton-James, and Ashkanasy (2006) declared that these claims may have done considerable harm to the field as they have led to much confusion about emotional intelligence and the potential it represents.

**Ability Model of Emotional Intelligence**

Despite this controversy, scholars agree that emotions are important in leadership and decision-making and endorse the ability model of emotional intelligence as an approach for future research within organizations. In the ability model, Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso (2008) have defined emotional intelligence as "the ability to engage in sophisticated information processing about one's own and others' emotions and the ability to use this information as a guide to thinking and behavior" (p. 503). This theory of emotional intelligence was first developed two decades ago (Salovey & Mayer, 1990) in support of the study of multiple intelligences and has continued to grow as a concept of interest in psychology and the business setting.

The ability model of emotional intelligence divides emotional abilities and skills into four areas or "branches" which consist of (1) the ability to perceive emotion, (2) the
ability to use emotion to facilitate thought, (3) the ability to understand emotions, and (4) the ability to manage emotions (Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2004) and are further described as follows.

Perceiving and Identifying Emotions: This first dimension of emotional intelligence involves the capacity to recognize and express one's own emotions and be aware of and appraise the emotion of others. People differ in the degree to which they are aware of the emotions they experience and their ability to verbally and non-verbally express these emotions to others. With respect to appraisal of the emotions of others, there are differences in the ability to determine what others are experiencing and to accurately communicate these feeling. This dimension of emotional intelligence also incorporates the concept of empathy, the ability to understand and experience another person's feeling or emotions (George, 2000).

Using Emotions to Facilitate Thought: The second dimension relates to the ability to use emotion to contribute to one's effective processing of information, such as being able to focus attention on important issues and making choices among competing options. This involves generating emotions to assist in judgments and facilitate decision-making and using moods to help in thinking processes and problem-solving. The ability to generate emotion and then use this emotion to reason is the essence of this dimension.

Understanding Emotions: The third dimension of emotional intelligence reflects the capacity to analyze one's own and others' emotions to understand their causes and consequences and their changing nature. It involves the ability to understand the complexity of emotions and the emotional "chains" moving emotions through transitional stages, and allowing them to evolve over time.
Managing Emotions: The fourth dimension relates to managing and controlling one's own and other emotions so that they aid rather than interfere in effective information processing. It involves staying aware of and being open to one's emotions and solving emotion-laden problems without necessarily suppressing negative emotions. This dimension of emotional intelligence enables one to integrate the data of emotions and learn from the valuable information emotions contain in order to make decisions and take action.

Emotional Intelligence and Leadership

Emotional intelligence combines emotions and reasoning and allows one's appraisals, decisions and actions to be informed by an understanding of one's own emotions and emotions in others (George, 2000). Since a critical dimension of emotional intelligence includes the ability to read and understand others in a social context, detect nuances or emotional reactions, and use this information to make decisions and influence others, emotional intelligence is increasingly being seen as a requirement for effective leadership and team performance in organizations (Prati, Douglas, Ferris, Ammeter, & Buckley, 2003). George (2000) argued that emotions play a central role in leadership and decision-making and that emotions are inseparable from the work setting therefore, emotional intelligence, the ability to recognize, understand and manage the emotions of self and others, is critical to effective leadership in organizations. Antonakis, Ashkanasay, and Dasborough (2009) encourage researchers to continue to study emotions, particularly their role in leadership, with a view that future empirical studies may eventually provide strong evidence for the link between emotional intelligence and effective leaders.
There is a growing body of theoretical literature applying emotional intelligence to leadership. Although traditional leadership theories have not explicitly addressed the role of emotions in the leadership process, recent theories of leadership, such as the visionary and inspirational models, are based on establishment of a close bond between a leader and follower and have placed a greater emphasis on understanding and managing emotions inherent in this type of relationship. Charismatic leadership (House, 1977), transformational leadership (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Conger & Kanungo, 1987), and visionary leadership (Sashkin, 1988) are all examples of leadership theories that highlight the ability of a leader to motivate followers, garner their trust, and empower them as co-agents of organization change through processes that involve emotional engagement (Zaccaro, 2001).

An increased emphasis is being placed on the need for leaders to take on roles of facilitating, coordinating, and orchestrating the work behavior of others, more frequently in a team structure, in order to accomplish organizational goals. These roles often call for a leader to manage multiple demands and high levels of stress, resolve conflicts, and generate and maintain a sense of cooperation and trust (George, 2000). Hackman (2002) claims that leading a team is emotionally demanding, especially as it involves dealing with the anxiety and emotion of self and others, and those leaders who are "emotionally mature" can use these feelings to foster team learning and change. Goleman, Boyatizis, and McKee (2002) believe that emotional intelligence is particularly important as leaders deal with teams because of the need for the leader to motivate and challenge team members to work together, facilitate team interaction and dynamics, build interpersonal trust and relations, and inspire team members to implement the organization's goals and
vision. The ability of a leader to influence followers' emotions has also been linked to the type of leadership processes that are necessary to accomplish major organization change (Prati, et al., 2003; George, 2000).

**Emotional Intelligence and Organization Change**

Huy (2002) has argued that organization change is an emotion laden experience. Intense emotions are triggered when fundamental or radical change occur in organizations, such as changes in an organization's identity or strategy. He cautions that the progress and success of an ambitious change can be hindered if these intense emotions are not considered and managed appropriately. Zhou and George (2003) propose that a work environment that nurtures creativity is necessary to accomplish effectively major organization change and suggest that a leader's emotional intelligence plays a pivotal role in facilitating creativity-enhancing behavior. One theoretical model has been developed by Prati et al. (2003) linking emotional intelligence, leadership, and team outcomes and focusing on the effects of emotional intelligence of both the leader and team members on team cohesion, team trust, team decision-making ability, and team creativity.

Although the empirical research supporting the direct role of emotional intelligence in the workplace is meager (Zeidner, et al., 2004), scholars have provided sound theoretical models and propositions regarding the effects of emotional intelligence in organizational life. The focus on a leader's ability to manage complex social and personal dynamics in the work setting, specifically in work teams, has led to this increasing interest in studying the role of emotions in organizations (Carson, Carson & Birkenmeier, 2000). In theoretical studies, emotional intelligence has been tied to
transformational leadership, organizational culture, creativity, teamwork, and organization change (Barbuto & Burbach, 2006; George, 2000; Huy, 2002; Prati, et al., 2003; Zhu & George, 2004). While these and other effects of emotional intelligence within the workplace have been proposed, well designed empirical studies that test these propositions are needed.

Previous results of research in this area have been criticized due to problems and confusion associated with the way emotional intelligence has been measured (Antonakis, et al., 2009). Although there has been support for the ability model of emotional intelligence, which enables a focus on the skills of perceiving, using, understanding, and managing emotions, further research is needed to provide evidence that this construct and this approach are useful, especially in relation to leadership, leading teams, and managing organization change.

**Team Cognitive Style, Leader Emotional Intelligence and Organization Change**

The literature and research in the areas of organization change, teams, cognitive style, and emotional intelligence have been integrated to propose a model for this study (Figure 1) that examines the relationship between team composition with respect to cognitive style and the management of radical organization change. It also includes the influence of a leader's emotional intelligence on team performance. This model identifies how teams that have either diverse or similar membership with respect to thinking and problem-solving approach (cognitive style) along with the emotional intelligence level of the team leader affect both team interaction processes and the eventual outcomes of team satisfaction and performance.
Model Linkage 1: Merger Team Cognitive Style, Leader Emotional Intelligence and Team Outcomes

Jackson et al. (1991) argued that work teams face numerous challenges and opportunities and that team composition can have a considerable impact on the processes teams use and the outcomes they can achieve. Team composition with respect to various demographic variables such as gender, ethnicity, race, and culture has been described as surface-level diversity and has been extensively studied in relation to team outcomes (Tsui, Egan & Xin, 1995; Mohammed & Angell, 2004). Differences with respect to personality, attitudes and values, known as deep-level diversity, has also been explored (Barrick, Stewart, Neubert & Mount, 1998; Harrison, Price, Galvin & Florey, 2002), but with less frequency. Organizational research over the last twenty years has demonstrated
that personality characteristics can be useful for predicting work performance (Mount, Barrick & Stewart, 1998; Hogan, Hogan & Roberts, 1996). Since organizations are increasingly using teams to accomplish work, more evidence regarding the relationship between personality diversity in teams and team performance outcomes is necessary (Mohammed & Angell, 2004).

This study considered differences within a team with respect to cognitive style, a particular personality characteristic, and examined the effect of this diversity on team outcomes. Because of a widespread acceptance of the Five Factor Model of personality over the last several years, most studies of personality diversity in teams use one or more of the dimensions of the Five Factor Model, most frequently exploring extraversion and conscientiousness. However, given the nature of the task of implementing a radical organization change, cognitive style, the problem-solving approach taken by team members, may be an appropriate area of focus with teams. Kirton (2003) suggested that the full range of the adaption-innovation continuum is essential for solving the types of problems that teams will face. While some problems may naturally require more adaptive or more innovative solutions so that a narrower problem-solving style may be sufficient in those situations, most major change efforts will require a diversity of problem-solving styles. This diversity may be difficult to manage without the attention and skills of a leader capable of successfully dealing with different perspectives, approaches and problem solutions (Kirton, 2003).

Teams that are more similar in cognitive style and more adaptive on the continuum may also experience difficulty when dealing with a radical change since their preferred problem-solving approach favors staying within an existing structure or paradigm in
order to make incremental changes. Therefore, in the case of radical change, the homogeneous, more adaptive team may need a leader who can help the team successfully manage a break with the current structure. Teams that are homogeneous and more innovative on the continuum may be able to use their common preference for frame-breaking change to successfully manage their work and may have less need for a leader's intervention.

Leaders in organizations are increasingly expected to facilitate, coordinate, and orchestrate the work behavior of others and evidence has shown that a leader's social effectiveness skills are crucial to his or her effectiveness in these areas (Prati, Douglas, Ferris, Ammeter & Buckley, 2003). Although the empirical studies are scant and plagued by methodological problems (see Zeidner, Matthews & Roberts, 2004; Antonakis, Ashkanasy & Dasborough, 2009), emotional intelligence has been shown to relate to job satisfaction and commitment (Bar-On, 1997), transformational leadership behaviors (Barbuto & Burbach, 2006), positive team performance (Ashkanasy & Dasborough, 2003), and leader induced creativity in the workplace (Zhou & George, 2003).

The emotional intelligence of a leader of a team chartered to implement radical organizational change may influence the team's potential for successful outcomes. The leader's ability to use information about his or her own and others’ emotions as a guide to thinking and behavior (Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2008) in an emotion-laden situation, such as a major transformational change, may contribute to a team's success. While one recent study showed that the emotional intelligence of supervisors in a manufacturing setting correlated with performance ratings by employees (Cote & Miners, 2006) and a second study showed that the performance appraisal of managers by their bosses...
correlated with results on the ability measure of emotional intelligence (Rosete, 2007), there are no studies of the effect of a leader's emotional intelligence on team outcomes of performance or satisfaction.

The present study predicted that the successful performance and satisfaction of teams engaged in a radical organization change initiative would be influenced by the emotional intelligence of a team leader. Additionally, it was expected that both the cognitive style of the team and the diversity of the team with respect to cognitive style would also directly affect these outcomes.

The first set of hypotheses addressed the relationship between the predictor variables of composition of the merger team with respect to cognitive style and emotional intelligence of the leader and the outcome variable of team performance.

*Team Performance as Outcome*

**Hypothesis 1a:** Merger teams that have a leader who scores high in emotional intelligence will receive higher ratings of team performance than merger teams that have a leader who scores low in emotional intelligence.

**Hypothesis 1b:** Merger teams that are heterogeneous with respect to cognitive style will receive higher ratings of team performance than merger teams that are homogeneous with respect to cognitive style.

**Hypothesis 1c:** Merger teams that are more innovative with respect to cognitive style will receive higher ratings of team performance than merger teams that are more adaptive with respect to cognitive style.
The second set of hypotheses addressed the relationship between the predictor variables of composition of the merger team with respect to cognitive style and emotional intelligence of the leader and the outcome variable of team satisfaction.

**Team Satisfaction as Outcome**

**Hypothesis 2a**: Merger teams will have higher team satisfaction when the team leader has a higher score in emotional intelligence than when the team leader has a low score in emotional intelligence.

**Hypothesis 2b**: Merger teams that are heterogeneous with respect to cognitive style will have higher team satisfaction than merger teams that are homogeneous with respect to cognitive style.

**Hypothesis 2c**: There will be no difference in team satisfaction whether merger teams are more innovative or more adaptive with respect to cognitive style.

Although the team’s task involves managing a radical, innovative change initiative, both adaptive-oriented and innovative-oriented teams can successfully work together to accomplish the goal. Therefore, it was expected that the ratings of team satisfaction would be similar for both types of teams.

**Model Linkage 2: Merger Team Cognitive Style, Leader Emotional Intelligence and Team Interaction Processes**

The terms team processes, intragroup processes, or interaction processes all refer to how members of groups or teams behave and interact with one another with respect to communicating and sharing information, expressing feelings, managing conflicts, and supporting the leader (Barrick, Stewart, Neubert & Mount, 1998; Gladstein, 1984; Guzzo
& Shea, 1992; Hackman, 1987). Gladstein (1984) explained that group process influences effectiveness and includes specific activities such as open communication, discussion of strategy, and ensuring individual inputs. Task, role, and goal clarity were also considered to be critical to the team’s effectiveness and, although more structural in nature, contribute to effectiveness through a direct influence on the processes that occur within the group (Gladstein, 1984).

A study of 45 production teams conducted by Stewart and Barrick (2000) demonstrated that team process served as an intervening variable between task and performance and that this relationship was strongest when the task required interdependence of team members. Barrick, Stewart, Neubert, and Mount (1998) used the construct of social cohesion to capture the many processes involved in interpersonal dynamics within teams and found that social cohesion mediated the relationship between team personality characteristics and team performance. Katzenbach and Smith (1993) explained that most successful teams develop processes and common approaches that enable them to work together to accomplish their purpose. They proposed that an effective team invests considerable time and effort in crafting these work processes and common work approach.

Guzzo and Shea (1992) identified an input - process - output model as the dominant model for team performance research. Processes that have been studied using this framework include patterns of participation, decision-making strategies, information exchange, leadership, communication styles and shared norms (West, Hirst, Richter & Shipton, 2004). Results have typically shown support for the intervening role of process in the task to performance relationship.
Many team scholars have focused on the role of the team leader in creating the conditions within the team to enable the development of these effective team processes (Druskat & Wheeler, 2003; Gersick & Hackman, 1990; Hackman, 2003). Hackman (2003) suggested that the team leader's role is to focus on identifying the conditions that will increase the likelihood that the group will naturally evolve and emerge as a high performing unit. Gersick & Hackman (1990) argued that team leaders must create the conditions that foster a work team's motivation to develop processes and routines that are appropriate for its own work and that ensure a mindful, deliberate processing of how the team members are responding to one another and to their work as a team.

In addition to the behaviors of the team leader, team learning has also been studied as a critical process that enhances team outcomes. Kayes, Kayes and Kolb (2005) argued that teams can increase their effectiveness through an intentional focus on team learning by routinely reflecting on the experiences within the team in order to integrate the different team members' perspectives. Gersick & Hackman (1990) describe the importance of creating habits within the team that result in purposeful discussions of current tasks and situations and possible alternative actions.

While teams that are homogeneous with respect to cognitive style may find it easier than heterogeneous teams to establish norms and processes for interaction and working together, both will benefit from the deliberate processing practice suggested by Gersick and Hackman (1990) that encourages teams to be mindful of their own processes and the way in which they handle differing points of view. The ability of a team to deal effectively with conflicting perspectives through a deliberate exploration of opposing
viewpoints can improve creativity and decision-making (Tjosvold, 1990) and will be particularly important when managing change.

In their study of the conditions that prompt effective group processes, Hackman, Broussseau, and Weiss (1976) found that the establishment of a group norm of "overt discussion" encouraged active and explicit exploration of strategy alternatives by the team, but that members often felt uncomfortable or awkward during these discussions. Team leaders can play an important role at this point, facilitating team processes of reflection, discussion, and negotiation that enable the team to deal with conflicting perspectives in a constructive manner and that lead to enhanced team performance.

Given the need to understand and manage the different feelings and perspectives of team members and to create the context where effective work processes and strategies can be established, it is possible that the emotional intelligence level of the team leader may have a significant influence on a team’s ability to work well together.

The current study proposed a link between team composition with respect to cognitive style, the leader's emotional intelligence and the processes that teams create and employ in the accomplishment of their work. These team interactions are considered vital to successful team outcomes. Based on internal team processes outlined by Beckhard (1972), Gladstein (1984), and Hackman (1987), four specific areas of focus were selected and incorporated in this study to represent the "team interaction" component of the proposed model. These include: (1) a task/role/goal clarity dimension, (2) a process/relationship dimension, (3) a team leader behavior dimension, and (4) a team learning dimension.


**Task/Role/Goal Clarity as Outcome**

The following set of hypotheses addressed the proposed relationships between merger team composition with respect to cognitive style, emotional intelligence of the team leader, and the task/role/goal dimension of team interaction processes.

**Hypothesis 3a:** Merger teams will have higher ratings of task/role/goal clarity when the leader is high in emotional intelligence than when the leader is low in emotional intelligence.

**Hypothesis 3b:** Merger teams that are heterogeneous with respect to cognitive style will have higher ratings of task/role/goal clarity than merger teams who are homogeneous with respect to cognitive style.

**Hypothesis 3c:** Merger teams that are more adaptive with respect to cognitive style will have higher ratings of task/role/goal clarity than merger teams that are more innovative with respect to cognitive style.

It was expected that teams that were composed of innovators would be more comfortable with the task of dealing with a radical organization change, such as a merger. Because innovators have a natural preference for breaking outside of structures and looking for different solutions to problems, they may not require as much direction and clarification for establishing tasks, roles and goals. Therefore, their ratings of task/role/goal clarity may not be as high as those of the teams comprised of adaptors who value an emphasis on structure and clarity.
Process/Relationship Ratings as Outcome

The next set of hypotheses addressed the proposed relationship between merger team composition with respect to cognitive style, emotional intelligence of the leader, and the process/relationship dimension of team processes.

*Hypothesis 4a:* Merger teams will have higher ratings on the process/relationship dimension of team experience when the leader is high in emotional intelligence than when the leader is low in emotional intelligence.

*Hypothesis 4b:* Merger teams that are heterogeneous with respect to cognitive style will have higher ratings on the process/relationship dimension of team experience than merger teams that are homogeneous with respect to cognitive style.

*Hypothesis 4c:* Merger teams that are more adaptive with respect to cognitive style will have higher ratings on the process/relationship dimension of team experience than merger teams that are more innovative with respect to cognitive style.

It was expected that teams that are more adaptive would require the intervention of the team leader in establishing effective work processes and relationships despite the fact that the team members are similar in problem-solving style. The expectation of a need for help in creating effective work processes in this situation is due to the mismatch between the team preference of adaption and the task requirement of a radical change, a merger. The leader may play an important role in helping the team to work together productively in the context of a task that requires breaking out of established structure in order to succeed. The innovative group, given their common preference for breaking out from structure and their task requirement for accomplishing major change, may be able to
establish their own effective team work processes without intervention from the team leader.

**Team Leader Behavior as Outcome**

The next set of hypotheses addressed the proposed relationship between team composition with respect to cognitive style, emotional intelligence of the leader and the team leader behavior dimension of team processes.

**Hypothesis 5a:** Merger teams will have higher ratings of team leader behavior when the team leader is high in emotional intelligence than when the team leader is low in emotional intelligence.

**Hypothesis 5b:** Merger teams that are heterogeneous with respect to cognitive style will have higher ratings of team leader behavior than merger teams that are homogeneous with respect to cognitive style.

**Hypothesis 5c:** There will be no difference in ratings on team leader behavior whether the team is more adaptive or more innovative with respect to cognitive style.

It was expected that a team leader higher in emotional intelligence would exhibit leader behaviors that create conditions to enable effective team interactions. These behaviors include establishing a climate of trust and cooperation, encouraging contributions from all team members, generating optimism and enthusiasm, managing feelings and emotions, and dealing with conflict. Teams that are heterogeneous with respect to cognitive style will benefit from a team leader who is able to create conditions where differences are used productively. Therefore, it was expected that heterogeneous teams would acknowledge the leader’s influence on the team dynamics. Additionally,
given the nature of the merger task, both adaptor-oriented and innovative-oriented teams
would appreciate leader behaviors that supported a climate for working well together.

*Team Learning as Outcome*

The next set of hypotheses addressed the proposed relationship between team
composition with respect to cognitive style, emotional intelligence of the leader and the
team learning dimension of team processes.

**Hypothesis 6a:** Merger teams will have higher ratings of team learning when the team
leader is high in emotional intelligence than when the team leader is low in emotional
intelligence.

**Hypothesis 6b:** Merger teams that are heterogeneous with respect to cognitive style will
have higher ratings of team learning than merger teams that are homogeneous with
respect to cognitive style.

**Hypothesis 6c:** There will be no difference in ratings of team learning whether the
merger team is more innovative or more adaptive with respect to cognitive style.

In a study of cross-functional teams in an information technology setting, Yeh and
Chou (2005) found that team learning had a significant positive effect on the team with
respect to performance and satisfaction. Therefore, it was expected that members within
heterogeneous merger teams would acknowledge higher levels of learning as a result of
working with others who approach problem-solving and decision-making from differing
perspectives and that this situation increases team learning opportunities and experiences.
Additionally, it was expected that a team leader who is high in emotional intelligence
may purposefully create the conditions within the team for more team learning to occur.
However, the cognitive style of the team (more adaptive or innovative on the whole) should have no effect on the experience of team learning.

**Model Linkage 3: Team Interaction (Processes) and Team Outcomes**

By applying the traditional input-process-output framework to teams, team interaction processes can be seen as another critical influence on the team outputs or outcomes of performance and satisfaction. In order to satisfy this linkage, connecting interaction processes to outcomes, it was expected that team interaction processes and team outcomes will be related. Specifically, better team interaction processes will result in better performance and increased satisfaction.

**Team Interaction (Processes) and Team Performance as Outcome**

**Hypothesis 7a:** Merger team ratings of the team interaction dimension of task/role/goal clarity are positively related to team scores on team performance.

**Hypothesis 7b:** Merger team ratings of the team interaction dimension of team processes/relationships are positively related to team scores on team performance.

**Hypothesis 7c:** Merger team ratings of the team interaction dimension of team leader behavior are positively related to team scores on team performance.

**Hypothesis 7d:** Merger team ratings of the team interaction dimension of team learning are positively related to team scores on team performance.

**Team Interactions (Processes) and Team Satisfaction as Outcome**

**Hypothesis 8a:** Merger team ratings of the team interaction dimension of task/role/goal clarity are positively related to team scores on team satisfaction.
**Hypothesis 8b:** Merger team ratings of the team interaction dimension of team processes/relationships are positively related to team scores on team satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 8c:** Merger team ratings of the team interaction dimension of team leader behavior are positively related to team scores on team satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 8d:** Merger team ratings of the team interaction dimension of team learning are positively related to team scores on team satisfaction.

**Summary**

The proposed model and hypotheses for this study outlined the expected relationships between the predictors of team cognitive style, team cognitive style diversity, and team leader emotional intelligence and the outcomes of team performance and team satisfaction. It was predicted that merger teams that scored as more innovative and more diverse with respect to cognitive style would receive higher team performance ratings. Additionally, it was predicted that teams would perform the task of merger implementation better when the team leader was high in emotional intelligence. The same conditions relating to the predictor variables (i.e. more innovative and diverse merger teams and leaders high in emotional intelligence) were expected to lead to higher team satisfaction.

Furthermore, it was expected that a direct relationship would be shown between ratings of team interactions (task/role/goal clarity, team processes/relationships, team leader behavior, and team learning) and the study outcome variables, such that higher ratings of team interactions would result in higher scores of team performance and team satisfaction.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Overview

This section describes the research design and methodology used to test the hypotheses in this study. First, the sample population is described, followed by an explanation of the procedures used for data collection. Next, a detailed description of the measures employed in this study is provided, including measures of cognitive style, emotional intelligence, team experience and satisfaction, and change outcomes. Finally, the analysis procedures used to test the hypotheses are explained.

Participants

Two large organizations involved in radical change efforts, each undergoing a merger and using a team approach for effecting this change, were identified as potential sites for data collection. Decision makers in each of these organizations were provided an explanation of the research study and offered the opportunity to participate. One of the organizations, a large non-profit religious institution, accepted the invitation. A description of the research study, including its objectives, potential benefits and the data collection process entailed, was briefed to the organization leaders at a routine merger planning meeting.

The mergers within this organization involved combining parish communities throughout a large Catholic Diocese in southern New Jersey. A total of 76 parishes in the diocese were affected by the merger effort. The organization adopted a team approach to the merger implementation and created 37 teams, each working on the combination of
two parishes into one new integrated parish community. These 37 teams, called Merger Core Teams, comprised the sample population for this study. Each team consisted of six to eight team members, representing each of the combining parishes, and a team leader, a Catholic priest who would likely be the pastor of the new parish. Therefore, the study involved a potential for a total of 259 team members, 37 team leaders, and 37 teams. All team members were volunteers for this major change initiative, were committed to full participation in the merger work, and spent many hours involved in meetings and activities in support of the merger.

**Procedure**

Participants from each of the teams were asked to complete two web-based instruments, a measure of cognitive style and a team experience survey. Team leaders were also asked to complete the cognitive style inventory as well as a measure of emotional intelligence. Organizational leaders from the Diocese, who provided oversight for this change initiative, informed the participants about the research study and the questionnaires at the start of the merger project, encouraged participation, and reinforced the confidentiality of the responses and the fact that participation was voluntary. Once the e-mail contact information for each of the team members was provided to the researcher, all future communication with the participants relating to any aspects of the study was accomplished by the researcher.

An individual personal e-mail was sent from the researcher to each of the participants and included an explanation of the study (Appendix A), an informed consent attachment, and an electronic link to the survey sites. The confidentiality of the responses...
and the fact that participation was voluntary was reiterated. The cognitive style instrument website link was sent to the participants as a part of the initial explanatory e-mail. The team experience survey was sent out to the participants once their team's work had been approved by the Merger Review Committee and the merger had been decreed. The team leaders in the study were asked to complete the measure of emotional intelligence at the same time as the cognitive style instrument since both of these instruments measure stable characteristics that should not be affected by the team experience.

The consent form document informed the participants that data would be collected, stored, and analyzed on a secure Columbia University computer accessible only to the researcher and that only the summarized findings would be shared with the organization. Each participant's individual responses were kept confidential and used only by the researcher in the analysis of data. Names were removed and each respondent's identification was coded in order to place each participant's responses with those from others in the same team. Other than during the initial steps, where team members were informed of their desired participation in the study, the organization's leaders were not involved in the collection or analysis of the data.

The web-based survey method was chosen over a paper-and-pencil based approach based on convenience and accessibility. Evidence has been provided that both approaches are equivalent from a psychometric perspective (Donovan, Drasgow & Probst, 2000). The teams in this study were spread across a wide geographic area of southern New Jersey and were completing these instruments at different times and in different locations across the region. Therefore, because of its flexibility, speed, and cost-
effectiveness, the web-based distribution approach was preferred for this study. Although web-based data collection can cause some problems such as confidentiality concerns, unexpected technology glitches, confusion with junk mail, and response rate variability (Sills & Song, 2003), it is still considered a sound approach and is gradually becoming a standard practice (Best, Kreuger, Hubbard & Smith, 2001).

Reminder e-mails were sent to individuals who had not participated or responded within two weeks of the initial e-mail sent from the researcher. The merger team members were reminded of the potential benefits of the study and encouraged to participate. For several merger teams, the collection of the cognitive style data preceded the completion of the team’s merger work; therefore, in order to collect the team experience information, a second round of e-mails with the link to the second survey site was sent to participants when their work was finished. The same process as previously described was used to communicate with the participants and reminder e-mails were sent if necessary.

Based on the merger project design, the merger teams were expected to complete their merger work and file for the Merger Review Committee evaluation process by October 2010. However, due to the nature of the project, some merger teams worked more slowly or had disruptions that caused significant delay. Therefore, of the 37 teams originally expected to be part of the study, only 30 teams were finished with their merger process and available to be included in the full data collection process. Those 30 teams represented a potential for 240 study participants.

The study measures were completed by 195 participants, which resulted in an overall response rate of 81% across the merger project. This research was designed to
study the variables of interest at the team level. Therefore, for all measures, with the exception of the emotional intelligence test, the scores of individuals within a team were to be aggregated to represent a team score for that particular construct. As a result, only data from participants from teams for which there were at least five participants per team were used in the analysis. The five members per team criteria was based on work by Bleise (1998), which suggests that a five member per team minimum be employed to offset potential biases when aggregating scores to the group level. Additionally, in order to be certain that the variables used in the analysis reflected the entire team that engaged in the work, all members that were identified as part of a particular team needed to participate in the study. When these criteria were applied to this study, the result was a final sample of 26 teams, representing 86% of the merger teams that had completed the merger process.

The demographics of the participants in the study were as follows: gender (62% male, 38% female); age (mean = 55.7 years, standard deviation=10); ethnicity (78% white, 11% Hispanic, 6% Asian, 5% Black); education (13% high school, 16% some college or technical training, 37% college degree, 2% some graduate school, 33% graduate degree); and occupation (15% retired, 12% technical or trade, 72% professional, and 3% unemployed). All team leaders in this study were males (Catholic priests). The mean age for team leaders was 57.2 years and the median age was 58.5 years. Team membership was balanced with respect to gender.

**Measures**

Four major categories of variables were measured in this study including (1) the cognitive style of all team members, (2) the emotional intelligence level of all team
leaders, (3) the extent of team processes used and satisfaction with team experience as identified by all team members, and (4) the organizational outcome, as indicated by success of the team on all required merger implementation activities.

Cognitive Style

The Kirton Adaption-Innovation (KAI) (Kirton, 1976) inventory was used to measure the cognitive style of each participant. A summary of numerous studies shows internal consistency coefficients for the KAI ranging from .76 to .91 (Kirton, 2005). The KAI is a self-report measure consisting of 32 items each scored using a five-point Likert-type scale. Respondents rate themselves on the 32 statements by indicating how easy or difficult it is for them to behave in the described manner consistently over a long period of time. Examples of items include "a person who proliferates ideas", "is methodical and systematic," "never seeks to bend or break the rules", "would sooner create something than improve it", "prefers changes to occur gradually" and "has fresh perspectives on old problems." Responses range from "very hard" to "very easy" and are scored from 1 to 5; therefore, the possible total summed scores range from 32 to 160. Observed scores for large population samples from several different countries typically range from 45 to 145 and are normally distributed with a mean approximating 95. Lower scores indicate cognitive styles toward the adaptive end of the continuum while higher scores represent more innovative cognitive styles.

The KAI inventory is composed of three subscales identified as (1) style of originality, (2) style of efficiency, and (3) style of rule/group conformity which are briefly described here. The first subscale, Style of Originality, relates to an individual's preference for idea generation. Adaptors tend to produce a fewer number of ideas and
those ideas are usually sound, safe, more immediately relevant and considered "good bets". The adaptors confine their idea generation to the currently agreed upon structure and are oriented to producing a sufficiency of ideas to address the problem or issue encountered. Innovators tend to spontaneously produce many more ideas, often generating a surplus. The ideas generated by innovators usually break outside of the current boundaries, are more risky, and are often seen as bizarre.

The second subscale, Style of Efficiency refers to the method or approach used by an individual for problem-solving. Adaptors are more orderly, methodical, detailed, careful and precise and work within the system to refine and improve upon current structures and paradigms. They prefer stability and control and achieve progress more incrementally. Innovative problem-solvers pay less attention to the current structures and are less consistent, less meticulous, and more flexible when searching for solutions. Innovators trade off thoroughness for the opportunity to look outside of the current paradigm to solve problems.

The third subscale, the Style of Rule/Group Conformity relates to the preference for operating within rules and existing structures. Adaptors prefer rules, seeing them as efficient guidelines that help to establish consensus. Group cohesion is important to adaptors. They approach change cautiously and gradually, tending to modify or enhance the current structures and processes in an incremental fashion. Innovators have less regard for structure, consensus, tradition, or cohesion and are more likely to be comfortable bringing about challenging changes that disrupt the status quo. Innovators challenge the rules and the accepted structures.
Internal reliabilities for each of the subscales of the KAI have been shown to be greater than coefficient alpha .70 (Kirton, 2005) and sample items ask a respondent if he/she is a person who "copes with several ideas at the same time" (Originality), "is methodical and systematic" (Efficiency) and "readily agrees with the team at work" (Rule/Group Conformity).

The items included in the KAI inventory are provided as Appendix B. For this study, results of the reliability analysis for the KAI (total) demonstrated an internal reliability $\text{Cronbach's alpha } = .86$, consistent with previous research studies using this inventory as a measure of cognitive style. Internal reliabilities for the subscales for the sample were as follows: Sufficiency of Originality $\alpha = .82$; Efficiency $\alpha = .81$; and Rule/Group Conformity $\alpha = .82$.

KAI scores were used to create two different measurements in this study. First, a mean KAI score was computed for each team to be used as an indicator of the team’s cognitive style. Kirton and McCarthy (1988) first described the use of an aggregate measure of cognitive style for a group, identifying the mean of the group members’ scores as the representation of the collective preferred style, and refer to this collective style as the group cognitive climate. Several other researchers interested in teams and groups, especially in the workplace, have continued to use the group KAI mean as the measure of a group’s cognitive style (Clapp, 1991; Hammerschmidt, 1996; Puccio, Talbot & Joniak, 2000; Prato-Previde & Rotondi, 1996; Rickards, 2000) and as an indicator of whether the collective cognitive style or preference of the group is more adaptive or more innovative.
Barrick, Stewart, Neubert, and Mount (1998) noted that researchers have used various ways to identify the personality or style preferences of a group, but the calculation of the mean score is the most common of the methods employed. The mean is most useful when the collective amount of a particular personality trait in a team is assumed to have positive or negative effects on the group regardless of how it is distributed within the group (Halfhill, Sundstrom, Lahner, Calderone & Nielsen, 2005). For example, characterizing a team as high in conscientiousness (from the Five Factor Model) would indicate that although not all team members score highly on this trait, some of the members score high enough to elevate the average for the team. Because the KAI scoring system identifies those who score at one end of the continuum (the lower scores) as adaptors and those who score at the other end of the continuum (the higher scores) as innovators, the KAI mean scores of the teams in this study were used to identify the predominant cognitive style of the team at the team level, i.e. a team that was collectively more adaptive or more innovative along the cognitive style continuum.

While this provides a measure of team cognitive style, it does not address the relationship between team diversity (with respect to a personality dimension) and team outcomes. Therefore, another method that can be used to operationalize team composition is the assessment of the variability within the team on a particular personality characteristic (Neuman, Wagner & Christiansen, 1999). In this method, a team's diversity related to that personality trait can be determined and the heterogeneity or homogeneity of the team with respect to that characteristic can be identified. Because both the variance and range of the scores on a particular personality characteristic within a given team provide information about the dispersion of that characteristic, both can be
used to represent the extent of a team's diversity (Barrick et al., 1998; Halfhill et al., 2005).

In this study, the diversity of cognitive style of the team was measured using the scores from the KAI inventory. Since the KAI measures an individual's cognitive style using a continuous scale, the variance and the range for each team could be calculated and teams were able to be identified as more homogeneous or more heterogeneous with respect to cognitive style. Additionally, there were differing ranges across the 26 teams in the study from a low of 17 to a high of 66. This enabled the range to be used as a continuous measure in this study and to demonstrate that increasing values of the range of KAI scores represented a greater level of cognitive style diversity within a team.

Therefore, the KAI provided measures of two of the independent variables in this study, (1) the cognitive style of each team, represented by the team KAI mean, and (2) the diversity of cognitive style for each team, represented by the team KAI range.

Emotional Intelligence

The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) (Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2003) was used to measure the emotional intelligence level of each of the participants who were serving as team leaders (called Conveners) for the teams participating in this study. The MSCEIT is an ability-based or performance measure of emotional intelligence that asks test takers to solve problems about emotions and to use emotions to make decisions. The MSCEIT is designed as a 141-item scale measuring four branches, or specific skills, of emotional intelligence: (1) perceiving emotions (2) using emotions to facilitate thought (3) understanding emotions and (4) managing
emotions. Each of the branches is measured with two tasks that include: (a) judging the emotions in faces and pictures; (b) generating and then reasoning with an emotion; (c) defining complex emotional terms; and (d) selecting an optimal emotional decision-making strategy (Caruso, Mayer & Salovey, 2002).

The first branch, Perceiving Emotions, is measured with the Faces task and the Pictures task. In the Faces task, participants are asked to use a five point scale to identify the degree of emotion present in a photograph of a face. In the Pictures task, the response scale consists of cartoon faces to capture and identify the specific emotion conveyed by landscapes and designs. The second branch or ability area, Using Emotions to Facilitate Thought, is measured with the Sensations and Facilitation tasks. In Sensations tasks respondents compare emotions to other sensory stimuli and in Facilitation tasks respondents identify emotions that would facilitate a type of thinking.

The third branch, Understanding Emotions is measured through the Changes task, which tests the ability to know when emotions increase or decrease and how emotions change and the Blends task, which tests the ability to identify emotions that can be combined to result in other complex emotional states. The fourth branch, Managing Emotions is measured through tasks that require respondents to judge hypothetical scenarios and select the actions necessary for changing or maintaining feelings (Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2004).

The correctness of responses for each of the items on the MSCEIT has been determined by a group of emotions experts. The expert panel was comprised of 21 volunteer members of the International Society for Research on Emotions, a group dedicated to the scholarship and interdisciplinary scientific study of emotions. The expert
panel consisted of ten males and eleven females from eight Western countries; mean age of the group was 39.38 years (Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, & Sitarenios, 2003.) The degree of correspondence between the expert answers and the answers of the respondent is computed resulting in a total MSCEIT score and a score for each of the four branches. Based on large samples, the mean score for the MSCEIT total is 100 with a standard deviation of 15. Reliabilities computed for the MSCEIT have been shown to range from .86 to .91 for the total score and from .77 to .91 for the four branches (Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2004; Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2008). The MSCEIT items are provided as Appendix C. The reliability of the MSCEIT for the sample in this study was computed using the responses from the 26 team leaders with a resulting Cronbach’s alpha = .85, consistent with other studies using the MSCEIT to measure emotional intelligence.

The emotional intelligence score of each team’s leader, using the MSCEIT total score, was assigned to that team as the measure of leader emotional intelligence. Because all members of a particular team were exposed to the same leader over the entire course of the merger process, the emotional intelligence score of that leader was considered a team-level measure, representing the environment in which the team worked to accomplish its task.

Team Experience

A survey developed to measure the team’s experience and team interaction was completed by the team members. The survey consisted of a total of 37 self-report items measured using a five-point Likert-type scale that ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) and four open-ended questions. Five scales were created to measure
team experiences related to team interactions and team processes. Scale items were based on typical categories of team behaviors that have been identified by team scholars and were adapted from scale items developed and used by team research experts (e.g. Hackman, 1987, 2002; Wageman, Hackman & Lehman, 2005; Gladstein, 1984).

The original plan for this study was that all team members, including the team leaders, would complete the Team Experience survey. However, in the end, only team members were asked to respond to the survey items. Because the team leaders in this merger project served as “Conveners” or moderators of a merger team’s work, they could be viewed as external managers or facilitators for the team. This is a common design for teams in many work environments that use a team approach to accomplish tasks. Since the influence of the team leader on the team’s processes and results was a focus of interest in this study, and because the measure included items about the behaviors of the team leader, it was determined that team members, but not team leaders, would be asked to complete this survey. This avoided the potential for biased responses from those serving as team leaders which could have had an effect on the analysis of the team experience survey results.

As noted, the team experience survey was designed to include five areas of focus that represent categories of team interactions that are typically seen in team research. These areas were: (1) team task/roles/goal clarity, (2) team processes/relationships, (3) team leader behaviors, (4) team learning, and (5) team satisfaction. In order to explore what categories were actually represented within the current study and how the items clustered, responses to all items were subjected to a principal-components factor analysis with varimax rotation. This analysis revealed six factors accounting for 70% of the
variance in the data for eigenvalues greater than 1 (see Table 1 for items and factor loadings).

The first factor that was identified consisted of ten items that addressed leader behavior; all ten were the original items designed for the team leader behavior scale. The second factor included ten items that were originally designed for measuring team process/relationship. Two of those items cross-loaded onto the first factor and one item cross-loaded onto the third factor; therefore, they were omitted from subsequent analyses using that scale. Items loading onto the third factor included three of the original four items designed for the team learning scale. The fourth item cross-loaded onto another factor and was omitted from further analysis. All six items originally designed to measure team task loaded onto the fourth factor that was generated by the principal component analysis. Of the original seven items designed to measure team satisfaction, five items loaded onto a fifth factor. The other items cross-loaded onto the second factor; therefore, they were omitted.

The sixth factor resulting from the analysis accounted for only two percent of the variance for eigenvalues greater than one and only one item had a loading greater than .2 onto this factor. Since that item also cross-loaded onto the first factor, it was eliminated from the analysis. After omitting those items that cross-loaded onto more than one factor, the Team Experience Survey included a total of 31 items within five scales that were consistent with the original categories of interest.

A reliability analysis of each of the five scales of the Team Experience Survey was conducted and the computed Cronbach’s coefficient alpha for each of the five scales is shown in the following sections. These sections provide further details about the final
scales used in the analysis. Additionally, Table 1 provides the items and factor loadings as well as the reliability coefficients for the five scales within the Team Experience Survey.

**Team Task/Roles/Goal Clarity (alpha = .82)** This scale consists of six Likert-type items measuring the extent to which the team task, roles and goals are understood and agreed upon by team members. Items are rated using a five-point scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. Items created for this scale were adapted from previous work in the area of team development (Phillips & Elledge, 1989; Francis & Young, 1992). Sample items from this scale include "each person on the team agreed with what was expected of him/her as a team member" and "team members were completely committed to the goals of the team."

**Team Processes/Relationships (alpha = .92)** This scale assesses the degree to which team processes are employed and relationship building occurs during the course of the team's work. Seven Likert-type items adapted from questionnaires developed by Wageman, Hackman & Lehman (2005) and Richards and Smith (1994) were included in the final version of this scale. Items were rated using a five-point scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. Sample items include "the team had an effective process for making decisions at meetings", "team members listened carefully to each other", "there was a high degree of cooperation in the team", and "differences of opinion among team members were worked through productively".

**Team leader behaviors (alpha = .95)** This scale assesses behaviors exhibited by the team leader within the context of a team's work together. It consists of ten items modified from the questionnaire developed by Pearce and Sims (2002) which examined
leadership in teams. Item selection for the team leader behavior scale was also informed by items from the Wageman, Hackman & Lehman (2005) team diagnosis questionnaire and the Francis & Young (1992) Team Review Survey. Items are rated using a five-point scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. Sample items for this scale include "the team leader clearly communicated the team's responsibilities and the desired end state", "the team leader encouraged expression of feelings" and "the team leader helped the team members learn ways to improve the effectiveness of their teamwork."

**Team learning. (alpha = .83)** The team learning scale assesses the extent to which the team engages in processes of reflection, seeking feedback, and discussion of expected and unexpected outcomes. This scale is based on three of five items from the Edmonson (1999) team learning behavior scale. These items were initially used in a study of 51 manufacturing teams examining the relationship between team learning and psychological safety. Items are rated using a five-point scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. Sample items include "the team took the time to review its work outcomes, learning from both success and failure" and "team members regularly discussed how effectively they were collaborating to get the work done."

**Team Satisfaction. (alpha= .88)** This set of items addresses the team's experience of working together for accomplishment of the specific task of merging parishes. Team satisfaction relates to the extent to which team members create a positive approach to the desired outcome within the team and the extent to which team members would agree to work with this team again. This scale consists of five items based on previous work in the areas of teams managing change and team satisfaction (Gladstein, 1984; Peeters, Rutte, Van Tuijl, Reymen, 2006; Van de Vegt, Emans, & Van de Vliert, 2001). These items,
which have been used in studies of undergraduate students working on an engineering design, business students working in teams in a marketing simulation, and sales teams in the communications industry were adapted to specifically address the context of the merger situation and the experience of working with the team toward merger success.

Items are rated using the five point Likert-type scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. Item examples include "team members truly believed in the prospects of the merger and were genuinely excited about the future", "team members were role models for how to work together for the good of the newly formed parish" and "I was pleased with the way the team worked together". An item taken from Peeters, Rutte, van Tuijl, & Ryemen (2006) assesses whether team members would be willing to work on this team again and uses the following five-point rating scale: 1 = "I would definitely not agree to work with this team again"; 2 = "I would probably not agree to working on this team again", 3 = "I am not sure whether I would or would not work with this team again", 4 = "I would consider working with this team again" and 5 = "I would definitely agree to work with this team again". This item was reverse scored for analysis.

Although the team experience survey items included in these five scales have been shaped by previous research and theory in the general area of teamwork and the specific focus areas of team interactions and team processes, this particular configuration of items has not been previously used in any published research studies. Questionnaires developed by team researchers (as noted) and used in work with teams functioning across disciplines and multiple industries provided examples for content and informed the selection of the final survey items. This Team Experience Survey was developed for the current study because of the focus on the use of the team approach to accomplishing a
major organization change. However, as noted, the items and scales in this survey were subjected to factor analysis and reliability analysis procedures. Results demonstrate that this survey is statistically sound and represents an appropriate measure of the team experience construct.

*Team Experience Survey Open-Ended Questions*

Four open-ended questions were included at the end of the survey to enable study participants to supply their own answers, without being constrained by a fixed set of responses, to questions relating to the team experience. These questions were developed based on previous research and theory regarding the use of teams to accomplish tasks in a work setting (Gladstein, 1984; Hackman, 2002; Katzenbach & Smith, 1993; Wageman, Hackman & Lehman, 2005). The questions that were posed addressed team leadership, team processes and strategies employed, and learning from the team experience.

Based on recommendations for data analysis within qualitative research methodology (Creswell, 2003; Maxwell, 2005; Ruona, 2005; Ryan & Bernard, 2003), responses to the open-ended questions were analyzed using a process that included familiarization, identification of recurring topics and patterns, coding of responses into categories or themes, and generating meeting. First, responses from each participant in the study were read in their entirety one after another until all participant comments were reviewed. This step was done several times in order to immerse in the data, obtain a general sense of the information, and reflect on the overall meaning.

Next, a cutting and sorting technique was used to separate the comments and then sort them into piles consisting of comments representing similar themes. In this case, index cards were used for each comment and the team to which that respondent belonged
was noted on the back of the card. No participant names were included; however, by identifying which team a comment represented, the themes that were generated could be compared across teams later in the analysis. Through a process of continual comparison, noting similarities and differences among the comments, themes began to emerge from the data. Noting the repetition of comments and tallying the number of times particular words or phrases were used also helped to identify themes. Once all comments were sorted into these separate categories, the comments within each category were read again. The category was then given a code or “label” that captured a meaningful theme or pattern representing the data in a clear and concise manner.

Finally, the entire set of themes generated through the analysis was reviewed and merged and the themes were explored for connections, contrasts, or patterns. This step provided the opportunity to generate the meaning, or the story, of the team experience for the participants in this merger study. These final themes and patterns provided insights into the actual experience of working on the teams that were engaged in the merger process. After looking at the themes in general across the study, these themes were then compared to the responses from participants in those teams that had been rated highest in team performance and team satisfaction.

In order to ensure the trustworthiness of the qualitative data analysis, tactics to confirm findings and avoid researcher effects should be employed (Ruona, 2005). Therefore, in the course of qualitative data analysis for this study, findings and interpretations were subjected to a peer examination process. Two independent fellow researchers, one familiar with the study and the other having no information about the study objectives, reviewed the results of the qualitative data analysis. Peer reviewers
discussed the way in which the participant comments had been grouped and identified any comments that could fall into more than one category. Through further discussion, the researchers came to consensus on the final groupings of comments and the labels for those groups. Agreement was reached regarding the themes that emerged from the full set of participant comments. The researchers also agreed on the connections between themes and the interpretation of the patterns that occurred in the qualitative data. The interpretation of the meaning attached to the team experience as expressed by the study participants is summarized in the next chapter.

Aggregation of Team Experience Questionnaire Data to Team Level

The relationships between the variables in this study were conceptualized at the team level. Although the team is the unit of study, data were initially collected from team members at the individual level. Therefore, individual scores for each scale within the Team Survey (team satisfaction, task/role/goal clarity, team interaction, team leader behavior, and team learning) were aggregated to create a team score. In order to justify aggregation of individual level responses on these measures to the team level, there must be a sufficient degree of within-group agreement, or consensus among respondents (Bliese, 2000; Koslowski & Hattrup, 1992).

For this study, consistency of team members' responses for each of the five scales of the Team Experience survey was assessed using the r_{wg(j)} procedure (James, Demaree & Wolf, 1984). The r_{wg(j)} demonstrates within-group interrater reliability for respondents’ mean scores when rating items in a multi-item scale. This procedure computes a measure of consensus among respondents, thereby providing an index of within-group agreement.
Scores of \( r_{wg(j)} \) range from 0 to 1; higher \( r_{wg(j)} \) values indicate more agreement or greater similarity in perceptions within a group or team. When the values for \( r_{wg(j)} \) are .70 or higher, there is justification for aggregating individual-level data to the team-level (Glick, 1985; Bleise, 2000). The \( r_{wg(j)} \) value for each of the five scales comprising the Team Experience survey met the criteria for within-group agreement by exceeding the .70 threshold (see Table 2). This suggests that sufficient consensus existed among the individual responses in the teams and provides the justification needed for aggregating individual scores to create a team score for each scale.

Further justification for aggregation is based on the person-fit literature where a compilation approach is often used to represent a variable of interest. Compilation is based on the idea that different elements within same domain combine to form a whole and that this combination of lower level elements results in a higher level attribute that can be considered equivalent to the original elements that comprise it (Ostroff and Schulte, 2007). Additionally, when a single index is needed to represent the environment for all individuals in that context, it is often based on aggregated data from those individuals. When a concept of interest represents shared perceptions (such as the experience within a team) and agreement among individuals within that context has been demonstrated, the aggregate score can then be taken to represent the higher level property (Ostroff, 2007).

**Team Performance**

A questionnaire consisting of a total of eight items that measured the effectiveness of the team's work in accomplishing the desired outcome of "readiness for final merger"
was completed by the organization's formally chartered evaluation team, the merger review committee. Items were developed based on the particular requirements being used for success as outlined by the leadership of the institution. When the team successfully completed these requirements, the merger was officially decreed and the combination of the parish communities occurred.

The first section of the questionnaire addressed the five required merger tasks and asked how well the team accomplished each task in preparing for final merger. The items were developed using a five-point Likert scale ranging from a score of 1 (unprepared) to 5 (very prepared). These tasks include the Church and Canon Law specific requirements related to establishment and management of parish communities. The last part of the questionnaire included three items related to merger processes that the teams were expected to employ and measured the extent to which each occurred. Sample items include "to what extent did this team work together to prepare to establish the new parish?" and "to what extent did the team convener create an atmosphere of cooperation and collaboration within this team?" Items are rated using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (very little extent) to 5 (considerable extent).

The merger review committee employed a consensus approach to evaluating each merger team. Following an extensive evaluation process for each of the merger requirements and a final meeting with each merger core team, the members of the review committee collectively discussed the team’s performance and final results. Using the merger evaluation questionnaire designed for this study, the merger review committee members agreed on a score for the team for each of the eight items. Item scores were then summed to create a total score for team performance for each team in the study. Team
performance scores ranged from 27.0 to 39.7, mean = 34.26, standard deviation 3.62. The team performance questionnaire is provided as Appendix D.

**Control Variables**

The mean age for each team and the mean education in years for each team served as control variables for this study. Each outcome variable proposed in the hypotheses was regressed on each of these control variables to test for significance. Only mean age for the team was found to significantly affect at least one of the dependent variables. Therefore, mean age for the team was included as a control variable in the regression models used for hypotheses testing.

**Hypotheses Testing**

To test the proposed hypotheses in this study, data were analyzed using both simple regression and hierarchical multiple regression techniques. Based on the initial analyses of the correlations among the variables, regression analyses would typically be conducted only when predictor and outcome variables demonstrated a significant linear relationship. However, in this study, simple regressions were conducted for all hypothesized relationships between potential predictors and outcome variables. Mean age of the team was included as a control variable in all hypotheses testing.

The first set of hypotheses predicted that the variables of leader emotional intelligence, team cognitive style, and team cognitive style diversity would each have a significant direct effect on team task performance and on team satisfaction. Using simple regression analysis first, the outcome measure of team performance was regressed on the predictor variables separately. The same simple regression procedure was then conducted
using team satisfaction as the outcome. When considering team performance as the outcome variable, Hypotheses 1a, 1b, and 1c were tested. When using team satisfaction as the outcome variable, Hypotheses 2a, 2b, and 2c were being tested.

Standard multiple regression and hierarchical multiple regression procedures were then used to test models that included more than one predictor variable. Hierarchical multiple regression is a stepwise approach that allows variables to be entered into a regression equation through a series of specified steps and shows the incremental effects of each step on the dependent variable. In the standard multiple regression analysis, the independent variables of team cognitive style and team cognitive style diversity were included together to determine their combined effects on the outcome of team performance. Hierarchical regression analysis was used to test the incremental effects of adding one of these variables to a regression model that already included the other predictor.

In the second set of simple regressions, the four separate dimensions of team interaction served as the outcomes and were regressed on the predictor variables of leader emotional intelligence, team cognitive style, and team cognitive style diversity. The mean age of the team was included as a control variable. This set of regressions were intended to test Hypotheses 3a, 3b and 3c (for task/role/goal clarity as outcome), 4a, 4b, and 4c (for team process/relationships as outcome), 5a, 5b, and 5c (for team leader behavior as outcome), and 6a, 6b, and 6c (for team learning as outcome). These tests indicated whether leader emotional intelligence, team cognitive style, or team cognitive style diversity had any direct effect on any of the dimensions of team interaction.
Finally, the criterion variables of team performance and team satisfaction were each regressed on the four separate dimensions of team interaction through a series of eight simple regressions. These regressions tested Hypotheses 7a, 7b, 7c, 7d and Hypotheses 8a, 8b, 8c, 8d. This was followed by a multiple regression analysis using all four predictor variables together to test their combined effects on the outcome variable of team satisfaction. Hierarchical regression analysis was then used to determine whether any incremental effects on team satisfaction were noted when the predictors were entered in a sequential manner.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Overview

This chapter presents the procedures used and results obtained from the data analysis. Descriptive and correlational statistics are provided. The regression analyses that were performed to test the hypotheses posed in this study are then described. Finally, the results of the qualitative data analysis are provided.

Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Analysis

Descriptive statistics were assessed at the team level for the variables of leader emotional intelligence, team cognitive style, team cognitive style diversity, team satisfaction, team performance, team task/role/goal clarity, team leader behavior, team process/relationships, and team learning. Using data representing each variable at the team level, mean scores and standard deviations (based on a sample size of 26 teams) were calculated. Additionally, intercorrelations between the variables were computed. The control variables of mean age of the team and mean education in years of the team were also included. These results are summarized in Table 3. Table 4 provides the descriptive statistics for these variables displayed for each of the teams separately.

This preliminary correlation analysis indicated that some but not all of the expectations regarding the relationships between the predictor and outcome variables in this study were supported. There is a significant linear relationship between team cognitive style and team performance ($r = .42; p < .05$), as well as between team cognitive style diversity and team performance ($r = .46; p < .05$). However, there is no evidence for a significant linear relationship between leader emotional intelligence and
the outcome of team performance ($r = .31$). Additionally, there is not a significant linear relationship between leader emotional intelligence, team cognitive style, or team cognitive style diversity and any of the team experience scales of team task/role/goal clarity, team leader behavior, team processes/relationship, or team learning. However, there is a significant positive linear relationship between the control variable of mean age of the team and each of the team interaction variables of team task/role/goal clarity ($r = .44$, $p < .05$), team processes/relationships ($r = .43$, $p < .05$), team leader behavior ($r = .43$, $p < .05$), and team learning ($r = .53$, $p < .01$). As team age increased, ratings were higher for these team interaction variables.

With respect to the dependent variable of team satisfaction, none of the predictor variables of leader emotional intelligence, team cognitive style, or team cognitive style diversity were significantly correlated with that outcome. However, each of the team experience scales demonstrated a significant linear relationship with team satisfaction. There were significant positive correlations between team task/role/goal clarity and team satisfaction ($r = .70$; $p < .01$); team processes/relationship and team satisfaction ($r = .86$; $p < .01$); team leader behavior and team satisfaction ($r = .68$; $p < .01$); and team learning and team satisfaction ($r = .72$; $p < .01$).

One interesting finding indicated by the correlation analysis is that all of the team experience scales of team task/role/goal clarity, team leader behavior, team processes/relationship, and team learning, as well as the outcome variable of team satisfaction, were negatively correlated with team cognitive style. Although not reaching a level of statistical significance, these results indicate that as teams scored higher on one
of those variables, scores on the other decreased. Study findings showed that a more innovative team cognitive style resulted in lower ratings of team experience.

Regression analyses would typically be performed only for those hypotheses supported by correlations demonstrating a significant linear relationship between the variables of interest. However, in this study, simple regressions were conducted for all hypothesized relationships between potential predictors and outcome variables.

**Hypotheses Testing**

**Team Performance as Outcome:** The first set of hypotheses (H1a, H1b, and H1c) predicted the relationships between the independent variables of team leader emotional intelligence, team cognitive style, and team cognitive style diversity and the dependent variable of team performance. As indicated by the preliminary analyses already discussed, only team cognitive style and team cognitive style diversity demonstrated a significant linear relationship with team performance. As noted, the independent variable of leader emotional intelligence was not significantly related to the dependent variable of team performance, nor was it related to any of the other variables in this study.

Although there are no significant findings related to leader emotional intelligence in this study, it is interesting to note that the mean score for leader emotional intelligence in this sample (mean = 90.1, standard deviation = 11.93) differs from the MSCEIT published norms for the general population (mean = 100, standard deviation = 15). A t-test comparing this sample to the published standard reveals that this difference is statistically significant (t(25) = -4.26; p < .001).

To test Hypotheses 1b and 1c, simple regression analyses were performed by regressing the outcome variable of team performance on each of the predictor variables
of team cognitive style and team cognitive style diversity. Hypothesis 1b, which predicted that merger teams that are heterogeneous with respect to cognitive style will receive higher ratings of team performance, was supported ($b = .13; \ p < .05$). Team cognitive style diversity explained 21.2% of the variance in team performance. Hypothesis 1c, predicting higher ratings of team performance for merger teams that are more innovative, was also supported ($b = .27; \ p < .05$). Team cognitive style explained 18% of the variance in team performance. Although leader emotional intelligence did not demonstrate a significant linear relationship with the dependent variable of team performance, a simple regression analysis was performed to confirm that team performance could not be significantly predicted by the leader’s score on emotional intelligence ($b = .09; \ p = .13$) and Hypothesis 1a is not supported. Table 5 includes the summary results of the simple regression analyses for this set of hypotheses.

Conducting several simple regression analyses can increase the likelihood of experiment-wise error and lead to findings of significant differences which may exist simply by chance. Therefore, a multiple regression procedure, which treats the independent variables as a set of predictors that work together to explain the dependent variable, was also conducted. In order to determine if team cognitive style diversity and team cognitive style together improved the prediction of team performance scores, a multiple regression was performed that included both of these independent variables in the model simultaneously. Results indicated that including both team cognitive style and team cognitive style diversity accounted for 36.1% of the variance in team performance scores. Each of the predictors in the model, cognitive style diversity ($b = .12; \ p < .05$) and cognitive style ($b = .25; \ p < .05$) was significant. These results are included in Table 5.
A final question to be addressed was whether adding one of these variables as a second predictor after the effects of the first were already considered would demonstrate that using both independent variables increased the ability to predict the outcome. Therefore, a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to demonstrate the incremental effect of adding team cognitive style as a second predictor to a model that already included the predictor of team cognitive style diversity. Results showed that the addition of the second predictor increased the explained variance in the outcome of team performance by 14.9% and represented a significant change (R square change = .15; b = .25; p < .05). Table 6 depicts the hierarchical multiple regression analysis results.

*Team Satisfaction as Outcome:* The second set of hypotheses (H2a, H2b, and H2c) predicted the relationships between the independent variables of leader emotional intelligence, team cognitive style diversity, and team cognitive style and the dependent variable of team satisfaction. As already noted, there is not a significant linear relationship between the independent variables of team leader emotional intelligence and team cognitive style diversity and the dependent variable of team satisfaction. The results of simple regression analyses reinforce these findings for leader emotional intelligence and team satisfaction (b = .01; p = .51) and for team cognitive style diversity and team satisfaction (b = .01, p = .33). Therefore, Hypotheses 2a and 2b were not supported.

Hypothesis 2c predicted that team cognitive style would have no effect on the outcome variable of team satisfaction. The results demonstrated that, as expected, there was no evidence for a relationship between whether a merger team was more adaptive or more innovative and the outcome of team satisfaction. A simple regression analysis was performed and a confidence interval was calculated confirming that team cognitive style
does not significantly predict team satisfaction (b= -.02; p = .36); 95% CI [-.06, .02].

Table 7 provides regression analyses results for this set of hypotheses.

**Team Task/Role/Goal Clarity as Outcome:** The next set of hypotheses (H3a, H3b, and H3c) predicted relationships between the outcome of team members’ perceived clarity of the team’s task, role, and goals and the predictors of the team leader’s emotional intelligence, team cognitive style diversity, and team cognitive style. Based on correlation analyses, no significant linear relationship existed between this outcome variable and any of these predictors. Simple regression analyses confirmed that leader emotional intelligence (b = .01, p = .31), team cognitive style diversity (b = .01, p = .26) and team cognitive style (b = -.01, p = .295) were not significant predictors of ratings for team task/role/goal clarity. Therefore, none of these hypotheses (H3a, H3b, or H3c) were supported. For each of the regression models with team task/role/goal clarity as the outcome, the control variable of mean age of team was statistically significant (b=.04, p < .05).

**Team Processes/Relationships as Outcome:** Hypothesis 4a predicted that team members’ ratings of team processes/relationships would be related to the team leader’s emotional intelligence; Hypothesis 4b predicted a relationship between team members’ ratings of team processes/relationships and team cognitive style diversity. Based on the correlation analyses conducted in this study, there was no significant linear relationship between either of these potential predictors and the outcome of team members’ ratings of team processes/relationships. Simple regression analysis were conducted and demonstrate that none of the variables of team leader emotional intelligence (b = .00, p = .61), cognitive style diversity (b = .01, p = .29), or team cognitive style (b = -.02; p = .21) were
significant predictors of ratings for team processes/relationships. Therefore, H4a, H4b, and H4c were not supported. For each of the regression models with team processes/relationships as the outcome, the control variable of mean age of team was statistically significant (b = .04, p < .05).

**Team Leader Behavior as Outcome:** This set of hypotheses predicted a relationship between team members’ ratings of team leader behavior and the independent variables of leader emotional intelligence, team cognitive style diversity, and team cognitive style. As noted in the preliminary correlation analysis, there was no significant linear relationship between the ratings of team leader behavior and any of these potential predictor variables. Simple regression analyses demonstrated that leader emotional intelligence (b = .01, p = .34) and team cognitive style diversity (b = .01, p = .16) were not significant predictors of ratings for team leader behavior. Therefore, Hypotheses 5a and 5b were not supported.

Hypothesis 5c predicted that team cognitive style (adaptor or innovator) would not be related to team members’ ratings on team leader behavior. Consistent with this hypothesis, correlation analysis showed no linear relationship between these two variables. The results of a simple regression analysis with calculation of confidence interval confirmed that team cognitive style did not significantly predict ratings of team leader behavior (b = -.01; p = .79); 95% CI [-.05, .01]. Therefore, as expected, ratings of team leader behavior were not dependent on whether the team was adaptor-oriented or innovator-oriented. For each of the regression models with team leader behavior as the outcome, the control variable of mean age of team was statistically significant (b = .04, p < .05).
Team Learning as Outcome: Hypothesis 6a predicted a positive relationship between ratings of team learning and team leader emotional intelligence. Hypothesis 6b predicted that there would be higher ratings of team learning as team cognitive style heterogeneity increased. There was no evidence of a linear relationship between leader emotional intelligence and ratings of team learning or team cognitive style diversity and ratings of team learning. Simple regression analyses demonstrated that leader emotional intelligence (b = .01, p = .43) and team cognitive style diversity (b = .00, p = .91) were not significant predictors of ratings for team learning. Therefore, H6a and H6b were not supported.

Hypothesis 6c predicted that team cognitive style would not be related to team learning. A correlation analysis showed no linear relationship between these two variables. The results of a simple regression analysis with calculation of confidence interval confirms that team cognitive style did not significantly predict team learning (b = -.02; p = .15); 95% CI [-.04, .007]. Therefore, as expected, team learning ratings cannot be predicted based on whether a team is more adaptive-oriented or more innovative-oriented. For each of the regression models with team leader behavior as the outcome, the control variable of mean age of team was statistically significant (b = .04, p < .05).

Results of the regression analyses for each of the four dimensions of team interactions as the outcome variable and emotional intelligence, cognitive style diversity, and cognitive style as predictor variables are summarized in Table 8.

Team Interaction and Team Performance: The next set of hypotheses predicted a relationship between the four dimensions of team interaction (team task/role/goal clarity,
team processes/relationships, team leader behavior, team learning) and the outcome of team performance. The initial correlation analyses indicated that team performance did not have a significant linear relationship with any of these four variables. Simple regression analyses regressing team performance on team task/role/goal clarity (b = 1.17, p = .56), team processes/relationships (b = 1.84, p = .33), and team learning (b = .95, p = .67) confirmed the preliminary results for those predictor variables. Therefore, Hypotheses 7a, 7b, and 7d were not supported. However, Hypotheses 7c, which predicted that team leader behavior would be a significant predictor of team performance, is marginally supported. Results of the regression analysis demonstrated a marginally significant relationship between the outcome of team performance and team leader behavior (b = 2.91, p = .07). The control variable of team mean age was not significant in any of these regression models. Table 9 provides these results.

Team Interaction and Team Satisfaction: The final set of hypotheses predicted a relationship between the four dimensions of team interactions (team task/role/goal clarity, team processes/relationships, team leader behavior, team learning) and the outcome of team satisfaction. Team satisfaction was highly correlated with each of these variables and all of the correlations were statistically significant. Therefore, simple regression analyses were performed first to test each hypothesis: H8a, H8b, H8c, and H8d. Hypothesis 8a predicted that higher ratings of task/role/goal clarity would result in higher team satisfaction. The simple regression analysis supported this hypothesis (b = .95; p < .001). Team task/role/goal clarity alone explained 45.6% of the variance in team satisfaction. Hypothesis 8b predicted that higher team processes/relationships ratings would lead to higher team satisfaction. This hypothesis, tested through simple regression
analysis, was supported (b = 1.16; p < .001). Additionally, team processes/relationships alone explained 71.6% of the variance in team satisfaction.

Hypothesis 8c predicted that higher ratings of team leader behavior would result in higher team satisfaction and the simple regression analysis supported this hypothesis (b = .77; p < .001). When used as the only predictor in the regression model, team leader behavior explained 41.8% of the variance in the outcome of team satisfaction. The last hypothesis, Hypothesis 8d, predicted that higher ratings of team learning would lead to higher team satisfaction. The simple regression analysis results supported this hypothesis (b = 1.13; p < .001) and indicated that 51.3% of the variability in team satisfaction was explained by team learning when it was used as the only predictor. The control variable of team mean age was not significant in any of these regression models. Table 10 summarizes the results of these regression analyses.

As previously stated, conducting several simple regression analyses increases the likelihood of Type I error and can lead to findings of significant differences which may exist simply by chance. Therefore, a multiple regression procedure, which treats the independent variables as a set of predictors that work together to explain the dependent variable, was also conducted to test whether the team interaction dimensions significantly predict the outcome of team satisfaction.

In order to determine the effect of all of the team interaction predictors together on the outcome of team satisfaction, a standard multiple regression analysis was performed including all four of the team interaction dimensions (team task/role/goal clarity, team processes/relationships, team leader behavior, and team learning) in one model. The overall model was significant; [F (5, 20) = 15.05, p< .0005] and the model as
a whole explained 74.5% of the variance in team satisfaction. Results indicated that the team processes/relationships variable was the strongest predictor of team satisfaction and when all the other predictors were included in the model, it provided a unique contribution that independently explained 34.2% of the variance in team satisfaction. With all four predictors in the model, the team processes/relationships variable was the only predictor of team satisfaction that was statistically significant (b=.85, p<.05).

A hierarchical multiple regression analysis was performed to determine whether a model that included the team processes/relationships variable as the initial predictor would be improved by the addition of any of the other predictor variables in a sequential manner. This was conducted in order to determine if any combination of two of the predictors (versus just team processes/relationships alone or all four of the potential predictors) would provide additional explanation of the variance in team satisfaction.

The team leader behavior variable was chosen as the first of the additional potential predictors to test because its partial and part correlation values (with team satisfaction) were the next highest after the team processes/relationships variable. After entering the control variable of mean age of team into the model in the first step, the team processes/relationships variable was included in the second step, and team leader behavior was added in the following step of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis. Results indicated that the second model (including mean age of team as the control and team processes/relationships as the predictor) accounted for 73.5% of the variability in the outcome of team satisfaction. The addition of the predictor variable of team leader behavior did not significantly improve that model (R square change = .02; F change = 1.97, p = .17) to add to the explained variance of team satisfaction. As expected, based on
the previous regression analyses and the partial and part correlation values, similar results were found if the original model (that included team processes/relationships as the predictor) was augmented by team learning (R square change = .01, F change = 1.37, p = .25) or team task/role/goal clarity (R square change = .00; F change = .31, p = .34).

Beta values from multiple regression analysis for team leader behavior (.17), team learning (.14), and team task/goal/role clarity (.04), which represent the unique contribution of each variable when the overlapping effects of the other variables are statistically removed, also indicated that these potential predictors did not make a statistically significant contribution over and above team processes/relationship.

The variables of team task/role/goal clarity, team processes/relationships, team leader behavior, and team learning were highly correlated with one another; therefore, when they were used together as the predictor variables in a regression model, the overlapping variables did not contribute unique information. In this study, most of the information relating to the explained variability in team satisfaction was being supplied by the team processes/relationship variable; the other variables did not add significantly to the prediction of team satisfaction. Table 11 summarizes the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analyses that were conducted for this set of hypotheses.

**Summary of Hypothesis Testing**

In this study, the expected relationships were found for ten of the 26 proposed hypotheses. Nine hypotheses were supported at the p < .05 significance level and one additional hypothesis was supported when using a significance level of p < .08. Team cognitive style diversity and team cognitive style were shown to be significant predictors
of team performance. Team leader behavior demonstrated a marginally significant relationship with team performance; however, the emotional intelligence level of the team leader was not found to be a significant predictor of the team performance outcome. While each of the team interaction dimensions individually were significant predictors of team satisfaction and could explain a significant amount of the variance in team satisfaction if used alone, the team process/relationships variable was shown to be the strongest and best predictor of the team satisfaction outcome.

Figure 2 provides a diagram of the hypotheses for this study and highlights those hypotheses that were supported by the results of the quantitative analyses. Additionally, Table 12 lists the 26 proposed predictor-outcome relationships in the study and indicates the results for each.

**FIGURE 2**
*Summary of Model Hypotheses Supported by Results of Regression Analyses; (*) Indicates Significance*
Analysis of Qualitative Data

The responses to the four open-ended questions in the Team Experience Survey were analyzed using a qualitative data analysis process. Two major content areas emerged from the participant comments. The first area related to leadership, specifically addressing what the team leader did that enhanced the team experience during the merger process. The second major area related to the processes and interactions within the team itself and included how the team members related to one another, what processes or strategies were most helpful to the team, and what actions made the team experience successful.

These two content areas were analyzed separately and themes were identified for each. The themes relating to leadership are displayed in Figure 3. The themes are shown in a concept map, a diagram which presents the relationships among a set of connected concepts. The main idea emerging from the data analysis is displayed in the top node and entitled “What the Leader Did” and the connection to and between the themes within this topic is represented by the placement of the circles and arrows. The themes that were the clearest and most recurring are displayed in bold and positioned on the first level of the diagram, closest to the main idea, and are shown as the largest circles in the diagram. These themes and the participant comments they represented were repeated most often across all teams in the study. These include “Listened and made team members feel heard”, “Encouraged team members to be open to one another”, “Created an atmosphere for open discussion”, and “Welcomed and encouraged differences of views and ideas.” Each of these themes represented numerous comments from participants and provided the
strongest message of what the participants valued in the team leader. These themes represented the leader’s ability to create an environment where everyone felt included and heard and where differences were valued.

Although stated less frequently, the themes on the next level in the diagram, displayed in smaller circles (e.g. managing conflict, helping the team to learn, and trusting) were also clearly evident in the participant responses. Taken together, these themes represented the relationship-oriented behaviors necessary for good leadership.

The theme entitled “Reinforces purpose and vision” and its connected themes involving keeping the focus, giving clear directions, and delegating were also evident in the participant responses, but were mentioned less often. These themes represented the task-oriented leadership behaviors that helped ensure a team’s success. Themes relating to the team leader’s willingness to show his appreciation, demonstrate humility, and exhibit a genuine caring approach were connected to both the relationship and task oriented areas of leadership focus.

Participant responses from the ten highest rated teams for the team performance outcome were reviewed and compared to the general themes that emerged across the study. All ten teams had a clear emphasis on leader behaviors that created a climate where everyone was heard, differences were respected, and honest discussions occurred.
Figure 3

*Concept Map of Themes from Qualitative Data Analysis Regarding Team Leader*

Note: Themes closest to central node were most frequent
The second major content area emerging from the qualitative data analysis related to how the team worked together. Figure 4 presents a diagram that displays eleven themes that were apparent in the participant responses and lists examples of specific comments for each of the themes. Several themes and their associated comments were related to team member behaviors that created an environment in which (1) all members were respected and accepted, (2) open and honest discussions occurred, (3) all members were listened to prior to team decisions being made, (4) reflection and learning were valued, and (5) all members were committed to the process and to working as a team.

Other themes were more oriented to tasks or were more practical in nature (e.g. agreeing to a common goal, creating subgroups to accomplish tasks, communicating regularly), but these comments were not mentioned as frequently as comments that related to creating a safe and supportive environment for working together.

Based on the findings from the qualitative data analysis, it appears that the members of the teams that were engaged in accomplishing these mergers under challenging and difficult circumstances placed considerable importance on the ability of the team leader to create a safe environment for participation. Additionally, when working together as a team, team member behaviors that led to a safe climate for participation and a genuine respect for differences were highly valued and contributed to the overall success of the team.
Figure 4
Themes and Comments Extracted from Qualitative Data Regarding Team Process and Team Interaction

How the Team Worked Together

Themes:

- Agreed on a Common Goal
  
- Showed respect to one another
  
- Listened to one another
  
- Engaged in open and honest discussions
  
- Accepted different points of view

Comments from Participants:

- Always kept the final goal in mind
- Made decisions with end in mind
- Shared strong belief in common goal

- Showed genuine respect
- Mutual respect evident
- Respected differences
- Recognized the contributions of all

- Really listened to one another before making decisions
- Listened to one another’s perceptions to see the whole
- Good listening when feelings were expressed

- Good group discussions with collaborative reasoning
- Always allowed each person a voice in discussions
- Stayed open minded during discussions

- Respected different opinions
- Were open to new ideas and a different way to accomplish something
- Accepted one another’s perspectives
- Recognized and accepted differences in cultures

- Created subgroups to get tasks accomplished

Themes:

- Saw the team as greater than the individual
  
- Were committed to the process
  
- Demonstrated patience, compassion, and understanding
  
- Communicated regularly with one another
  
- Engaged in reflection

Comments from Participants:

- Believed group could accomplish more than any one person
- Appreciated work of teammates
- Realized did not have to be the center of attention to be effective
- Found that teamwork could solve issues

- Respected the process for change
- Kept an open mind about the process
- Committed to the process without bringing personal agendas
- Realized importance of process in challenging circumstances

- Allowed everyone’s feelings to be expressed
- Showed compassion for others’ concerns
- Able to express fears and feelings of loss
- Demonstrated tolerance of others’ concerns
- People were not judged for their concerns

- Frequent meetings with continual discussion
- Regular emails between meetings
- Constant open communication
- Kept participants fully informed throughout process

- Regularly reflected on our work together and acknowledged our learning
- Recognized that a diverse group could work toward consensus
- Found team more rewarding than individual achievement

Comments from Participants:

- Broke tasks down into smaller pieces and divided up responsibilities
- Formed sub-teams or subcommittees to manage different tasks
- Distributed tasks and delegated functions
- Divided up the work then regrouped as a team to discuss and decide
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Overview

This study examined the use of teams to accomplish mergers in the non-profit environment of the Catholic Church. Diocesan leaders decided to use teams for this major organization change after arming themselves with a knowledge and understanding of the dynamics that would be involved in this choice. Recognizing both the challenges and the benefits of the team approach, the Bishop made the following statement when commissioning the merger implementation teams:

“You are commissioned into service for all the people of the Diocese of South Jersey. This will not be an easy service; it will have its difficulties. But if you, as Conveners and Core Teams, will reflect and share with one another, you will become a community yourselves and can model for those you are serving what it is that they will be called upon to achieve. It is not a rejection of the past, but it is rather a hope for the future. No one of us can do it alone – but together, with God’s help, we will become a more faith-filled, faith-lived community; we will be what it means to be Church.”

As the Bishop indicated, a merger is not a simple or easy solution. It represents a major organization change - a transformation of each organization's personality, style, beliefs, and culture (Giffords & Dina, 2003). When two previously independent organizations merge, their separate identities are erased as they meld into one single, new, and different entity. A significant amount of time and energy is required to create the new organizational culture while a sense of profound loss is often being experienced by members of each of the merging organizations (Elias, 2009; Stahl & Voigt, 2008).
Organizational researchers consider a merger situation the trickiest type of restructuring because each of the combining entities must undergo a complete fundamental change in order to join forces and operate as one (Marks & Mirvis, 2001).

Despite the increase in mergers as a strategic choice for survival among organizations in the non-profit sector, there is little research or reliable information available about the implementation and impact of mergers in this context. Once the decision to merge has been made, the work of real change for the organization is in the implementation stage. Information and guidance that is usually available to leaders engaged in a merger is typically focused on the "hard organizational dimensions" - the fiscal, operational, and staffing issues. But implementation involves more than the accomplishment of a myriad of internal and external tasks to dismantle the existing structures and establish the new organizational entity. It also entails the psychological preparation of the stakeholders affected by this change, the commitment to forging a new identity, strategy and structure, and the "soft organizational dimensions" of culture, attitudes, and satisfaction (Giffords & Diana, 2003; Marks & Mirvis, 2001).

This dissertation study has focused on the use of mergers to effect radical change in a large religious institution within the non-profit sector. In 2008, Church leaders of a large Catholic diocese in Southern New Jersey engaged in a year of study and consultation regarding the best course of action to address the challenges they faced resulting from changes in population and demographics, a decline in Mass attendance and religious practice, and a decline in the number of priests available to minister. Population changes included an increase in the age of parishioners across the diocese as well as an increasing number of Hispanic families. Participation at Mass had decreased and engagement of
parish members in other activities within the parish community was low. Across the parishes throughout the diocese, youth and young adults were not attending services. Fewer priests were being ordained and clergy were not available to staff the parishes.

The 2008 study findings suggested that uniting certain parishes through consolidation could strengthen parish life within the diocese and address the pastoral priorities expressed by people throughout the Church. After considerable deliberation, a decision was made to reconfigure the parishes within the diocese through mergers. This Parish Reconfiguration plan entailed combining many parishes that had existed as separate spiritual communities for over 50 years. Over 70 parishes were affected and 37 mergers were planned. Diocesan leaders believed that consolidating individual communities and uniting them as one new parish through this merger process was necessary to revitalize parish life, provide better stewardship of resources, and strengthen the Church for the future.

Similar decisions have been made in many dioceses across the country resulting in parish closures and mergers throughout the Church, but the Bishop of the diocese represented in this study selected a unique approach to implementing the change. The planning and implementation of these mergers were accomplished using a team approach. Core Teams consisting of members from each of the merging parishes and a Priest Convener were commissioned to lead the formation of each new parish into a renewed community of faith, worship, and service.

The purpose of this dissertation study was to examine the conditions necessary for teams to accomplish successfully the implementation of a merger, a radical organization change. This study specifically focused on the three team variables of team cognitive
style, team diversity with respect to cognitive style, and the emotional intelligence level of the team leader, and explored the effects of these variables on the outcomes of team performance and team satisfaction. Additionally, the team experience itself as it related to tasks, processes, leadership, and learning was also explored to help identify the behaviors and conditions that were vital to the success of the team approach to merger implementation.

**Study Linkages**

The following sections of this chapter describe and discuss the linkages that were predicted in this study. For each of the findings related to expected relationships, possible reasons for that finding are explored. The order in which the hypotheses are presented and discussed is based on the following pattern about the story that emerged regarding the use of teams to accomplish a merger: (1) characteristics of the team, (2) characteristics of the leader, and (3) the connection between the behaviors and work of the team (including the leader) and the final outcomes of performance and satisfaction.

**Team Cognitive Style and Team Cognitive Style Diversity as Predictors**

The first two sets of predictions in this study connected the outcomes of team performance and team satisfaction with the variables of team cognitive style, team diversity with respect to cognitive style, and leader emotional intelligence. Focusing first on the predictors of team cognitive style and team cognitive style diversity, a description of the findings regarding their effect on team performance and team satisfaction is provided. A description of the effect of these same two predictors on the team experience dimensions of task, processes, leader behavior, and learning (comprising another set of
hypotheses) follows. Study results with respect to these two predictor variables and the two outcomes were mixed. The predictions related to the outcome of team performance were supported by the data from this study, but the findings related to team satisfaction and the team experience dimensions of task, process, leader behavior, and learning were not as expected.

**Team Performance as Outcome.** One prediction in this study was that the more innovative a team was with respect to cognitive style (as assessed by the Kirton [1976] inventory), the higher its rating would be for team performance (Hypothesis 1c). According to Kirton (1976) cognitive style with respect to problem-solving, decision-making, and creativity determines the way in which an individual (or group) approaches problems and manages change. Individuals or groups are theoretically located on a value neutral continuum ranging from more adaptive to more innovative.

Adaptors attempt to manage change by working within current systems and structures while innovators break outside of the existing framework and see the established system as part of the problem; therefore, each poses a different type of solution and ideas for managing change (Kirton & McCarthy, 1988). Since by its nature a merger requires more of a frame-breaking change and the establishment of a new and different organization, it was expected that teams with more of an innovative cognitive style would be more comfortable with the task of merging two parishes and would result in better performance. This prediction was supported in the analysis of the performance outcomes of the 26 teams that comprised this study. The teams that rated themselves as more innovative in cognitive style received higher ratings of team performance.
Although an innovative approach to this radical change was helpful for managing the movement from the old organization to the new, a balance of perspectives within the team was also essential in order to build upon meaningful structures and traditions and create the “renewed community of faith” called for by the Bishop. Numerous studies that support a team approach as the best vehicle to deal effectively with difficult and complex organizational change also suggest that a diverse team is needed to manage successfully the changes required in a merger ((Kozlowski, Gully, Salas & Cannon-Bowers, 1996; Manz & Sims, 1987; Sundstrom, 1999; West, Hirst, Richter, & Shipton, 2004). Therefore, another prediction in this study was that merger teams that were more heterogeneous with respect to cognitive style would have higher ratings of team performance (Hypothesis 1 b).

Although few studies specifically address diversity in terms of team personality, a review of the research on group personality composition and group effectiveness conducted by Halfhill, Sundstrom, Lahner, Calderone, and Nielson (2005) found evidence to suggest that the more heterogeneous a group becomes with respect to personality variables, the more likely performance will actually decrease. However, a study of undergraduates engaged in a simulated performance task (Vernon, Bergman, Bowler, Engel, Zelno, Rentsch and Woehr, 2003) presented at the 18th Annual Conference for the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology examined the impact of personality congruence on team work and found that greater diversity among team members with respect to personality variables was associated with increased team performance. Additionally, an earlier study by Neuman, Wagner, and Christiansen (1999)
found that team effectiveness was enhanced when team members’ personalities were
diverse, since each member contributed unique perspectives to the team.

The results of the current study of teams engaged in accomplishing parish mergers
are consistent with the findings of Neuman et al. (1999) and Vernon et al. (2003) and
showed that teams that were more diverse on the personality variable of cognitive style
received higher ratings of team performance.

**Team Satisfaction as Outcome.** Two additional hypotheses predicted the
relationship between the predictor variables of team cognitive style and team diversity
with respect to cognitive style and the outcome of team satisfaction. The nature of this
merger implementation task involved managing a major transformational change and the
duration of the team engagement was anticipated to be approximately 12 months.
Although innovative teams may initially be more comfortable and satisfied with this type
of team task, it was expected that the opportunity for a team to work together over time
would allow for the mutual creation of work processes and strategies appropriate to the
needs of the task, regardless of cognitive style.

Therefore, it was hypothesized that there would be no difference in team
satisfaction whether the team was more adaptor-oriented or more innovative-oriented
with respect to cognitive style (Hypothesis 2c). As expected, results showed no
significant relationship between team cognitive style and team satisfaction. Based on this
finding, team satisfaction cannot be predicted by knowledge of the team’s cognitive style.
Given the complexity of this team assignment, variables other than the team’s cognitive
style, such as ability, skill, or motivation, may have been more influential in determining
satisfaction with the experience.
The other hypothesis related to the outcome of team satisfaction predicted that team diversity with respect to cognitive style would lead to greater team satisfaction (Hypothesis 2 b). Previous research has suggested that team diversity might have a negative effect on team satisfaction since the differences within the team could be a source of significant conflict and misunderstanding (Lau and Murnighan, 1998). However, other studies have shown that as members of diverse groups interact with one another over time, they become more effective at their work together and cooperation, cohesion, and satisfaction increase (Earley & Mosakowski, 2000; Harrison et al., 1998; Jackson et al, 1991). In this study, given the estimated length of time the merger teams would work together and the unique opportunities for collaboration and cooperation, it was expected that the heterogeneous teams would provide higher ratings of team satisfaction.

The findings of the current study indicate that a greater diversity in team cognitive style was not related to team satisfaction; team diversity with respect to cognitive style had a non-significant correlation with team satisfaction ratings. Therefore, this study hypothesis was not supported. However, this finding does provide one argument against the notion that heterogeneity within the team has a negative effect on team satisfaction. In conjunction with the previously noted findings regarding team performance, it suggests that the use of diverse teams can still lead to enhanced performance without necessarily causing a reduction in satisfaction.

*Team Experience Dimensions as Outcome.*

On completion of their work together as a team, participants in the study rated their experience in terms of task/goal/role clarity, team process/relationships, team leader
behavior, and team learning. Several study hypotheses had been developed using these dimensions as criteria variables. Focusing first on the two predictors of team cognitive style and team cognitive style diversity, a description of the findings is provided for each of the four dimensions of team experience.

It was expected that teams that were more adaptor-oriented and more diverse with respect to cognitive style would provide higher ratings of *team task/role/goal clarity* (Hypothesis 3c; Hypothesis 3b). Because adaptors prefer structure and work well within it, the expectation was that the adaptor-oriented teams would appreciate the guidelines and structures that were established for teamwork more than the innovative-oriented teams. It was also expected that diverse teams would find structure beneficial in creating a way for those with differing perspectives to gain agreement on task, goal, and role issues. These two hypotheses were not supported. The relationship between team cognitive style and task/role/goal clarity was not significant; the relationship between diversity of team cognitive style and task/role goal clarity was also not significant. Given the nature and complexity of the task that the teams were asked to complete, it is possible that the structure and clarity provided to the teams by the Diocese were welcomed by all teams regardless of their preferences or differences in this area.

It was also expected that teams that were more adaptor-oriented and teams that were more diverse with respect to cognitive style would provide higher ratings of *team processes/relationships* (Hypothesis 4c; Hypothesis 4b). Because this outcome variable included the way the team worked together and included cooperating, encouraging, managing conflict, expressing feelings, and listening, it was expected that adaptor-oriented teams and teams that were diverse would provide higher ratings. It was
hypothesized that these types of teams would be more cognizant of the benefits of establishing agreed upon processes and strategies in support of the work. Hackman (2005) noted that a team must use established processes to manage diversity in order to create the synergy that enables team members to capitalize on differences for the organization’s benefit.

These two hypotheses were not supported in this study. There was not a significant relationship between team processes/relationships and team cognitive style, nor was there a significant relationship between team diversity and team processes/relationships. Once again, it is noted that perhaps all teams, regardless of their cognitive style or diversity, realized the importance of establishing sound team processes that would enable them to work together more easily on this difficult and challenging task.

The third dimension of the team experience outcomes related to team leader behavior. This focused specifically on what the Merger Core Team Convener did to create the environment for the Core Team members to work together. It was predicted that heterogeneous teams would have higher ratings on this outcome variable, while the team cognitive style would not make a difference in how team leader behavior was rated (Hypothesis 5b; Hypothesis 5c). Several team researchers have noted that while all teams require that a leader create conditions that will enhance performance through use of "encouragement" and "consideration" behaviors as they clarify goals, manage conflict, and build the team (Druskat & Wheeler, 2003), this is especially important, perhaps even more critical, with heterogeneous teams whose diversity must be carefully managed in order for it to be useful.
In this study, findings did not support this prediction; there was not a significant relationship between team diversity and ratings of team leader behavior. Therefore, despite the expectation that diverse teams would acknowledge and appreciate a leader who created conditions for the successful management of diverse perspectives, this particular study result does not provide that evidence. Additionally, there was not a significant relationship between team cognitive style and team leader behavior ratings; therefore, as was expected, team leader ratings cannot be predicted based on team cognitive style. It is possible that the heterogeneous teams were able to manage their own diversity through creating processes that enabled them to work well together. Also, it is possible that both homogeneous and heterogeneous teams had similar ratings of the team leader behavior because both types of team benefited from the leader’s skills and influence.

The fourth team experience dimension related to team learning. It was predicted that diverse teams would provide higher ratings of team learning, while team cognitive style would not have an effect on team learning ratings (Hypothesis 6b; Hypothesis 6c). Edmonson (1999) describes team learning as the activities a team uses to process data and allow the team to improve as a team. It was expected that, while all teams would benefit from a purposeful and explicit approach to team learning, heterogeneous teams would more likely engage in and acknowledge their learning processes and would rate this outcome variable higher than homogeneous teams (Hypothesis 6b). Additionally, it was expected that team cognitive style would not be related to team learning outcome (Hypothesis 6c).
Results from this study indicated that team diversity is not significantly related to team learning; therefore, ratings of team learning cannot be predicted based on team diversity with respect to cognitive style. This finding may provide more support for the notion that both homogeneous teams and heterogeneous teams engage in team learning processes equally. Based on the nature and challenge of their task of merging two organizations, participants in this study valued the opportunity to learn as a team and appreciated this aspect of working together. As expected, there was not a significant relationship between team cognitive style and team learning; therefore, ratings of team learning cannot be predicted based on team cognitive style.

The previous descriptions summarize findings from the quantitative analyses conducted for the predictors of team cognitive style and team diversity. Although these analyses provide one look at the relationships that were expected, qualitative data were also available from the responses to open-ended survey questions and from comments captured and published in the Diocesan newspaper when mergers were officially decreed. Figure 4 summarizes the themes from the survey question responses. The specific comments captured when the merger was officially decreed provide rich additional insights about the team experience, especially with respect to the effects of team diversity. They are offered here to provide a more complete picture of the effects of these variables on teamwork.

Several of these comments capture the learning that occurred and the approaches that were used to work together in a diverse team:

“The process of working in the Core Team was very enlightening. We tried to put aside our differences and then realized that we really should take advantage of them. We were able to work together with great respect and acceptance of each other and our opinions.”
“I was impressed with how the members of the Core Team respected the gifts and talents
each other. We respected the history and traditions, but we were also open to the many new
possibilities.”

“Learning to work together changed things for us from an ‘us and them’ mentality to ‘we
are united above and beyond any parish boundary lines’.”

“We all understood that we were building the foundation for a new parish. Yet we all
brought different perspectives and expertise to the process. We challenged and affirmed each
other as we worked together.”

“Initially there was some uncertainty as to how this would work, but we figured out how
to work together well and found that it was well worth all the effort.”

“Our work together started out slowly and at times our task became challenging and
emotional, but as time went on a compassionate and courageous group emerged.”

“We were able to respectfully challenge each other and even to disagree without
becoming disagreeable.”

“There were sometimes different opinions and perspectives certainly, but consensus was
reached on all the important questions. The Core Team quickly blended together and worked
toward a common mission”.

Additional comments address the emotions that the team members dealt with as
they worked together to accomplish a difficult and challenging task:

“It was a time of mixed feelings. We had to be sensitive to the feelings of loss that came
with such a change, but also anticipate the blessings and gains of the future.”

“Feelings of loss were present, but we realized that sometimes we have to lose something
to gain something greater. We were then able to focus on bringing about a more vibrant parish
community.”
“It was a sad and difficult time for all of us. But now that the merger is being implemented, I am filled with relief, hopefulness, pride, and determination.”

“It was difficult for us even though deep down we knew it was for the best. You are used to the same thing, the same community, and the familiar faces. But now will have a more vibrant community where everyone can thrive.”

“The work has been challenging and the hours long. We experienced pain and loss, but through this process, we have discovered great hope.”

“At first things were very challenging and emotional, but a collaborative hopeful spirit carried the day and we now have a great sense of optimism and excitement”

All of the teams that were included in this study were successful in accomplishing the task of implementing the parish mergers. All completed the review and received the decree for the new parish. While some teams may have received higher ratings of performance, satisfaction, or team experience, these comments from participants across the study demonstrate that teams were able to welcome and use their differences and consciously to develop processes for working together in an emotion-laden, complex, and challenging situation.

These remarks, which indicate that team members were able to engage together to overcome hurdles and achieve their goals, are consistent with the recommendations offered by Kayes, Kayes, and Kolb (2005) with respect to the power of experiential learning in teams. They suggested that teams progress through developmental stages as the members refine their understanding of their purpose, learn to respect and be receptive to differing points of view, and collectively reflect on their work together in support of the big picture. One team member summarized that learning experience in the following comment. “As we grew through the process, we melded multiple agendas into one
common purpose – to create the best community of faith that we could. We discovered that it is not the church buildings that are most important, but it is the people who are really your family, your Church.”

Although team cognitive style and team cognitive style diversity did not predict the team experience ratings or the outcome of team satisfaction directly, it appears that an intervening dynamic occurring within the successful teams led to increased team satisfaction. The willingness and ability of the team members to work together over time and learn ways to take advantage of their diversity were critical components of their eventual success. By their nature, cognitive style differences within a team may require and lead team members to engage in these behaviors more often ultimately leading to success and satisfaction; however, the cognitive style measure itself cannot capture or predict that dynamic.

**Leader Emotional Intelligence as a Predictor**

As noted, the other main predictor included in this study was the emotional intelligence of the team leader. Emotional intelligence has been defined by Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso (2008) as "the ability to engage in sophisticated information processing about one's own and others' emotions and the ability to use this information as a guide to thinking and behavior" (p. 503). Although still in the early stages of theoretical development, emotional intelligence is increasingly being tied to effective leadership. Organizational scholars suggest that emotional intelligence is particularly important for leaders of teams and is demonstrated when leaders can facilitate team interaction and
dynamics, build interpersonal trust and relations, and inspire team members to implement the organization's goals (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002; Prati et al., 2003).

Given this understanding of the construct of emotional intelligence, and due to the emotion-laden, complex nature of the task of merging two parish communities, it was expected that the emotional intelligence of the team leader (Convener) would have a significant influence on the team (Merger Core Team) in terms of performance, satisfaction, and the team experience. In this study, emotional intelligence of the team leader was used as a predictor variable for several hypotheses. It was expected that a higher emotional intelligence score for the team leader would be positively related to team performance (Hypothesis 1a), team satisfaction (Hypothesis 2a), and each of the team experience dimensions of task/role goal clarity (Hypothesis 3a), team processes/relationships (Hypothesis 4a) team leader behavior (Hypothesis 5a) and team learning (Hypothesis 6a).

The findings of this study did not support any of these hypotheses related to the emotional intelligence of the leader. Despite the lack of support for these predictions based on the quantitative analyses, a further analysis using the qualitative data collected from the participants through the open-ended survey questions demonstrated that the skills and behaviors described as “emotional intelligence” were in fact present in the leaders of the teams in this study. Comments from the team members that identified these behaviors (shown in Figure 3) included “listened and made members feel heard”, “created an atmosphere for open discussion”, “welcomed and encouraged differences of views and ideas”, “encouraged team members to be open to one another”, “reinforced purpose and visions”, and “managed conflict”. Although these types of comments were
noted more often in the teams that had higher performance scores, all teams in this study were successful in accomplishing their task of implementation of a merger. Therefore, it would appear that these behaviors, indicating some level of emotional intelligence by team leaders, were present and were critical to the success of all the teams.

Another possible reason for lack of support for the hypotheses related to emotional intelligence of the leader may be connected to the use of the MSCEIT in this study as the measure of emotional intelligence. Although much theoretical work has been published supporting an “ability measure” of emotional intelligence, there has been very little empirical research using the MSCEIT in studies within teams and organizations. Kerr, Garvin, Heaton & Boyle (2006) noted that most research investigating emotional intelligence and performance outcomes has been conducted in laboratory settings using student sample populations. Other common uses of the MSCEIT have been in the context of leadership development activities where a leader’s emotional intelligence is evaluated and training to increase emotionally intelligent behavior is provided in a safe, supportive environment (e.g. Caruso & Salovey, 2004; Rosete & Ciarrochi, 2005). There are no examples of the use of the MSCEIT to measure the level and effects of a leader’s emotional intelligence in a real-world, highly-charged, emotion-laden context such as the one in this study.

The overall MSCEIT results in terms of total scores for the team leaders in this study were considerably different from the population norms provided by the MSCEIT publishers. Additionally, there was very little variation in the MSCEIT scores across the sample. This finding could be a result of the particular composition of the sample of merger team leaders. All leader participants were Catholic priests, members of the clergy
who shared a relatively similar background. In terms of their training, experience, and outlook, there may be very little variance among them. Their educational preparation for their role as spiritual advisors and religious leaders within a hierarchical context may not focus on the development of skills related to teamwork, facilitation, and managing emotions and conflict in groups.

This finding may also be connected to the nature of the measure itself. The MSCEIT is a lengthy test and requires considerable focus and concentration to complete. Anecdotally, several respondents indicated that they had difficulty getting through the questions, got distracted, or had to start over because of interruptions. Unlike situations where the MSCEIT is used for respondents who are engaged in a leadership development program and have committed time and energy to personal learning, these respondents were extremely busy, overwhelmed by occupational demands, and may not have seen any personal value in carefully completing an instrument that required a significant amount of their time. Additionally, despite attempts to clarify how the results would be used and to assure confidentiality, the respondents might have been uncertain about what their scores would represent and how they would be interpreted. These possible explanations for the unusual set of MSCEIT scores in this sample may have affected the results in this study.

Although these possibilities may have resulted in potentially unreliable and/or invalid emotional intelligence total scores, one other avenue for examining the MSCEIT results in this study was pursued as a “post-hoc” analysis. A study conducted by Kerr et al. (2006) using the MSCEIT with 38 leaders engaged in a career development program found that “only half of the MSCEIT scores were significantly large predictors” of performance ratings (p. 275). In their study, they found that only two of the four branch
scores of the MSCEIT measure, “Perceiving Emotions” and “Using Emotions”, had significant correlations with the outcome of performance. Therefore, with this as an example, a “post hoc” analysis was conducted for the current merger study. The four branch scores of the total MSCEIT were used as predictors for the same outcomes as previously examined. The findings demonstrated a marginally significant relationship between the branch score “Using Emotions” and the outcomes of team leader behavior and team learning. Although these results are not strong statistically, when considered in concert with the qualitative data presented for both leader behavior and team experience, a connection can be seen between the ability described as “leader emotional intelligence”, along with the ability of a diverse team to learn to work together, and the eventual outcome of successful performance.

**Team Experience Dimensions as Predictors**

The last two sets of hypotheses in this study involved the team experience dimensions of task/goal/role clarity, team processes/relationships, team leader behavior, and team learning and the outcomes of team performance and team satisfaction.

**Team Performance as Outcome.** The predictions in this set of hypotheses proposed that the outcome of team performance would be directly related to each of the team experience dimensions of task/goal/role clarity (Hypothesis 7a) team processes/relationships (Hypothesis 7b), team leader behavior (Hypotheses 7c), and team learning (Hypothesis 7d). The only significant finding in this set of hypotheses involved the prediction that team leader behavior was positively related to team performance (Hypothesis 7c). This hypothesis was marginally supported (b=2.91; p˂ .07) statistically. However, the qualitative data summary of the comments regarding “What the leader
did”(see Figure 3) provides some additional support for the notion that the team leaders in this study engaged in leader behaviors that created the conditions that enabled teams to accomplish their goals. Although the other three team dimension variables in this set of hypotheses were not found to be statistically significant predictors of team performance, the additional qualitative data related to “How the team worked together” (see Figure 4) provides a clear picture of the perceived importance of goal clarity, team processes, and team learning to the successful accomplishment of the work.

**Team Satisfaction as Outcome.** The final set of hypotheses included the predictions that suggest that the outcome of team satisfaction would be directly related to each of the four team experience dimensions of team task/goal/role clarity (Hypothesis 8a), team processes/relationships (Hypothesis 8b), team leader behavior (Hypothesis 8c), and team learning (Hypothesis 8d). The findings were as expected; all four hypotheses were supported. There was a statistically significant relationship with each of these four predictor variables and the outcome of team satisfaction. Additionally, the qualitative data (in the form of responses from the team participants to the open-ended survey questions as well as participant remarks captured by reporters at the merger decree ceremonies) summarized previously, supports the notion that once the teams learned how to use their differences to their advantage, working on this difficult task became a positive and rewarding experience.

Although the team experience variables did not directly predict the team performance outcome, there was a significant relationship between all of the team experience variables and the outcome of team satisfaction. All of the teams in the study completed the merger implementation process and were successful in obtaining the
diocesan decree. The team experience and team satisfaction measures represented the participants’ perspective on how well they communicated and worked together, despite their feelings of loss and their differences in problem-solving approach. Therefore, the team satisfaction outcome was an indicator of team performance from the point of view of the team members. If team satisfaction could be measured at different junctures in time over the entire span of a merger team’s work together, information about the critical turning points in the successful development of a diverse team engaged in a merger situation could be collected. This type of data could help to identify ways to support the teams and increase the success of using the team approach for a merger implementation.

**Limitations**

Although this study provided some insights into the relationships between predictor variables of team cognitive style, team diversity, team leader behaviors and team work processes and the outcome variables of team performance and team satisfaction in the context of accomplishing mergers within a large Church organization, there are several limitations that should be noted when considering the study results. Primary limitations in this study included the cross-sectional nature of the study design, the study sample and context, the performance outcome variable measurement, and the measure used for the predictor variable of emotional intelligence.

The research design used in this study was a cross-sectional, correlational design that limits the ability to attribute causality between any of the study variables. Although data were collected from participants at more than one juncture in time (i.e. cognitive style inventory was completed when the team was first in place and survey data were
collected at the completion of the merger), there was no experimental manipulation or intervention in the teamwork process. Moreover, the study was not a longitudinal study. Therefore, although the direction of the predicted relationships within the study (presented in the model depicted in Figure 1), was based on theory within organization science and related disciplines and on practical findings from the problem-solving, creativity, and group literature, this field study design did not allow cause and effect statements to be made with any certainty. A longitudinal research design, in which team experience data would be collected at several points during the team’s work together as well as at the completion of the team’s task, may be a better design and may provide a stronger argument for the direction of predicted influences. However, the longitudinal design for this type of field study would prove to be cumbersome and unwieldy for researchers and participants.

A second limitation involved the sample and context for the study. The teams being examined were engaged in parish mergers occurring within a large Catholic diocese in Southern New Jersey. This context may differ in many ways from other merger situations in the non-profit arena and findings from this study may not apply to other non-profit settings. All parishes within the diocese were not affected by the merger; however, 37 mergers were anticipated involving a total of 76 parish communities. Therefore, this organization was managing numerous mergers simultaneously across a wide geographic region, which may differ from other non-profit mergers between two organizations located in proximity to one another and combining all operations from both entities.
The merger teams that were commissioned consisted of parish community members who volunteered their services for this mission and were selected through a process established by diocesan leaders. The total of over 250 individuals that comprised the merger teams were not employees of the organization; therefore, their relationship to the merging entities as well as to the larger organization of the diocese differs from merger situations in which merger transition teams may be made up of employees of the merging units. However, the team leaders in this study were related to the larger organization, reporting directly to the Bishop of the diocese. The design of these teams with team leader in an “employee” role and team members in a volunteer role may differ from other teams tasked to implement mergers outside of the Church context. Therefore, findings from this study may not necessarily generalize to other merger team situations.

A third limitation in this study concerned the items used to measure the team performance outcome. The items did not comprise a standardized performance measure, but were designed specifically for this organization. The performance outcome measure provided an evaluation of how well each team completed identified tasks required for an official merger and how well the team worked together to accomplish these tasks. The results demonstrated adequate variability in team performance in this study and therefore proved to be useful for measuring outcomes in this situation. However, as it currently exists, it would not be an appropriate measure for performance outcomes in mergers in other, different organizations.

Another limitation related to the team experience survey used in this study. This survey had not been previously used in its current form in other research. Although the scales comprising this measure consisted of items combined from a variety of sources
that had used portions of these items in previous team research studies, this full survey was designed because no published reliable and valid measure existed that captured all of the dimensions to be examined in this study. Factor analyses and reliability analyses conducted for the scales in this survey demonstrated that it was statistically sound; however, the current form of this team experience survey may need further validation and adjustments prior to use in other team studies.

A final limitation to be noted in this study involved the use of the MSCEIT as the measure of emotional intelligence. As initially explained in the description of the study methodology, the MSCEIT was chosen because it had been validated as an “ability-based” (rather than a self-report) measure of emotional intelligence and therefore could provide a more objective and accurate measurement of the construct. As previously discussed, the MSCEIT has predominantly been used with student samples or in support of leader development programs; no published research which used the MSCEIT in a field study, real-world context were found. The MSCEIT score results for this sample of team leaders as well as anecdotal comments relating to the length and complexity of the measure caused some concern and questions about the use of the MSCEIT as the best measure of emotional intelligence in this type of context. Results of the qualitative data analyses in this study were not consistent with the interpretation of the MSCEIT scores in this sample; therefore, results relating to the emotional intelligence of the team leaders in this study may not adequately reflect the predicted effects of leader emotional intelligence (as that construct was understood and used in the context of this study) on the outcome of team performance.
**Contributions, Implications for Practice, and Future Research**

This study can make several contributions to the existing literature, specifically in the areas of mergers as an example of radical organization change, team diversity and its effects on team outcomes, team experience necessary for successful team work, and characteristics and behaviors of leaders of teams engaged in major change. The findings highlight opportunities for further study of the use of mergers in non-profit settings, the use of diverse teams to accomplish radical change in organizations, and the qualities necessary for leaders of diverse teams engaged in emotion-laden change.

First, this study extends our understanding of the use of mergers as a choice for ensuring viability of organizations in the non-profit sector. It specifically addressed the unique aspects of merging components within a larger organizational structure, such as the merger of parish communities within the larger organization of the Church. Each of the mergers in this study represented a combination of two previously independent communities or “organizations” that had previously served tens of thousands of individuals and families. In many cases, these mergers were larger and more complex than similar merger attempts in the non-profit setting as well as some mergers in the corporate arena. The unique focus on mission and purpose in non-profit organizations, as well as their orientation to personal and community service, provides the opportunity to implement mergers in a manner that allows participation and inclusion of stakeholders at many levels. This approach is not typically seen in mergers and combinations in a for-profit setting. By focusing on the effects of the use of a team approach to the implementation of mergers, this study was one of the first to provide information
regarding the characteristics of a team and the team work processes necessary for successful outcomes in a merger situation.

Basinger & Peterson (2008) studied a merger between two non-profit arts organizations, focusing on the reactions of the “insider” decision-makers and the “outsider” patrons and other stakeholders, and found that the opportunity to participate in the decisions and implementation plans had a significant effect on the support of the merger outcomes and the success of the newly combined organization. In their case study, many key stakeholder groups who were not involved in the merger process, felt frustrated and disenfranchised, and eventually abandoned the newly formed organization.

The current study of a team approach to implementation of parish mergers within a large Church diocese highlighted the effects of participation on the commitment to the process and the outcome. Findings regarding the characteristics of the merger implementation team and the teamwork processes necessary for successful merger outcomes can provide guidance to other organizations considering the use of the team approach to mergers.

As more and more Churches are struggling to remain relevant and viable in times of changing demographics, decreasing vocations within the ministry, and financial challenges, they are increasingly considering mergers as a potential solution. Most of the literature available in this area is comprised of unpublished manuscripts by authors that call attention to this trend and offer some basic advice based on their own interest and experience. There is a dearth of sound theoretical and empirical studies that could provide specific information that would be of value to this unique “industry” of Church establishments. For many people the Church is a vital part of life. The changes that are occurring within Church organizations can have a dramatic effect on the way they are
able to practice their faith and experience their full life. Future research in this area, specifically targeting the decision within Churches (of any denomination) to choose mergers as a strategy and the manner in which these mergers are implemented is needed.

Another area for future research involves a focus on the ongoing effort over time that is required when teams are used in a merger implementation. Each team in this study was engaged in the merger implementation process for at least ten months; some teams worked together for over a year before their implementation work was accomplished. Considerable theoretical work by organizational scholars has focused on the progressive nature of the implementation of organization change (Burke, 2011; Bridges, 1991; Galpin, 1996; Morris & Raben, 1995; Kotter, 1995; Nadler, 1980). Additionally, successive stages of the change process within organizations have been identified and a clear focus on the “transition stage” has been evident. Nadler (1980) described this period as one of considerable uncertainty that must be given time and be managed with a great deal of care. Focusing specifically on mergers as an example of major organization change, Marks and Mirvis (2000) recommended that some form of a transition structure, such as a transition team, be established to coordinate and support the change process over time.

The current study adds to the organization change literature by examining the effectiveness of such transition structures, i.e. transition teams that were created to manage the phased implementation of a major organization change. The findings regarding effects of the team composition, the characteristics of the team leader, and the team relationships and processes employed throughout the implementation phase provide insight into the use of a team approach for major organization change. Future research
should continue to focus on the characteristics of a team charged with implementing a radical organization change. For example, while this study found that diversity of the team with respect to problem-solving style was a valuable characteristic that encouraged healthy debate and discussion, many other team composition variables could be examined that would benefit teams, especially teams engaged in painful and difficult change.

Another area for future research with respect to teams engaged in managing major organization change is the focus on team learning or team development as a vital element of the team’s success. Gersick (1988) studied the way in which project teams developed over time and in context and found that steady, incremental progress was not necessarily the way most teams reached their goals. She highlighted the need for teams to engage in orienting and re-orienting activities at certain key stages within their lifespan as a strategy to help them accomplish their objectives. Kayes, Kayes, and Kolb (2005) focused on the importance of experiential learning in teams. They suggested that an explicit focus on the learning cycle within the team creates the environment for team members to develop their skills and collectively manage increasingly difficult and complex demands. As noted, the teams in this study worked together for approximately one year. Although the design of this study did not focus on the successive stages of teams’ development throughout their time together, further research of teams that have been created to implement a merger could contribute knowledge about the effects of time on team learning and its relationship to successful transformational change within an organization.

This study also makes a major contribution to the literature related to cognitive style and teams. Much of the current theoretical and empirical work in this area is focused at the individual level, examining cognitive style as an individual difference
variable. Kirton (2003) has suggested, however, that the understanding and use of cognitive style as a team variable can be particularly helpful to organizations. He stated that diversity within a team with respect to cognitive style provides the team with considerable problem-solving potential; however, he cautioned that the team members must be able to manage successfully that diversity by expending the effort to ensure effective collaboration. Although practitioners of Kirton’s theory agree that a heterogeneous team can be beneficial, most of the studies examining cognitive style and teams have found that homogeneous teams performed better. In an early experimental study of teams engaged in a planning exercise, Hammerschmidt (1996) found that a smaller “cognitive gap” within a team (which was the result of a homogeneous composition of either adaptors or innovators) led to higher success rates. Subsequent studies with teams have resulted in comparable findings; however, no empirical research has been conducted with real teams working on real issues in real organizations.

The results of the current study demonstrated that real-life teams involved in a major organization change effort, and diverse with respect to cognitive style, received higher ratings of performance than their homogeneous counterparts. The fact that these teams were able to work together over time and learned to create processes and strategies to capitalize on their diversity is an important component of their success. Therefore, teams that are diverse with respect to cognitive style can be particularly beneficial for managing the complex issues currently faced in organizations, but learning to manage that diversity is essential for success. Although caution must be taken regarding generalizations of these findings, the results of this study can revitalize research examining the use of diverse teams within organizations, especially in initiatives
involving major, complex change. Future studies should focus on how team members and leaders create the conditions for diverse teams to excel in this context.

One final contribution this study can make to the existing literature relates to the measurement of emotional intelligence. Although the findings in this study did not support the prediction that a leader high in emotional intelligence has a positive influence on team experience, team performance, and team satisfaction, it did resurface previous concerns and questions regarding the ability to adequately measure the emotional intelligence construct.

Earlier results of research in the area of emotional intelligence have been criticized due to concerns with the way emotional intelligence has been measured (Antonakis, et al., 2009). Similar concerns are raised based on the findings from this study. Results of the MSCEIT, the ability-based measure of emotional intelligence, were inconsistent with the qualitative data that was obtained from study participants describing the behaviors of the leaders of the merger teams. It was expected that a team leader higher in emotional intelligence would exhibit behaviors that included: (1) establishing a climate of trust and cooperation, (2) encouraging contributions from all team members, (3) generating optimism and enthusiasm, (4) managing feelings and emotions, and (5) dealing with conflict. As noted in Figure 3, the descriptions of team leader behaviors provided by the team members in this study correspond exceedingly well with the behaviors that were described and expected in a leader who was high in emotional intelligence.

This study was one of the first specifically designed to test the relationship between leader emotional intelligence and team outcomes in a field research setting;
however, the results may only add to the confusion regarding the appropriate way to measure emotional intelligence. Further theoretical studies and empirical research are needed to clarify the emotional intelligence construct and to create or refine a useful instrument for measuring this characteristic.

**Conclusion**

This study regarding the use of teams to accomplish mergers may contribute to the organization change literature, specifically related to the effects of team diversity of personality, team processes and strategies necessary for diverse teams to function well, and team leader behaviors required to support diverse teams through a difficult transformational change in an organization. The findings support the theoretical proposition that heterogeneous teams, if well managed, can capitalize on different perspectives and ideas in order to provide the best opportunity for successful major organization change. Additionally, there is support for the prediction that teams that include members with an innovative approach to problem-solving will be better equipped to deal with radical change initiatives. Study results also show that the ability of team members to establish team processes and strategies to work together, despite differences in perspectives, increases satisfaction with the teamwork experience. Finally, team leader behaviors that include listening, establishing an atmosphere for open and honest discussion, and encouraging the expression of different ideas and points of view within the team were shown to be essential for a diverse team to accomplish successfully the task of implementing a merger, a difficult and complex radical organization change.
Results from this study can aid in the understanding of how mergers can best be implemented in the non-profit sector in order to avoid the damaging results often seen when mergers occur in the corporate setting. In fact, nearly 75% of corporate mergers actually fail (Burke & Biggart, 1997). Participation in the merger implementation by stakeholders affected by the merger outcomes, a transition team commissioned to work together to facilitate the implementation process, and time and reflective practices that enable the learning and understanding necessary to accept and embrace the change are all required for success. Future theory and research may refine these findings so that leaders and practitioners in non-profit organizations engaged in mergers in the years ahead will have knowledge regarding the best ways to use teams to implement difficult, emotionally charged organization change.
### Table 1

*Factor Loadings for Principal Components Analysis, Varimax Rotation, and Cronbach’s alpha for Team Experience Survey Scales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team Leader Behavior (α = .95)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. There was open communication between the team leader and team members.</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Team members were comfortable going to team leader with questions or problems.</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Team leader encouraged expression of feelings.</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Team leader encouraged contributions from all team members, respecting and supporting differences in individual perspectives and styles.</td>
<td>.79 .38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Team leader welcomed constructive feedback from team members.</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Team leader was instrumental in creating a cooperative and trusting climate within the team.</td>
<td>.76 .34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Team leader involved team members in problem-solving and decision-making.</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Team leader helped the team discuss tough issues, raise concerns, and manage conflict.</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Leader clearly communicated team’s responsibilities and desired outcomes.</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Team leader helped team members learn ways to improve the effectiveness of their teamwork.</td>
<td>.64 .41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team Processes/Relationship (α = .92)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. There was a high degree of cooperation within the team</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. There was free expression of feeling within the team.</td>
<td>.345 .69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Team had a blend of different but complementary personalities.</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. All members participated fully in team tasks and processes.</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The team was able to collectively discuss problems and difficult issues.</td>
<td>.42 .64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Team members listened carefully to each other.</td>
<td>.31 .61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Differences of opinion were worked through productively.</td>
<td>.35 .62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Team members openly discussed their processes for working together.</td>
<td>.59 .59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The team used an effective process for making decisions at meetings.</td>
<td>.52 .53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Different points of view were encouraged.</td>
<td>.51 .53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team Learning (α = .83)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Team members regularly took the time to reflect on how they could improve and develop as a team.</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Team members regularly discussed how effectively they were collaborating to get the work accomplished.</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. If something went wrong with team processes or team dynamics, the team took the time to think it through and discuss it together.</td>
<td>.31 .57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. The team took the time to review its work outcomes, learning from both success and failure.</td>
<td>.45 .48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 1 (continued)**

*Factor Loadings for Principal Components Analysis, Varimax Rotation, and Cronbach’s alpha for Team Experience Survey Scales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team Tasks/Goals/Role Clarity (α = .82)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. All members clearly understood the purpose and goals of the team.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Team members took responsibility for their work and completed all assigned duties in the timeframe required.</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Each person on the team agreed with what was expected of him/her as a team member.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Team members were completely committed to the goals of the team.</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Team meetings were productive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Job responsibilities were openly discussed and questions about roles and responsibilities were clarified.</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team Satisfaction (α = .88)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Team members trusted one another to be honest and fair when making decisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Team members believed in their work and were excited about the future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I was pleased with the way this team worked together to accomplish its work.</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. All team members were role models for how to work together.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I was satisfied with the outcomes accomplished by this team.</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I would agree to work with this team again.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. The team routinely engaged and communicated with the parish community.</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2

*Aggregation Indices and Cronbach’s Alphas for Team Experience Survey (n = 175)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Number of Scale Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Average $r_{wg(j)}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Task/Role/Goal Clarity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Processes/Relationships</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Leader Behavior</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Learning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Satisfaction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Values of $r_{wg(j)}$ of .70 or higher provide justification for aggregating individual-level data to a higher-level (Bleise, 2000; James, et al., 1984)
Table 3

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations of Control, Independent, and Dependent Variables – Team Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Leader Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Team Cognitive Style Diversity</td>
<td>35.26</td>
<td>12.96</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Team Cognitive Style</td>
<td>92.72</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Team Task/Role/Goal Clarity</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Team Processes/Relationships</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.80*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Team Leader Behavior</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Team Learning</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Team Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.86**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Team Performance</td>
<td>33.65</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Team Age</td>
<td>55.76</td>
<td>9.99</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Team Education (years)</td>
<td>15.91</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 26 teams  * p < .05; ** p < .01
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Leader Emotional Intelligence</th>
<th>Cognitive Style Diversity (range)</th>
<th>Cognitive Style</th>
<th>Task/Role/Goal Clarity</th>
<th>Process/Relationships</th>
<th>Leader Behavior</th>
<th>Team Learning</th>
<th>Team Performance</th>
<th>Team Satisfaction</th>
<th>Team Age</th>
<th>Team Education (in years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>101.7</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: With the exception of the Emotional Intelligence score and Cognitive Style Diversity (range), all entries are mean scores for the team for each variable.
Table 5

Regression Analysis Models for Testing the Effects of Leader Emotional Intelligence, Team Cognitive Style Diversity, and Team Cognitive Style on Team Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Controls and Independent Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>SE Beta</th>
<th>R square</th>
<th>R square ∆</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Leader Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Team Cognitive Style Diversity</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>6.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Team Cognitive Style</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>4.99*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Team Cognitive Style Diversity</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Unstandardized coefficients are reported. † p < .08; *p < .05; **p < .01
### Table 6

*The Effects of Team Cognitive Style Diversity and Team Cognitive Style on Team Performance (Hierarchical Regression Analysis)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Controls and Independent Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>SE Beta</th>
<th>R square</th>
<th>R square ∆</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Team Cognitive Style Diversity</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>6.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Team Cognitive Style Diversity</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>5.11*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Unstandardized coefficients are reported. † p < .08; *p < .05; **p < .01
Table 7

*Regression Analysis Models for Testing the Effects of Leader Emotional Intelligence, Team Cognitive Style Diversity, and Team Cognitive Style on Team Satisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Controls and Independent Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>SE Beta</th>
<th>R square</th>
<th>R square ∆</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Satisfaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Leader Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Satisfaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Team Cognitive Style Diversity</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Satisfaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Team Cognitive Style</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Unstandardized coefficients are reported. † p < .08; *p < .05; **p < .01
### Table 8

The Effects of Leader Emotional Intelligence, Cognitive Style Diversity, and Team Cognitive Style on Team Task/Role/Goal/Clarity, Team Processes/Relationships, Team Leader Behavior, and Team Learning (Regression Analysis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Control and Independent Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>SE Beta</th>
<th>R square</th>
<th>R square Change</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Task/Role/Goal Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>5.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Leader Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Task/Role/Goal Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>5.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Team Cognitive Style Diversity</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Task/Role/Goal Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>5.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Team Cognitive Style</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Processes/Relationships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>5.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Leader Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Processes/Relationships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>5.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Team Cognitive Style Diversity</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Processes/Relationships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>5.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Team Cognitive Style</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Unstandardized coefficients are reported. † p < .08; *p < .05; **p < .01
Table 8 (continued)

The Effects of Leader Emotional Intelligence, Cognitive Style Diversity, and Team Cognitive Style on Team Task/Role/Goal/Clarity, Team Processes/Relationships, Team Leader Behavior, and Team Learning (Regression Analysis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Control and Independent Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>SE Beta</th>
<th>R square</th>
<th>R square Δ</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Leader Behavior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>5.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Leader Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Leader Behavior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>5.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Team Cognitive Style Diversity</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Leader Behavior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>5.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Team Cognitive Style</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Learning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>9.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Leader Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Learning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>9.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cognitive Style Diversity</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Learning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>9.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Team Cognitive Style</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Unstandardized coefficients are reported. † p < .08; *p < .05; **p < .01
### Table 9

The Effects of Team Task/Role/Goal/Clarity, Team Processes/Relationships, Team Leader Behavior, and Team Learning on Team Performance (Regression Analysis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Control and Independent Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>SE Beta</th>
<th>R square</th>
<th>R square Δ</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Team Task/Role/Goal Clarity</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Team Processes/Relationships</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Team Leader Behavior</td>
<td>2.91†</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>3.54†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Team Learning</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Unstandardized coefficients are reported. † p < .08; *p < .05; **p < .01
### Table 10

*The Effects of Team Task/Role/Goal/Clarity, Team Processes/Relationships, Team Leader Behavior, and Team Learning on Team Satisfaction (Regression Analysis)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Control and Independent Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>SE Beta</th>
<th>R square Δ</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Satisfaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>Team Task/Role/Goal Clarity</em></td>
<td>.95**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>11.61</td>
<td>21.07**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Satisfaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>Team Processes/Relationships</em></td>
<td>1.16**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>36.96</td>
<td>69.40**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Satisfaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>Team Leader Behavior</em></td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>9.99</td>
<td>17.99**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Satisfaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>Team Learning</em></td>
<td>1.13**</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>14.59</td>
<td>26.75**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Satisfaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>Team Task/Role/Goal Clarity</em></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>15.05</td>
<td>17.70*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Team Processes/Relationships</em></td>
<td>.85*</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>15.05</td>
<td>17.70*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Team Leader Behavior</em></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Team Learning</em></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Unstandardized coefficients are reported. † p < .08; *p < .05; **p < .01
Table 11
The Effects of Team Processes/Relationships with Team Leader Behavior, Team Learning, and Team Task/Role/Goal Clarity on Team Satisfaction (Hierarchical Regression Analyses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Controls and Independent Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>SE Beta</th>
<th>R square</th>
<th>R square Δ</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Satisfaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Team Processes/Relationships</td>
<td>1.15**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>36.96</td>
<td>69.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Satisfaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Team Processes/Relationships</td>
<td>1.15**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>36.96</td>
<td>69.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Team Processes/Relationships</td>
<td>.99**</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>26.34</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Team Leader Behavior</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Satisfaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Team Processes/Relationships</td>
<td>1.15**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>36.96</td>
<td>69.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Team Processes/Relationships</td>
<td>.96**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>25.49</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Team Learning</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Satisfaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Mean Age</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Team Processes/Relationships</td>
<td>1.15**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>36.96</td>
<td>69.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Team Processes/Relationships</td>
<td>1.06**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>24.01</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Team Task/Role/Goal Clarity</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Unstandardized coefficients are reported. † p < .08; *p < .05; **p < .01
Table 12

Summary of Predictor-Outcome Variables and Results of Quantitative Analyses for Study Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
<th>Result of Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Leader Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>Team Performance</td>
<td>Non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Team Cognitive Style Diversity</td>
<td>Team Performance</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>Team Cognitive</td>
<td>Team Performance</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Leader Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>Team Satisfaction</td>
<td>Non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Team Cognitive Style Diversity</td>
<td>Team Satisfaction</td>
<td>Non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>Team Cognitive</td>
<td>Team Satisfaction</td>
<td>As expected, no difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>Leader Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>Team Task/Role/Goal Clarity</td>
<td>Non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>Team Cognitive Style Diversity</td>
<td>Team Task/Role/Goal Clarity</td>
<td>Non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>Team Cognitive</td>
<td>Team Task/Role/Goal Clarity</td>
<td>Non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Leader Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>Team Processes/Relationships</td>
<td>Non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>Team Cognitive Style Diversity</td>
<td>Team Processes/Relationships</td>
<td>Non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td>Team Cognitive</td>
<td>Team Processes/Relationships</td>
<td>Non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>Leader Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>Team Leader Behavior</td>
<td>Non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>Team Cognitive Style Diversity</td>
<td>Team Leader Behavior</td>
<td>Non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c</td>
<td>Team Cognitive</td>
<td>Team Leader Behavior</td>
<td>As expected, no difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td>Leader Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>Team Learning</td>
<td>Non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td>Team Cognitive Style Diversity</td>
<td>Team Learning</td>
<td>Non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c</td>
<td>Team Cognitive</td>
<td>Team Learning</td>
<td>As expected, no difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td>Team Task/Role/Goal Clarity</td>
<td>Team Performance</td>
<td>Non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b</td>
<td>Team Processes/Relationships</td>
<td>Team Performance</td>
<td>Non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c</td>
<td>Team Leader Behavior</td>
<td>Team Performance</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d</td>
<td>Team Learning</td>
<td>Team Performance</td>
<td>Non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a</td>
<td>Team Task/Role/Goal Clarity</td>
<td>Team Satisfaction</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b</td>
<td>Team Processes/Relationships</td>
<td>Team Satisfaction</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8c</td>
<td>Team Leader Behavior</td>
<td>Team Satisfaction</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8d</td>
<td>Team Learning</td>
<td>Team Satisfaction</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Principal Researcher: Alice Cahill, MA, MSN, MPH, MS - Doctoral Candidate, Social-Organizational Psychology, Columbia University
Study Sponsor: Warner Burke, Ph.D. - Professor, Teachers College, Columbia University

BACKGROUND
The opportunity to study the use of a team approach for mergers within non-profit organizations can provide valuable information that is not yet available regarding the management of organizational change. Studies on teams in other work situations have shown that certain team characteristics and skills are necessary to reach a desired outcome; however, a merger is a special case of change in an organization. This study is designed to discover the conditions in which teams in non-profit settings can successfully be used to accomplish a merger, a major organizational change. Some of the key questions that will be addressed in this study include:
1. How does the composition of the team with respect to cognitive style (thinking/problem-solving approach) affect team outcomes in an organizational merger?
2. What relationship-orientation style and skills of a team leader provide the most benefit to a team's learning and performance when dealing with an organizational merger?

POTENTIAL BENEFITS OF THE STUDY
Data from this study will provide the organization's leaders with an understanding of the conditions necessary for teams to be successful in effecting change and may be used to provide guidance and insights to other non-profit organizations contemplating the use of a team approach for managing major organizational change. Additionally, results of the study may be used in future educational opportunities for the development of leaders within the organization who will be creating, leading and participating in work teams.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY - HOW IT WILL WORK
• Data that will be collected:
  (1) - Two online instruments, a measure of thinking/problem-solving style (the KAI) and a measure of relationship-orientation skills (MSCEIT) will be completed by the team leaders (Conveners)
  (2) – Team members will complete two online measures, the KAI and a final online team experience survey (once the merger is completed)
• Participants will receive an individual e-mail from Alice Cahill describing the study and providing the link to the online instruments.
• Time expected for completion of on-line instruments is: 10 minutes for KAI, 25 minutes for MSCEIT and 10 minutes for final team survey.
• All data will be confidential; only summary results and information will be shared for learning purposes. Results will be compiled, analyzed and stored in a password protected database accessible only to the principal researcher, Alice Cahill.

FOR MORE INFORMATION
Please contact Alice Cahill at (301)254-7700 or amc2120@columbia.edu for questions.
Appendix B

Kirton Adaption-Innovation Inventory

Contact details for the Occupational Research Centre & KAI Distribution Centre:

Dr M. J. Kirton
Cornerways
Cardigan Street
Newmarket
Suffolk CB8 8HZ
United Kingdom

Tel & Fax: 01638 662704 (from USA: 01144 1638 662704)

email: ukinfo@kaicentre.com
Appendix C

Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test

Source: Multi-Health Systems, Inc.

MHS Inc
P.O. Box 950
North Tonawanda, NY
14120-0950

Tel: 1.800.456.3003
or +1.416.492.2627
Fax: 1.888.540.4484
or +1.416.492.3343
Team Experience Survey - Core Team

This survey is part of a research study that is looking at the use of the Team Approach for accomplishing mergers in a non-profit setting. The questions you will be asked address typical team processes and experiences. They are presented in six short categories. Although the work of your team is now complete or nearly complete, please think back to the experience you had as a member of your Parish Merger Core Team when you respond to each of the questions.

(start survey button will appear here)

RESPONDENT INFORMATION: Please provide the following demographic information which will only be used for research purposes in completing this study. Your individual responses to the survey questions will not be connected to any information that identifies you personally. All personal data will be kept confidential.

1 - Name

2 - Age

3 - Sex
   - Male
   - Female

4 - Occupation

5 - Education
   - High School
   - Some College Coursework
   - Associates Degree
   - Bachelors Degree
   - Some Graduate Coursework
   - Masters Degree
   - Professional Degree or Doctorate
TEAM TASKS/GOALS/ROLES:

Please indicate your answer by choosing the appropriate code

1: Strongly Disagree - 2: Disagree - 3: Uncertain/Neutral - 4: Agree - 5: Strongly Agree

1 - All team members clearly understood the purpose and goals of the team.
2 - Team members were completely committed to the goals of the team.
3 - Job responsibilities were openly discussed and questions about roles and responsibilities were clarified.
4 - Each person on the team agreed with what was expected of him/her as a team member.
5 - Team members took personal responsibility for their work and completed all assigned duties in the timeframe required.
6 - Team meetings were productive.

Answer Code
1  2  3  4  5

TEAM PROCESSES/relsHIp:

Please indicate your answer by choosing the appropriate code

1: Strongly Disagree - 2: Disagree - 3: Uncertain/Neutral - 4: Agree - 5: Strongly Agree

1 - The team members openly discussed their processes for working together.
2 - There was a high degree of cooperation in the team.
3 - All members participated fully in team tasks and processes.
4 - Different points of view were encouraged.
5 - The team used an effective process for making decisions at meetings.
6 - Differences of opinion among team members were worked through productively.
7 - The team had a blend of different but complementary personalities.
8 - There was free expression of feelings and emotions within the team; feelings were supported.
9 - Team members listened carefully to each other.
10 - The team was able to collectively discuss problems and difficult issues.

Answer Code
1  2  3  4  5

(submit button will appear here)
TEAM LEADER/CONVENER:

Please indicate your answer by choosing the appropriate code
1: Strongly Disagree - 2: Disagree - 3: Uncertain/Neutral - 4: Agree
- 5: Strongly Agree

1 - The team leader clearly communicated the team's responsibilities and the desired outcomes.
2 - There was open communication between the team leader and team members.
3 - The team leader involved the team members in problem-solving and decision-making.
4 - Team members were comfortable going to the team leader with questions or problems.
5 - The team leader encouraged contributions from all team members, respecting and supporting differences in individual perspectives and styles.
6 - The team leader encouraged expression of feelings.
7 - The team leader was instrumental in creating a cooperative and trusting climate within the team.
8 - The team leader helped the team discuss tough issues, raise concerns, and manage conflict.
9 - The team leader welcomed constructive feedback from team members.
10 - The team leader helped the team members learn ways to improve the effectiveness of their teamwork.

TEAM LEARNING:

Please indicate your answer by choosing the appropriate code
1: Strongly Disagree - 2: Disagree - 3: Uncertain/Neutral - 4: Agree
- 5: Strongly Agree

1 - Team members regularly discussed how effectively they were collaborating to get the work accomplished.
2 - The team took the time to review its work outcomes, learning from both success and failure.
3 - If something went wrong with team processes or team dynamics, the team took the time to think it through and discuss it together.
4 - Team members regularly took the time to reflect on how they could improve and develop as a team.
TEAM APPROACH TO MERGER:

Please indicate your answer by choosing the appropriate code:
1: Strongly Disagree - 2: Disagree - 3: Uncertain/Neutral - 4: Agree - 5: Strongly Agree

1 - Team members truly believed in the prospects of the merger and were genuinely excited about the future.
2 - Team members trusted one another to be honest and fair when making decisions about how to combine the original parishes into one new community.
3 - All team members were role models for how to work together for the good of the newly formed parish community.
4 - The Core Team routinely engaged and communicated well with the parish community members throughout the merger process.
5 - I was pleased with the way this team worked together to accomplish its work.
6 - I was satisfied with the outcomes accomplished by this team.

(team button will appear here)

TEAM EXPERIENCE ASSESSMENT:

1 - Please indicate your satisfaction with your experience working on this team by using the following scale:

- I would definitely agree to work with this team again.
- I would consider working with this team again.
- I am uncertain about whether I would or would not work with this team again.
- I would probably not agree to working with this team again.
- I would definitely not agree to work with this team again.

2 - What processes or strategies used by the team were the most helpful in accomplishing the team's tasks and goals?

...

3 - What did the team leader do that was most helpful to the team's success?

...

4 - What do you wish the team had done differently in order to make the team experience better?

...

5 - What was the most important thing you learned from your experience working on this team?
Thank you page: Edit Thank-You Page of Survey

Thank you for completing this survey. Your cooperation and participation in this study is sincerely appreciated. The valuable insights learned from your team experience may contribute to the success of future teams engaged in similar experiences.

GENERATE THE SURVEY
Diocesan Merger Review Committee Survey for the Core Team Led By ____________________
(Convener Name)

Based on the materials (checklists, documents, etc.) that you have received from this Merger Core Team, together with what you know from any interactions you have had with the team during its merger preparation process, please rate the following items based on the scales provided.

Part A: Merger Tasks

1=Unprepared   2=Somewhat unprepared   3=Uncertain   4=Somewhat prepared   5=Very prepared

How well prepared is the Core Team for the parish merger in the following areas:

1. Laying the Foundation for Worship
2. Laying the Foundation for Pastoral Ministries
3. Pastoral Planning
4. Care of Temporal Goods
5. Canonical and Civil Issues

Part B: Merger Processes

1=Very poorly   2=Somewhat poorly   3=Uncertain   4=Somewhat well   5=Very well

6. How well did this Core Team work together to prepare to establish the new parish?

7. How well did this Core Team engage and communicate with the parish community members of the merging parishes throughout the merger process?

8. How well did the Team Leader (Convener) create an atmosphere of cooperation and collaboration within this Core Team?