soft.fact

Team Design Manual

The Science Behind

March 2022

Abstract

The Team Design Model is a multidimensional, modular model for the representation of dynamics in teams. In the combination of personality traits, roles, values, motives, ways of working, ways of communicating, trust, mindfulness, communication, motivation, self-efficacy, learning, proactivity, responsibility, emotional intelligence, resilience, performance and work satisfaction; the model and the products based on it offer added value in the development of versatile team potentials. The model contributes to existing research in the field of team constellations and team development and is continuously optimised and specified on the basis of empirical data.

Main areas of application: New work, health, personnel psychology, personnel development, team development, team design

Target group: The target group of this manual are people interested in the underlying model of the soft.fact products. This document describes the products in detail as well as the scientific basis of the products, for which appropriate diagnostic expertise is assumed.

1. Introduction

Consciously bringing together the right people in a team is the basis for high-performing, satisfied teams. For time reasons or because the necessary information for a good team composition is lacking, teams are often put together solely on the basis of professional characteristics or time availability. However, the constellation "group" is more than the mere presence of others and individuals behave differently in groups than when they are alone (Allport, 1924, Rechtien, 2020). Teams are something different than individuals put together. This is why it is so important to take into account these group dynamics that arise in teams. Team Design by soft.fact is the optimal combination of the members of a team in the areas of personality, values, team roles, working methods and communication. Within a team, it is good to have diverse character traits in order to be able to illuminate tasks from as many points of view as possible (Wilde, 2009). In this way, a team can find the best solutions. Teams whose roles complement each other have the possibility to react well to many different situations. In contrast, regarding values, working methods and communication, similarity of team members is important. A team can act better as a unit if it is similar in its values, chooses a similar way of working depending on the tasks and communicates as consistently as possible.

2. Why We Do It

2.1 Team Intelligence

People join together in groups to better cope with the demands that life places on them. In teams, the individual skills of each team member are combined with the skills of the other team members. Collective intelligence is the ability of a group to solve complex problems (Greiser et al., 2020). Collective intelligence is not directly dependent on the intelligence of the individual team members, but is influenced by the emotional intelligence of the team members, their ability to trust each other, the emotional and psychological security in the team and the equal opportunity to contribute (Greiser et al., 2020). The Collective Intelligence of a team depends on how well the diversity of each team member is integrated into the team. Diversity is thus one of the key components of a team's collective intelligence. Collective intelligence can be activated by integrating the differences of each team member. According to a study by the Boston Consulting Group in cooperation with Awaris, mindfulness is one way to activate collective intelligence and thus team performance (Greiser et al., 2020). The study, conducted with 196 people in 31 teams, measured the performance of a team on four problem-solving tasks (Moral Reasoning, Creativity, Output Optimisation and Judgement), which are key aspects of collective intelligence. Mindfulness, and thus the ability to create awareness of self, others and the situation, was associated with a 13% increase in collective intelligence, according to Greiser et al. (2020). Since the ability of a team to solve complex problems together is crucial for achieving the

team goal, the increase in collective intelligence can be understood as an indication of the increase in team performance.

2.2 Performance and Satisfaction in the Team

The topics of job satisfaction and performance are red-hot, as an Oxford University study published earlier this year shows (Bellet, DeNeve & Ward, 2020).
According to the Dorsch Encyclopaedia of Psychology, correlations between job satisfaction and individual job performance reach mean values of .30 (Judge et al., 2001). In a study, Nerdinger et al. postulate that they expect correlations to be influenced by moderators (Nerdinger et al., 2019, p. 472). Possible moderators are the occupational group and the complexity of the tasks.
The importance of selecting team members whose value orientations are similar is essential for performance in a project. A 2019 study by Wu et al. found that team diversity is positively associated with performance in a project; however, moderated by task conflict and relationship conflict. The implications of the study emphasise the importance of a diverse composition of people to promote a healthy level of task conflict in teams, while keeping relationship conflict low by selecting teams whose value orientations are similar (Wu et al., 2019). We therefore conclude that value compatibility in teams and performance are positively correlated.
In examining the relationship between work team performance and team personality composition, different studies and meta-analyses conclude that the Big Five traits are appropriate measures for predicting work performance (Neuman, Wagner & Christiansen, 1999, Bell, 2007, Peeters, Van Tuijl, Rutte & Reymen, 2006, Prewett, Walvoord, Stilson, Rossi & Brannick, 2009, Prewett, Brown,

Goswami & Christiansen, 2018 among others). Based on an extensive literature review, we hypothesise a positive correlation between a team's personality compatibility and performance.

Each person fulfils different roles within a social dynamic. Roles are a way of perceiving oneself within a social context and thus a part of a person's social identity. If two or more team members are incompatible in their roles, this can lead to conflict and even be related to a personal crisis. Every role needs its counterpart (Rechtien, 2019). Building on these thoughts, we relate role compatibility in teams to the psychological well-being of team members and thus to the job satisfaction of team members. We postulate a positive correlation between a team's role compatibility and job satisfaction.

Since job satisfaction is positively correlated with performance (Judge et al., 2001), we conclude that because of the assumed relationship between role compatibility and job satisfaction, role compatibility and performance must also be positively correlated, since job satisfaction and performance have a medium positive correlation (Judge et al., 2001, Greif, 2019). Therefore, we postulate a positive correlation between role compatibility and performance.

There is little research on the compatibility of ways of working in teams. Nevertheless, it seems very important to us to investigate the relationship between the compatibility of ways of working and performance and we assume a positive correlation between the two variables.

2.3 Mindfulness and Psychological Safety in the Team

Mindfulness is the basic component of our psychological model at soft.fact and runs through the entire soft.fact experience for teams. Mindfulness is a translation

of the Pali term sati, which refers to the ability of the mind to dwell on something and be present with attention (Walach, 2020). Being mindful means looking closely and not judging, but accepting and accepting without judgement. Mindful understanding is the basis for mindful action. Mindful action means making conscious decisions while keeping the entire dynamics of the situation in mind.

Psychological safety at work is the belief that the work environment is safe enough to take interpersonal risks. Psychological safety is the certainty that team members will not suffer any disadvantage from being themselves, openly sharing their ideas, questions, concerns or mistakes. Team members feel comfortable enough in a psychologically safe team to be honest and open and to trust. This trust is based on the quality of interpersonal relationships in the team (Edmondson, 1999). Soft.fact enables teams to have mutual understanding and awareness of the interpersonal dynamics in the team and therefore forms the basis for Psychological Safety in the team.

3. How We Do It

3.1 Team Design Model

The Team Design Model is the scientific basis of all soft.fact products. The Team Design Model is built according to the logic of a structural equation model. As such, it is a confirmatory statistical procedure for analysing multivariate relationships of interval-scaled, polytomous ordinal and dichotomous variables and theory-based path models. In structural equation models, analytical

possibilities of different multivariate statistical procedures such as path analysis, regression analysis or factor analysis can be combined. This provides the possibility to test complex theory models on an empirical basis with regard to their data fit and to estimate the expressions of the specific path coefficients. A structural equation model consists of latent constructs or factors that are estimated by means of manifest variables. The relationship of the latent constructs to each other is represented with theoretically sound, specified correlations. The team design model specifies both the relationships of the manifest variables to the respective latent constructs in the sense of a measurement model, and the relationships between latent constructs in the sense of a structural model (Wirtz, 2020).

We refer to the model as a confirmatory structural equation model, as it represents the testing of theory-based paths in a first step. Hypotheses, which are set up on the basis of existing empirical findings, are tested. The team design model is seen as a dynamic model and is extended iteratively in a data-driven manner. In this way, it represents a model that continuously integrates new findings. The quality of the psychological-diagnostic instrument is thus constantly improved.

3.2 Quality Criteria

Objectivity

The objectivity of a test or questionnaire indicates the extent to which the test results are independent of the test user (Bortz & Döring, 2002). Objectivity can be

determined on the basis of three different steps of a scientific study: The implementation, the evaluation and the interpretation.

Implementation objectivity depends on the investigator and can be compromised by different types of implementation. The objectivity of implementation is guaranteed in all soft.fact questionnaires, as the standardised procedure is guaranteed by the platform and there is no human interference in the questionnaire flow by an investigator.

Objectivity of evaluation is given when the allocation of test points for certain test answers is not influenced by the person. The evaluation objectivity is given for all soft.fact questionnaires, since the numerical and categorical evaluation is determined by the algorithm according to the same system.

The objectivity of interpretation is guaranteed if no individual interpretations are included in the interpretation of the test score. The objectivity of interpretation is given in all soft.fact questionnaires, as the algorithm is oriented towards predefined comparative values, the systematics of which are determined in the questionnaire design and iteratively calibrated and adjusted on representative samples and serve as a benchmark for comparison (Bortz & Döring, 2002).

Reliability

Reliability describes the precision of a test. As such, it characterises the degree of accuracy with which the tested characteristic is measured (Bortz & Döring, 2002). Reliability is higher the smaller the error portion E associated with a measured value X is. Perfect reliability would mean that the test is able to capture the true value T without any measurement error E (X=T). The higher the error variance, the more measurement errors are included in the test values. Similarly, a low error

variance indicates high measurement accuracy. In general, reliability is defined as the proportion of true variance in the observed variance.

To test the reliability of our instrument, we plan to calculate internal consistency as a measure of reliability. This will be carried out and iteratively improved as soon as a reasonably sufficient amount of data is available. Internal consistency represents the mean correlation between all possible test halves. A typical criterion is Cronbach's alpha. Internal consistency leads to more stable estimates than split-half reliability, but is an extension of it. The reasoning behind this is that a test can be broken down not only into test halves, but into as many small parts as it has items. This logic treats each item as a parallel test. The correlation between items reflects the true variance. Thus, Cronbach's alpha formally corresponds to the mean test bisection reliability of a test for all possible test bisections. The level of the coefficient depends on the ratio of the sum of the individual item variances to the total variance of the test scale and its number of items. Since our questionnaires are supposed to capture the constructs as comprehensively as possible, the items that are supposed to load on the various factors sometimes differ greatly in content. We therefore plan to calculate internal consistency additionally in relation to the subscales of the individual factors.

Validity

Validity describes the validity of a test. The validity of a questionnaire indicates how well it is able to measure exactly what it claims to measure (Bortz & Döring, 2002). Validity is considered the most important quality criterion of a test. If good validity is given, sufficiently good reliability and sufficiently good objectivity are also assumed.

Content Validity

A scale is content-valid if an item really or sufficiently precisely depicts the construct to be measured (Bühner, 2011). Content validity is also referred to as face validity or logical validity. It is given when the content of the test items exhaustively captures the construct to be measured in its most important aspects. It is important for a given content validity that the population of test items that are potentially eligible for the operationalisation of a construct is precisely defined. The better the test items represent this population, the higher the content validity.

Content validity is based on subjective assessments and cannot be determined purely numerically. Strictly speaking, content validity is therefore not a test quality criterion, but rather a target that should be considered in the test construction and is an indication of its quality (Bortz & Döring, 2002).

Before data collection, all newly constructed and revised questionnaires of the Team Design Model are checked for content validity. For this purpose, all items undergo content assessment by experts who assess the extent to which each item can be collected representatively for the respective construct. For the evaluation of the expert assessment, we refer to the Content Validity Indicator (CVI), an index described by Polit, Beck and Owen (2007). All items used show at least sufficient suitability according to the Content Validity Indicator (CVI) procedure used, most items show excellent suitability and are thus content-valid for the constructs to be measured.

Construct Validity

Construct validity is of particular importance, since content validity is not an objectifiable parameter and criterion validity only makes sense with suitable external criteria.

A test is construct-valid if hypotheses can be derived from the target construct to be measured, which can be confirmed on the basis of the test scores. Instead of naming a single manifest external criterion, a network of hypotheses about the construct and its relations to other manifest and latent variables is formulated. The fact that test values turn out to be what the hypotheses derived from theory and empiricism suggest can be taken as an indication of the construct validity of a test. This procedure is only promising if only well validated instruments are used in addition to the questionnaire to be tested. Since we validate our entire instrument, this is difficult for us to comply with. We counteract this by formulating the hypotheses as tightly as possible and testing the logical network as such. The idea behind this is as follows: if an essential proportion of hypotheses proves to be verifiable, the probability that the instrument is good in its entirety is high.

In formulating the hypothesis, we consider the three different perspectives of construct validity and survey (1) the correlation between tests that capture similar constructs (convergent validity), (2) the correlation between tests that capture dissimilar constructs (divergent validity) and (3) the structure of the test (factorial validity).

Criterion Validity

Criterion validity is fulfilled if the result of a test measuring a latent characteristic or construct (e.g. occupational aptitude) corresponds to measurements of a corresponding manifest characteristic or criterion (e.g. occupational success). Criterion validity is defined as the correlation between the test scores and the criterion scores of a sample.

3. What We Do

3.1 Personality

Definition: Personality is understood as the totality of all temporally stable characteristics that can be used to describe a person's experience and behaviour (Asendorpf, 2020).

Model: The model for describing personality is the Big Five model (also: OCEAN model, five-factor model). The model describes a person's personality by means of five dimensions (Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness and Negative Emotionality). Emotional stability is often used in parallel with negative emotionality. Each of the five dimensions can be subdivided into 3 facets, which is why the BFI-2 consists of a total of 15 facets (Openness: Curiosity, Aesthetic Sensibility, Resourcefulness; Conscientiousness: Orderliness, Diligence, Reliability; Extraversion: Sociability, Assertiveness, Energy; Agreeableness: Compassion, Politeness, Trust and Negative Emotionality: Anxiousness, Dejection, Inconsistency).

We use the Big Five Inventory 2 (BFI-2) to assess personality. The BFI-2 is a five-factor model widely used in psychology and has been repeatedly scientifically validated (Soto & John, 2017). The English questions are based on the second version of the Big Five Inventory (Soto & John, 2017). The German questions are based on the translation by Danner et al. 2006.

Measures: The questionnaire measures the construct *personality* by stating short, descriptive phrases, so called items, that respondents rate on a 5-point unipolar likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree* and calculating the mean of each domain.

3.2 Roles

Definition: Derived from the French word "rôle", which refers to the role of an actor in theatre, Driskell et al. (2017) define the role that a team member takes on as an internalised, enduring repertoire of behaviours. According to Driskell et al. (2017), roles in the team are important because they represent patterns of behaviour that are linked to the behaviour of other team members. They are also related to the achievement of the team goal (Driskell, Burke & Salas, 2017) and thus to team performance.

Model: Driskell et al. postulate that the models of a wide variety of researchers only use different names for similar role dimensions. For this reason, they developed the TRIAD model, with which they compare team roles by means of a cluster analysis and identify common role dimensions. These role dimensions combine similar role names from different role models and are called Core Roles. In total, the analysis by Driskell et al. provides for a role model with 13 roles. Currently, soft.fact uses 9 of the 13 roles, as the socially undesirable roles have not

yet been integrated in the current version. With the even clearer conversion of role attributions to role tendencies, soft.fact wants to show all aspects of role tendencies in the team and support the team in dealing with them in a mindful way. The complete integration of all 13 roles is planned for the near future.

To predict a person's role tendencies, we use the Big Five Inventory 2 (BFI-2). The BFI-2 is a five-factor model widely used in psychology and has been repeatedly confirmed scientifically (Soto & John, 2017). The English questions are based on the second version of the Big Five Inventory (Soto & John, 2017). The German questions are based on the translation by Danner et al. 2006.

Measures: The questionnaire measures the construct *role* by using the personality items and calculating a model fit.

3.3 Values

Definition: A value describes what a person considers desirable and worthwhile for themselves and others (Kluckhohn, 1951). Values guide people's behaviour and form the basis of decisions (Frey, 2016). According to the Dorsch Lexikon der Psychologie (2020), values are defined as an explicit or implicit conception of desirability characteristic of an individual or group that influences choices among available modes, means and goals of action. Values are often defined more as a measure than as a good. Values of a person or group thus influence which goals and means are perceived as good or bad by a person or group. A person's values thus influence the decision-making and behaviour of the individual and the group. A team is facilitated to work together if the members prioritise similar value concepts. In some constellations, values can lead to conflicts and prevent successful cooperation.

Model: The construct currently used to describe value characteristics is based on Graves (1974). Graves' model offers soft.fact the possibility to show the strength of the expressions in the following value categories: Family Values, Self-Centred Values, Socio-Structural Values, Strategic Values, Communal Values, Systemic Values, Holistic Values. soft.fact is currently statistically testing whether a stronger approximation of the model to capture a person's motivational structure and value system is possible. The textbook Psychology of Values (Frey, 2016) provides indications of the proximity of the concepts of values and motives.

Measures: The questionnaire measures the construct *values* by stating short, descriptive phrases that respondents rate on a 5-point unipolar likert scale ranging from *not at all* to *absolutely important* and calculating the mean of each domain.

3.4 Way of Working

Definition: According to the Duden dictionary, working methods are the way of working.

Model: Currently, the desired way of interacting, the preferred focus working hours and the skills of a person are recorded. By making a person aware of his or her way of working and the way his or her team members work, we enable teams to design a way of working that suits them as a team and supports them in their satisfaction and promotes their performance.

Measures: The questionnaire measures the construct *way of working* by stating short, descriptive phrases which are opposing each other that respondents rate on a 7-point bipolar likert scale, both poles stating *absolutely* and calculating the mean of each domain.

3.5 Motives

Definition: Motivation and motive are both based on the Latin term movere, which means to move. It is therefore a question of what factors lead a person to move in a certain direction or to change his or her situation.

According to the Dorsch Lexikon der Psychologie (Dorsch Dictionary of Psychology), motivation is understood to be processes that involve setting and evaluating goals. A person's motivation determines which goals a person wants to strive for and which criteria they follow in doing so (Achtziger, 2019). The latent evaluative disposition for goals and situation characteristics that lead to the expectation of goal achievement or goal failure is regarded as a motive. Motives refer to content classes of goals. Motives can be understood as organism-side determinants of motivation and thus as internal causes of behaviour (Puca, 2019). In determining motive structures, we are concerned with capturing and reflecting back a person's inner driving factors. It is therefore about the inner cause of behaviour, about the determinant of motivation, which is to be found on the organism side - i.e. in the person. The aim of recording a person's motivational structure is to divide his or her driving factors into categories in order to promote his or her understanding of what drives him or her and to activate his or her driving factors with concrete recommendations for action.

Model: The soft.fact Motivational Structures Questionnaire (sfQMS) is based on basic literature on motivation and motives (Atkinson, 1964, McClelland, 1985). The MMQMS expands on motive structures as captured in existing motive structure questionnaires such as the Insights MDI, the REISS Motivation Questionnaire and the Motivation Sources Inventory (Barbuto & Scholl, 1998). The total of 16 derived

motives are the categories that seem to make the most sense in terms of cumulative science, with which a person's motive structure can be captured in the best possible way.

Measures: The questionnaire measures the construct *motive structure* by stating short, descriptive phrases, that respondents rate on a 5-point unipolar likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree* and calculating the mean of each domain.

3.6 Trust

Definition: Trust describes a specific relationship quality between a trust giver and a trust object. Trust is defined in many different ways, but what they all have in common is that trust is an advance performance on the part of the trust giver associated with a positive expectation of the future. Trust implies taking individual or collective risks, as trust can be linked to negative consequences (Clases, 2020).

Model: The soft.fact Trust Questionnaire (sfTQ) measures trust with the criteria prior experience with trust, honesty and openness.

Measures: The questionnaire measures the construct *trust* by stating short, descriptive phrases that respondents rate on a 5-point unipolar likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree* and calculating the mean of each domain.

3.7 Communication

Definition: Communication refers to a process in which an individual or a group conveys information about ideas, feelings and intentions to another individual or group. Communication goes beyond the mere transmission of a message; in

addition to the exchange of information, motivational, emotional and social aspects are significant (Bierhoff, 2020).

Model: The soft.fact Communication Questionnaire (sfCQ) measures communication with the criteria communication structure, information content and communication style. Items of the criterion communication structure can be subdivided in terms of content into task clarity, goal clarity, conversation management, time planning and conversation focus. Items of the criterion information content can be subdivided into richness of ideas, parts of speech and level of detail. Items of the criterion communication style can be subdivided into directness and appreciation.

Measures: The questionnaire measures the construct *communication* by stating short, descriptive phrases that respondents rate on a 5-point unipolar likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree* and calculating the mean of each domain.

3.8 Mindfulness

Definition: Mindfulness is a translation of the Pali term sati, which refers to the ability of the mind to stay with something and to be present with attention (Walach, 2020).

Model: The soft.fact Mindfulness Questionnaire (sfMindQ) measures mindfulness with the criteria of pausing, becoming aware, attitude and focus. Items of the criterion pausing can be subdivided into finding support and stepping back and observing. Items of the criterion becoming aware can be divided into body, mind, emotion and experienced situation. Items of the criterion Attitude can be divided

into Appreciation, Kindness and Acceptance. Items of the criterion Focus can be divided into Focused Attention and Freedom of Choice.

Measures: The questionnaire measures the construct *mindfulness* by stating short, descriptive phrases that respondents rate on a 5-point unipolar likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree* and calculating the mean of each domain.

3.9 Motivation

Definition: The term "motivation" means movere in Latin, to move. Motivation describes processes that involve setting and evaluating goals (Achtziger, 2020).

Model: The soft.fact Motivation Questionnaire (sfMotQ) captures motivation with the criteria Activating Motivation, Directed Motivation and Sustained Motivation. By activating motivation we mean a proactive need to change the current state. By Directed Motivation we understand the idea of a goal that embodies a value. By Sustained Motivation we mean persistent and anticipatory actions in pursuit of the goal.

Measures: The questionnaire measures the construct *motivation* by stating short, descriptive phrases that respondents rate on a 5-point unipolar likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree* and calculating the mean of each domain.

3.10 Self-Efficacy

Definition: Efficacy beliefs or self-efficacy beliefs serve to assess one's own possibility of being able to realise measures to cause consequences. Accordingly,

the self-efficacy expectation is the generalised conviction or specific expectation of achieving desired results with one's own behaviour (Heinecke-Müller, 2020).

Model: The soft.fact Self-Efficacy Questionnaire (sfSEQ) measures self-efficacy with the criteria competence awareness, action result conviction and dealing with adversity. By competence awareness we mean confidence in one's own competencies, which creates a feeling of security. By action-result conviction we mean the conviction that one's own behaviour produces the desired effect.
By dealing with adversity we mean confidence in one's own abilities to solve difficult situations well.

Measures: The questionnaire measures the construct *self-efficacy* by stating short, descriptive phrases that respondents rate on a 5-point unipolar likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree* and calculating the mean of each domain.

3.11 Learning

Definition: Learning potential describes a competence that is not only about the ability to learn, i.e. the ability to learn, but also about the desire to learn, i.e. the motivation to learn (Sarges, 2020).

Model: The soft.fact Learning Questionnaire (sfLQ) measures learning with the criteria learning ability and learning motivation.
By learning ability we mean the subjective conviction of being able to learn things. By learning motivation we mean the motivation to consciously and proactively approach one's own further development.

Measures: The questionnaire measures the construct *learning* by stating short, descriptive phrases that respondents rate on a 5-point unipolar likert scale

ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree* and calculating the mean of each domain.

3.12 Proactivity

Definition: Proactivity can be understood as a characteristic that includes identifying and acting on opportunities. Also characteristic of proactive behaviour is showing initiative and taking and maintaining action until meaningful change occurs (Crant, 1995).

Model: The soft.fact Proactivity Questionnaire (sfProQ) measures proactivity with the criteria intention to change, goal visualisation and becoming active.

By intention to change we mean the desire to improve. By goal visualisation we mean the broad view of action that directs the desire for improvement towards a concrete goal. By becoming active we mean the action that is triggered by the change intention and strives for an anticipated target state.

Measures: The questionnaire measures the construct *proactivity* by stating short, descriptive phrases that respondents rate on a 5-point unipolar likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree* and calculating the mean of each domain.

3.13 Responsibility

Definition: The Dorsch Lexikon für Psychologie does not define the term responsibility without the word "social". In the team context, we are primarily concerned with responsibility in relation to other people, which is why the definition of social responsibility is considered an important part of the construct. Social responsibility has both the aspect of supporting the well-being of others

and pursuing one's own goals without harming others in the process (Bierhoff, 2020).

Model: The soft.fact Responsibility Questionnaire (sfRespoQ) measures responsibility with the criteria acceptance of responsibility and leadership.
By acceptance of responsibility we understand the recognition of responsibility for one's own actions. By leadership we mean the ability to set the direction for oneself and others.

Measures: The questionnaire measures the construct *responsibility* by stating short, descriptive phrases that respondents rate on a 5-point unipolar likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree* and calculating the mean of each domain.

3.14 Emotional Intelligence

Definition: Emotional intelligence is the multidimensional ability to recognise feelings, to deal with and use feelings and to express feelings appropriately (Rindermann, 2020).

Model: The soft.fact Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire (sfEIQ) measures emotional intelligence with the criteria of emotion understanding and emotion integration. By emotion understanding we mean the awareness and understanding of intrapersonal and interpersonal emotions. By emotion integration we mean the competent handling of intrapersonal and interpersonal emotions.

Measures: The questionnaire measures the construct *emotional intelligence* by stating short, descriptive phrases that respondents rate on a 5-point unipolar

likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree* and calculating the mean of each domain.

3.15 Resilience

Definition: Resilience describes the resilience of an individual to develop successfully despite adverse and critical life events (Warner, 2020).

Model: The soft.fact Resilience Questionnaire (sfResiQ) measures resilience with the criteria strength and flexibility. Items of the strength criterion can be subdivided in terms of content into indomitability, determination, endurance and mental resilience. Items of the criterion flexibility can be subdivided into readiness to change, adaptability and cognitive vision.

By strength we understand the holistic strength in the face of adversity in life. By flexibility we mean the flexible willingness to change, which makes it possible to remain holistically healthy in the face of life's adversities.

Measures: The questionnaire measures the construct *resilience* by stating short, descriptive phrases that respondents rate on a 5-point unipolar likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree* and calculating the mean of each domain.

3.16 Performance

Definition: The Dorsch Lexicon of Psychology defines performance as the value created through the expenditure of energy. Psychologically, performance is the use of a person's available abilities as well as their result. The term "collective intelligence" is also closely interwoven with team performance and is described in

a study by the Boston Consulting Group and Awaris as "a group's ability to perform the wide variety of tasks required to reach a goal. (Greiser et al., 2020).

Model: In order to best map the performance of a team, we use the soft.fact Performance Questionnaire (sfPQ) to capture both the subjective assessment of individual performance and the subjective assessment of team performance. Both subjective and team performance are measured with items that capture efficiency, effectiveness, goal achievement, success, quality of results and general performance. In the medium term, we also plan to measure performance through a third-party assessment of the individual performance of team members as well as an objective performance measurement. In the long term, in addition to capturing individual and team performance, we are considering using performance measurement at the corporate level to ensure a holistic capture of performance.

Measures: The questionnaire measures the construct *performance* by stating short, descriptive phrases that respondents rate on a 5-point unipolar likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree* and calculating the mean of each domain.

3.17 Satisfaction at Work

Definition: The Dorsch Dictionary of Psychology defines job satisfaction as a positive emotional state resulting from the evaluation of one's job or experiences in one's job (Locke, 1976).

To best map job satisfaction in teams, we capture different facets of job satisfaction.

Model: The soft.fact Satisfaction Questionnaire (sfSQ) measures satisfaction with colleagues, leadership, communication in the team, work incentive, general work feeling and stress.

Measures: The questionnaire measures the construct *satisfaction at work* by stating short, descriptive phrases that respondents rate on a 5-point unipolar likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree* and calculating the mean of each domain.

4. Sources

Achtziger, A., Gollwitzer, P., Bergius , R., & Schmalt, H., & (2020, October 29). Motivation. In Dorsch Lexikon der Psychologie. Retrieved from: https://dorsch.hogrefe.com/stichwort/motivation

Allport, F. H. (1924). Social psychology. Boston: Mifflin.

Atkinson, W. (1964). An Introduction to Motivation. D. Van Nostrad Company: New Jersey

Asendorpf, J. (2020, September 03). Persönlichkeit. In Dorsch Lexikon der Psychologie. Retrieved from: https://dorsch.hogrefe.com/stichwort/persoenlichkeit

Barrick, M., Mount, M., Judge, T. (2001). Personality and Performance at the Beginning of the New Millennium: What Do We Know and Where Do We Go Next? International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9(1-2), 9-30.

Beierlein, C., Kovaleva, An. Zsuzsa, L., Kemper, C., Rammstadt, B. (2014). Eine Single-Item-Skala zur Erfassung der Allgemeinen Lebenszufriedenheit: Die Kurzskala Lebenszufriedenheit-1 (L-1). Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften.

Bell, S. (2007). Deep-level composition variables as predictors of team performance: A meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 92(3), 595-615.

Bierhoff, H. (2020, October 29). Kommunikation. In Dorsch Lexikon der Psychologie. Retrieved from: https://dorsch.hogrefe.com/stichwort/kommunikation

Bierhoff, H. (2020, October 29). soziale Verantwortung. In Dorsch Lexikon der Psychologie. Retrieved from: https://dorsch.hogrefe.com/stichwort/soziale-verantwortung

Barbuto, J., Scholl, R. (1998). Motivation Sources Inventory: Development and Validation of New Scales to Measure an Integrative Taxonomy of Motivation. Psychological Reports, 82, 1011-1022.

Bortz, J., Döring, N. (2002). Forschungsmethoden und Evaluation. Heidelberg: Springer Verlag.

Bühner, M. (2011). Einführung in die Test- und Fragebogenkonstruktion. PS Psychologie. München: Pearson Studium.

Buytendijk, F. J. (1956). Allgemeine Theorie der menschlichen Haltung und Bewegung. Berlin: Springer. doi

Clases, C. (2020, October 29). Vertrauen. In Dorsch Lexikon der Psychologie. Retrieved from: https://dorsch.hogrefe.com/stichwort/vertrauen

Crant, M. (1995). The Proactive Personality Scale and Objective Job Performance Among Real Estate Agents. Journal of Applied Psychology, 80(4), 532-537.

Danner, D., Rammstedt, B., Bluemke, M., Treiber, L., Berres, S., Soto, C. J., & John, O. P. (2016). Die deutsche version des big five inventory 2 (bfi-2).

Driskell, T., Driskell, J., Burke, C., Salas, E. (2017). Team Roles: A Review and Integration. Sage Publications

Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological Safety and Learning Behavior in Work Teams. Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 44, No. 2 (Jun., 1999), pp. 350-383

Frey, D. (2016). Psychologie der Werte. Springer Verlag: Berlin Heidelberg

Graves, C. W. (1974). Human nature prepares for a momentous leap. The futurist, 8(2), 72-85.

Greif, S. (2020, October 29). Arbeitszufriedenheit. In Dorsch Lexikon der Psychologie. Retrieved from: https://dorsch.hogrefe.com/stichwort/arbeitszufriedenheit

Greiser, C., Martini, J., Stephan, L., Tamdjidi, C. (2020) Tap Your Company's Collective Intelligence With Mindfulness. Boston Consulting Group x Awaris

Heinecke-Müller, M. (2020, October 29). Wirksamkeitsüberzeugungen, Selbstwirksamkeitsüberzeugungen. In Dorsch Lexikon der Psychologie. Retrieved from: https://dorsch.hogrefe.com/stichwort/wirksamkeitsueberzeugungen-selbstwirksamkeitsueberzeugungen

Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E. & Thoreson, C. J. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. Psychological Bulletin, 127, 376–407.

Kluckhohn, C. (1951). Values and value orientations in the theory of action. In: T. Parsons, & F. A. Shields (eds.), Toward a general theory of action (pp. 388–433). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kobau, R., Sniezek, J., Zack, M. M., Lucas, R. E., & Burns, A. (2010). Well-being assessment: An evaluation of well-being scales for public health and population estimates of well-being among US adults. Applied Psychology: Health and Well-being, 2(3), 272-297. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1758-0854.2010.01035.x

Kristof-Brown, A., Barrick, M., Stevens, C. (2005). When opposites attract: A multi-sample demonstration of complementary person-team fit on extraversion, Journal of Psychology, 73(4), 935-958.

Krohne, H. W. & Hock, M. (2007). Psychologische Diagnostik: Grundlagen und Anwendungsfelder. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Leistung (2020, October 29). In Dorsch Lexikon der Psychologie. Retrieved from: https://dorsch.hogrefe.com/stichwort/leistung

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette, Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (S. 1297–1349). Chicago: Rand McNally.

McClelland, D. (1985). How motives, skills, and values determine what people do. American Psychological Association 40(7), 812-825

Moosbrugger, H., Kelava, A. (2012). Testtheorie und Fragebogenkonstruktion. Springer.

Neuman, G. A., Wagner, S. H., & Christiansen, N. D. (1999). The relationship between work-team personality composition and the job performance of teams. Group & Organization Management, 24(1), 28-45.

Nerdinger, F. W., Blickle, G. & Schaper, N. (Hrsg.). (2019). Arbeits- und Organisationspsychologie (4. Aufl.). Heidelberg: Springer.

Peeters, M., Van Juijl, H., Rutte, C., Reymen, I. (2006). Personality and Team Performance: A Meta-Analysis. European Journal of Personality, 20, 377-396.

Polit, D., Beck, C., Owen, S. (2007). Is the CVI an Acceptable Indicator of Content Validity? Appraisal and Recommendations. Research in Nursing & Health.

Prewett, M., Brown, M., Goswami, A., Christiansen, N. (2018). Effects of Team Personality Composition on Member Performance: A Multilevel Perspective, Group & Organization Management, 43(2), 316-348.

Prewett, M., Walvoord, A., Stilson, F., Rossi, M., & Brannick, M. (2009). The team Personality–Team performance relationship revisited: The impact of criterion choice, pattern of workflow, and method of aggregation. Human Performance, 22, 273–296.

Puca, R. (2021, January 12). Motiv. In Dorsch Lexikon der Psychologie. Retrieved from: https://dorsch.hogrefe.com/stichwort/motiv

Rechtien, W. (2020, November 02). Gruppendynamik. In Dorsch Lexikon der Psychologie. Retrieved from: https://dorsch.hogrefe.com/stichwort/gruppendynamik

Rechtien, W. (2020, September 03). Gruppenrollen, Quasi-Rollen. In Dorsch Lexikon der Psychologie. Retrieved from: https://dorsch.hogrefe.com/stichwort/gruppenrollen-quasi-rollen

Rindermann, H. (2020, October 29). Intelligenz, emotionale. In Dorsch Lexikon der Psychologie. Retrieved from: https://dorsch.hogrefe.com/stichwort/intelligenz-emotionale

Sarges, W. (2020, October 29). Lernpotenzial. In Dorsch Lexikon der Psychologie. Retrieved from: https://dorsch.hogrefe.com/stichwort/lernpotenzial

Schwarzer, R. (1992). Self-efficacy in the adoption and maintenance of health behaviors: Theoretical approaches and a new model. In R. Schwarzer (Ed.), Self-efficacy: Thought control of action (pp. 217–243). Washington: Hemisphere.

Schwarzer, R. (2011). Health behavior change. In H. S. Friedman (Ed.), Oxford handbook of health psychology (pp. 591–611). New York: Oxford UP.

Schwarzer, R., Hamilton, K. (2020). Changing Behavior Using the Health Action Process Approach. In M. Hagger, L. Cameron, K. Hamilton, N. Hankonen, & T. Lintunen (Eds.), The Handbook of Behavior Change (Cambridge Handbooks in Psychology, pp. 89-103). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/9781108677318.007

Six, B. (2020, September 03). Werte. In Dorsch Lexikon der Psychologie. Retrieved from: https://dorsch.hogrefe.com/stichwort/werte

Soto, C. J., & John, O. P. (2017). The next Big Five Inventory (BFI-2): Developing and assessing a hierarchical model with 15 facets to enhance bandwidth, fidelity, and predictive power. Journal of personality and social psychology, 113(1), 117.

Walach, H. (2020, October 29). Achtsamkeit. In Dorsch Lexikon der Psychologie. Retrieved from: https://dorsch.hogrefe.com/stichwort/achtsamkeit

Warner, L. (2020, October 29). Resilienz. In Dorsch Lexikon der Psychologie. Retrieved from: https://dorsch.hogrefe.com/stichwort/resilienz

Wilde, D. J. (2008). Teamology: the construction and organization of effective teams.

Wirtz, M. (2020, November 02). Strukturgleichungsmodelle. In Dorsch Lexikon der Psychologie. Retrieved from: https://dorsch.hogrefe.com/stichwort/strukturgleichungsmodelle