

AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF TEAM PERFORMANCE IN INDONESIA'S MULTINATIONAL FMCG COMPANY: MODERATING AND MEDIATING EFFECTS

Damar Aji Irawan*

International Business Management Program, Management Department, BINUS Business School Undergraduate Program, BINUS University

Richard Juan Yosepha

International Business Management Program, Management Department, BINUS Business School Undergraduate Program, BINUS University

Samuel Christian Lianto

International Business Management Program, Management Department, BINUS Business School Undergraduate Program, BINUS University

ABSTRACT

This research examines how Leader-Member Exchange Social Comparison (LMXSC) and Relative Perceived Organizational Support (RPOS) affect team performance. It also examines how hubristic pride plays a role in this process, with willingness to support the organization influencing team performance. In particular, this study used social comparison to bring together the theories of LMXSC and RPOS. It measured variables from previous studies, such as arrogance and willingness to support both social comparison applications. Therefore, this should provide new insight into the managerial applications of both theories when combined. This study used a cross-sectional method with 200 respondents from a multinational FMCG. The data was analyzed using structured equation modeling of partial least squares (SEM-PLS) and SmartPLS 4.0 software for data processing tools. The results showed that hubristic pride only moderates the positive impact of LMXSC on team performance and willingness to support. This study also found that RPOS positively impacts willingness to support and team performance only without hubristic pride. The results from this study indicate that LMXSC and RPOS relate to each other, significantly influencing individual and organizational settings, respectively. This research offers new evidence for the social comparison theory and highlights the importance of considering social and psychological factors in managing employees.

Keywords: Leader-Member Exchange Social Comparison, Relative Perceived Organizational Support, Hubristic Pride, Willingness to Support, Team Performance.

Received: 27th May 2024

Accepted: 8th January 2025

<https://doi.org/10.33736/ijbs.9547.2025>

* Corresponding author: International Business Management Program, Management Department, BINUS Business School Undergraduate Program, BINUS University, Jakarta, Indonesia, 11480, damar.irawan@binus.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

Indonesia's Fast-Moving Consumer Goods (FMCG) industry is one of the fastest developing industries in revenue among Southeast Asian countries, with 8.6% annual growth according to Kantar Worldpanel's research. The rapid development reflects high customer demands covering the entire international market, which uncovers opportunities for multinational FMCG companies in Indonesia. This phenomenon, coupled with growing competition from other companies, puts pressure on the managers and subordinates to perform. As a solution, many researchers have put their attention on navigating the complex dynamic relationships within companies, starting from team members and managers to the organization's effect on the end output mirrored by performance (Kim et al., 2022; Korman et al., 2023; Pan et al., 2021; Reizer et al., 2021; Tsachouridi & Nikandrou, 2019).

Early research has found that the support and relationships between leaders and team members, known as Leader-Member Exchange Social Comparisons (LMXSC), can lead to different individual advantages based on their performance (Korman et al., 2023). Further research has found that individual psychology and pride tendencies can lead to negative or positive repercussions as applied through the social comparison theory (Pan et al., 2021). Focusing on the social comparison theory, Tsachouridi and Nikandrou (2019) point out that Relative Perceived Organizational Support (RPOS), which reflects how much employees believe their organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being more than others, can also affect the willingness of employees to quit or support the organization. This empirical study looks at the factors that support team performance in this setting, focusing on the psychological and relational factors that affect how well and efficiently a team works. LMXSC and RPOS, two critical factors influencing team dynamics, are central to this study. This study also delves into the nuanced effects of hubristic pride on team and organizational dynamics, often having a negative connotation due to its association with conceit and overconfidence. Specifically, it examines how hubristic pride influences LMXSC and RPOS.

This study builds on earlier work about how hubristic pride affects leader-member exchange and team support (Korman et al., 2023), along with the new RPOS theory and its impact on employees' willingness to help (Tsachouridi & Nikandrou, 2019). The author also challenges the RPOS literature by arguing that there are adverse effects on RPOS through the personality trait theory of social comparison. As Korman and colleagues have proven in their study of hubristic pride's effect on LMXSC, the author argues that RPOS is also affected by the same type of pride. Since both LMXSC and RPOS are based on social comparison theory, hubristic pride should also be considered as a factor that can result from RPOS in certain people and situations, especially in team environments. It is critical to understand that hubristic pride as an emotion encourages actions meant to uphold one's social standing (Tracy et al., 2014). As a result, differences in RPOS can lead to similar effects on employees and their behaviors, like intimidation, not helping others, and undermining teammates—all to maintain their position in the organization. Crucially, the study proposes that the willingness of team members to support the organization is a key factor. This study uses employees' willingness to help as a key factor in measuring team performance, related to earlier research (Kim et al., 2022; Reizer et al., 2021). This research indicates that how willing team members are to return support they receive is essential for understanding how their

relationships with each other and their view of support from the organization can affect the team's overall performance. This exploration offers a deeper insight into the complex interplay of individual attitudes, interpersonal relationships, and organizational perceptions in shaping team success.

Preliminary research has yet to discuss the relationship between LMXSC and RPOS based on social comparison theory. Then, there is still limited discussion about employee behavior related to LMXSC and RPOS. Also, initial research has not looked at how LMXSC, influenced by the willingness to help or RPOS, is affected by hubristic pride, with team performance being the primary measure of this. This study is the first to combine these theories and measure their effects using clear performance metrics for the team. With the new insight provided by the combination of these factors, the author hopes to create new views, especially on employee behavior, so that management can increase the level of effectiveness of their human resources on multiple levels. This study aims to illuminate the complex relationship between team performance and employee management, particularly social exchange theory, in Indonesia's multinational FMCG industry. This knowledge will help HR specialists, team leaders, and employees navigate and improve their work environments to increase harmony and productivity.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

2.1. Leader-Member Exchange Social Comparison

The Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) theory, a pivotal factor in comprehending organizational leadership dynamics, has been instrumental in our understanding. With its focus on leader-subordinate relationships, LMX highlights the disparity in quality and its profound impact on organizational outcomes. While LMX has traditionally been explored individually, its implications reverberate across multiple levels, notably shaping the dynamics of team-centric enterprises (Schriesheim et al., 1998). LMX has showcased a plethora of beneficial impacts on organizations, enhancing OCB, job attitudes, and performance (Dulebohn et al., 2012; Gerstner & Day, 1997; Ilies et al., 2007). More studies have examined how LMX (Leader-Member Exchange) works in groups by focusing on differences in the quality of relationships within those groups (Erdogan & Bauer, 2010; Liden et al., 2006). This research provides helpful information about the LMX theory in a clear and detailed way, showing how complex interactions happen in organizations when LMX is involved. The results of LMX differentiation can vary and are hard to predict. There are reasons why the effects can be good or bad, and research has shown mixed results (Liden et al., 2006; Anand et al., 2015). Therefore, using social comparison theory is essential to understand why there are different results (Matta & Dyne, 2020).

Recent studies have provided empirical support for the role of social comparison in LMX relationships. For example, Afshan et al. (2021) conducted a study examining the influence of LMX relationships on employee performance outside the scope of social exchange. The authors concluded that in the LMX-performance relationship, LMXSC plays a vital role in validating or invalidating an employee's attained self-esteem based on their relationship with their supervisors. The research pointed out that negative LMXSC will subsequently decrease performance since employees feel less appreciated and vice versa. Additional research has found that LMXSC, along

with feelings of envy and pride, can either harm or help group performance instead of individual performance. The argument shows that how people view their LMX relationships compared to others is essential in influencing attitudes and behaviors in the workplace (Pan et al., 2021).

The quality of Leader-Member Exchange Social Comparisons (LMXSC) becomes even more critical when incorporated into the paradigm that Kim et al. (2022) propose. When constructive, these social comparisons can improve team members' perceptions of their contributions and worth (Suls et al., 2002). As a result, the team's confidence in its abilities is strengthened by peers, leadership support, and each member's awareness of their contribution and function to the group. According to Van Dun and Wilderom (2021), this all-encompassing strategy emphasizes fostering positive peer relationships and leader-member ties to maximize team performance in dynamic environments such as international FMCG corporations. Preliminary research has proven that LMXSC does improve an employee's perspective of self-worth and contributions. These studies have given the underlying foundation for applying LMXSC in organizations. However, there is a lack of research regarding the effect of LMXSC when willingness to support is considered. This study also fills the gap by using quantifiable outcomes, such as team performance, to delve into the managerial application of LMXSC.

2.2. Relative Perceived Organizational Support

The principle of causality, or the law of cause and effect, relates to all aspects of human existence, including the workplace. Workers believe they should receive support from the company commensurate with their contributions. As a result, they will evaluate their perceived level of support. This assessment serves as the foundation for Perceived Organizational Support (POS). POS is a company's appreciation of employees' performance (Eisenberger et al., 2002; Colakoglu et al., 2010). POS will be influenced by numerous characteristics of the organization's treatment of employees, as well as employees' interpretations of the organizational objectives that underpin this treatment. POS is thought to strengthen an employee's affective attachment to the organization and their belief that increased job effort would be rewarded (Eisenberger, 1986). Relative Perceived Organizational Support (RPOS) reflects individuals' perceptions of the level of support they receive from their organization relative to their peers. This RPOS stems from the tendency of employees to compare themselves with each other regarding the support provided by the organization, which follows social comparison theory (Tsachouridi & Nikandrou, 2019). Social comparison influences employees' self-evaluation and self-improvement. Employees are predisposed to create social comparisons in their organizations, which is encouraged by the fact that they receive knowledge for material from social comparisons both purposefully and accidentally (Greenberg et al., 2007).

RPOS enhances comprehension of differentiation in organizational contexts. RPOS expands on the dyadic understanding of POS, implying that other employees significantly shape a dedicated employee's perceptions of POS. This statement aligns with the assertions made by Eisenberger et al. (2004), which emphasize the significance of the social comparison process in the development of POS. The author utilizes RPOS to examine the impact of the social comparison process on the formation of POS and the subsequent reactions from employees. The RPOS establishes a connection between the role of social comparison in leadership therapy and the POS by incorporating it into organizational treatment (Tsachouridi & Nikandrou, 2019).

Previous research integrated social comparison theory and POS, giving rise to RPOS (Tsachouridi & Nikandrou, 2019). This study demonstrates that RPOS is a precursor to POS. Additionally, Tsachouridi and Nikandrou (2019) show that RPOS leads employees to perceive their organization as more helpful, thereby initiating reciprocation processes on their part. Nevertheless, our literature review findings revealed a scarcity of studies on this subject. Thus, the author introduced the concept of RPOS in this study to acquire novel insights that can advance future understanding.

2.3. Moderating Role of Hubristic Pride

Based on Tracy and Robins' (2007) theoretical foundation, there are two opposing sides of pride, which revolve around whether pride is achieved from genuine achievements and contributions or rather from an aggrandized self-view obtained from narcissism and excessive self-focus. Unlike authentic pride, its positively correlated facet, hubristic pride, has been understood to promote social undermining in team settings. From an emotional viewpoint, hubristic pride has evolved to accommodate social status maintenance (Tracy et al., 2014). People with hubristic pride believe they deserve power without earning it. They often act in dominating ways, like intimidation and claiming shared resources. In a work setting, this promotes social undermining, hindering and intimidating coworkers to maintain or achieve status (Duffy et al., 2002; Lee et al., 2016).

Preliminary research has shown the effects of hubristic pride in a work setting. Empirical studies have shown that hubristic pride elicits social undermining at work, which motivates negative coworker-directed behaviors (Korman et al., 2023). Notably, many psychological studies have shown that the two sides of envy—good and bad—have distinct effects on the actions of the person who feels envy (Lange et al., 2018a; Crusius & Lange, 2015). Further studies proved that hubristic pride is an underlying factor in malicious envy, which causes destructive behaviors toward the organization (Pan et al., 2021). Enviars with malicious envy make upward comparisons depending on the thought that the envied's position is undeserved and not obtained through proper effort and achievements. Hence, envious will engage in hostile behaviors toward the envied (i.e., pulling-down behavior), so the envied coworker will lose their superior status (van de Ven et al., 2009). The nature of hubristic pride supported these findings, suggesting that if it is not mitigated, it will initiate a lot of foreseeable negative impacts on an organization.

These preliminary studies have highlighted the opposing facet of hubristic pride but have not considered the possibility of positive outcomes in the short term. While it is undeniable that hubristic pride can lead to a toxic work environment over time, studies have yet to demonstrate how high hubristic pride employees may resort to appeasing their supervisors to uphold their status. This study hopes to fill the gaps by measuring the effects through a quantifiable outcome metric (team performance) in high-hubristic pride employees.

2.4. Mediating Role of Willingness to Support

Human resource management has an impact on the performance of a company, and this impact is felt directly by employees (Collins et al., 2005; Posada et al., 2017). Given the emergence of the direct effects, effective management is essential for achieving positive employee outcomes. Paying attention to employee outcomes has become increasingly popular. In this stream, HR does not

solely focus on organizational performance but instead focuses more on the impact that influences employee outcomes (Peccei & Van de Voorde, 2016). These employee outcomes include commitment, job satisfaction, intention to leave, effort, motivation, cooperation, organizational citizenship (Collins et al., 2005; Posada et al., 2017), and willingness to support (Tsachouridi & Nikandrou, 2019).

Based on preliminary studies, there is a correlation between a willingness to support and the social comparison theory, as demonstrated by Tsachouridi and Nikandrou (2019). When individuals perceive themselves as being superior to others, they are more inclined to exhibit behaviors that are advantageous for the organization (Spence et al., 2011). Employees may see differentiated treatment as an indication that they are in a more beneficial position (Tsachouridi & Nikandrou, 2019). Therefore, the way people are treated differently might impact their attitudes and behaviors by influencing their belief in their abilities and the reasons for their actions toward others (Henderson et al., 2008; Hu & Liden, 2013; Vidyarthi et al., 2010). However, previous studies on this topic have yet to discuss how falsely achieved pride affects the team dynamic. Falsely achieved pride can be destructive to the team's willingness to support due to the perceived unfairness of superiorly viewed peers, hence undoing all the advantageous behaviors for the organization.

2.5. Team Performance

For this research, preliminary studies describe teams as a recognizable group of two or more people who interact adaptively, dynamically, and interdependently, who have responsibilities or functions to perform, and who have shared aims or purposes. Teams work to achieve a set of tasks, highlighting efficacy and efficiency as a quantifiable outcome. Currently, there is a lack of present literature regarding the relationship between teamwork and team performance. Hence, it highlights that team performance solely reflects on the team's outcomes and not necessarily on how the team interacts (Salcinovic et al., 2022). Team performance happens when a group works towards a goal by using both individual skills and shared resources. This teamwork leads to creating products, providing services, and reaching goals. Though team members must understand the availability of shared resources and how to achieve their tasks through communication (Eman et al., 2023), team performance does not account for how that is completed. Therefore, organizations can use team performance as a quantifiable metric that directly reflects a team's output.

2.6. Relationship between LMXSC and Team Performance Mediated by Willingness to Support

Previous studies have pointed to the positive causation of LMX to team performance by means of peer mentoring (Kim et al., 2022). According to the study, effective peer mentorship inside the team is positively correlated with excellent LMX connections, which are defined by mutual respect and trust between leaders and team members. This collaboration will increase team potency, which is the group's overall confidence in its effectiveness and ability to succeed (Kozlowski & Ilgen, 2006). The author argues that increasing team potential will create a willingness to support the company, as shown in RPOS studies. Employees' confidence in succeeding and the frequency of successes they experience will enforce the idea of their importance to the organization. Moreover, the existence of social comparison in employees' work lives, coupled with better relationships with superiors, will create a sense of enthusiasm to give more to the company. Hence, the author proposes:

Hypothesis 1: LMXSC positively affects team performance with a willingness to support as an enhancing mediator.

2.7. Relationship between RPOS and Team Performance Mediated by Willingness to Support

Drawing from the recent study, the author proposes that RPOS affects team performance through the employees' willingness to support their organization and peers. Social comparison in organizational settings can have cognitive, affective, and behavioral outcomes (Goodman & Haisley, 2007; Spence et al., 2011). This social comparison makes employees compare themselves to others. When the comparison results say that employees feel more special than others, they will put more effort into their work. This effort leads to a willingness to support companies that value them compared to their peers. The author extends recent literature by adding team performance and proposes that this willingness impacts team performance.

Hypothesis 2: RPOS positively affects team performance with a willingness to support as an enhancing mediator.

2.8. Relationship between Hubristic Pride and the Effect of LMXSC and Team Performance Mediated by Willingness to Support

Recent empirical studies further develop hubristic pride by correlating it with downward social comparisons of LMX. Downward social comparisons in LMX occur when individuals with high LMXSC view employees with lower LMXSC as a status of self-worth and standings in a group setting (Vidyarthi et al., 2010). Even though high LMXSC can increase performance and citizenship in employees (Vidyarthi et al., 2010), the effect of hubristic pride can also have harmful effects when applied to downward and upward social comparison, specifically in individuals with high trait dominance (Korman et al., 2022) through negatively gossiping or sabotaging peers' work, to name a few (Matta & Van Dyne, 2020; Wert & Salovey, 2004). People with excessive pride in high-quality relationships with their leaders (LMXSC) may misbehave with employees who have weaker relationships with their leaders. Such action keeps their status and control in a team (Cheng et al., 2013; Korman et al., 2022). Similarly, individuals with low LMXSC tend to pull down their superior-compared peers to eliminate unjust superiority status. Employees with low LMXSC may be less willing to help their peers with high hubristic pride. However, those with high hubristic pride might use their power to push others to meet the organization's expectations. The author suggests that when a peer has a lot of hubristic pride, employees with low leader-member exchange social closeness (LMXSC) are likelier to feel malicious envy and act negatively. In contrast, employees with high LMXSC are likelier to display harmful behaviors and push others to complete their tasks to maintain their status and boost the team's performance.

Hypothesis 3: Hubristic Pride as a moderator enhances LMXSC's positive effect on Willingness to Support and Team Performance.

2.9. Relationship between Hubristic Pride and the Effect of RPOS and Team Performance Mediated by Willingness to Support

Social comparison theory is essential in social life as individuals build their self-image through social comparison (Corcoran et al., 2011; Greenberg et al., 2007; Wood, 1989). Individuals tend to compare, especially in an organizational setting, since employees automatically receive input

through informal conversations and interactions (Greenberg et al., 2007; Hu & Liden, 2013). This study challenges the RPOS literature by using the social comparison theory to suggest that the emotional mechanism (hubristic pride) present in LMXSC also works the other way around. Drawing from previous research, the author proposes that RPOS's effect on employees with high trait dominance should also include social undermining. Drawing on our arguments from hypotheses 1–3, social undermining in a teamwork setting due to hubristic pride should also affect RPOS, keeping people with low RPOS and vice versa.

For the same reason, hubristic pride aims to maintain status and may replicate its negatively correlated effects. As individuals with high RPOS keep improving and benefiting the organization, the author argues that there is a looping effect where individuals with low RPOS will remain low compared to those with lower RPOS. Hence, similarly to hypothesis 3, employees will coerce productive activities from their lower-compared peers to increase their overall team performance. ***Hypothesis 4:*** Hubristic Pride as a moderator enhances RPOS's positive effect on Willingness to Support and Team Performance.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Sample and Procedure

As one of the industries with a high level of competition and the highest growth, according to Kantar Worldpanel's research, the FMCG industry faces various challenges in managing its human resources to run effectively. The author collected data from multinational FMCG companies in Indonesia. In this study, there were 200 willing respondents with diverse backgrounds. Regarding the participants' gender, there were 113 male employees (56.50%) and 87 female employees (43.50%). The average age of participants in this study was 26.47 years. As for the positions that participated in this study, 153 respondents (76.50%) were staff, 28 respondents (14%) were supervisors, and 19 respondents (9.50%) were managers. The average length of work among participants in the company was 24.82 months. For the respondent's division, there are 54 respondents (27%) in Manufacturing, 53 respondents (26.50%) in Marketing, 33 respondents (16.50%) in Export, and 20 respondents (10%) in Human Resource Development, 17 respondents (8.50%) in R&I, 13 respondents (6.50%) in Accounting, and 10 respondents (5%) in Finance. All samples in this study are employees who work in one of the multinational FMCG companies in Indonesia, focusing on food and beverages, personal care, hygiene, and cleaning products. This study uses a cross-sectional time horizon. Data was collected by distributing online questionnaires through the company's internal system. We distributed the questionnaire for two months (March 2024 to April 2024). The authors used the structural equation modeling of partial least squares (SEM-PLS) analysis technique to process the data with SmartPLS 4.0 software.

3.2. Measures

Leader-member exchange social comparison (LMXSC) was measured using four items of scale developed by Vidyarthi et al. (2010). Responses to the instruments were provided on seven-point Likert scales ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Sample questions are "My

manager is more loyal to me compared to my coworkers" and "My manager enjoys my company more than he/she enjoys the company of other group members" (Cronbach alpha: 0.826).

Relative perceived organizational support (RPOS) was measured using four items of the Relative Perceived Organizational Support Scale developed by Tsachouridi and Nikandrou (2019). Responses to the measurement instruments were provided on seven-point Likert scales ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Sample questions are "Compared to my coworkers, I consider that my company shows more concern for me" and "Compared to my coworkers, I feel that my company considers more strongly my own goals and values" (Cronbach alpha: 0.785).

Hubristic Pride (HP) was measured using six scale items developed by Tracy & Robins (2007). Responses to the instruments were provided on seven-point Likert scales ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Sample questions are "I feel like I am conceited" and "I feel like I am egotistical" (Cronbach alpha: 0.846).

Willingness to support (WtS) was measured by adapting three scale items developed by Choi and Mai-Dalton (1999). The instruments were provided on seven-point Likert scales, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) (Cronbach alpha: 0.774).

Team performance (TP) was measured using five scale items adapted from the Thompson et al. (2009) scale. Responses to the measurement instruments were provided on seven-point Likert scales ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Sample questions are "Team members seemed attentive to what other team members were saying when they spoke" and "Team members willingly participated in all relevant aspects of the team" (Cronbach alpha: 0.848).

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Results

Before testing the hypothesis, several tests need to be conducted to assess the convergent and discriminant validity of the measurements. Cronbach alpha, composite reliability, and average variance extracted (AVE) are used to test the reliability and validity. The Cronbach alpha value must be greater than 0.5, and the composite reliability value must be greater than 0.7 to be considered reliable. In addition, the average variance extracted (AVE) value must be greater than 0.5.

Table 1: Reliability Test

Variable	Cronbach Alpha	Composite Reliability	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)
LMXSC	0.826	0.886	0.661
RPOS	0.785	0.861	0.607
HP	0.846	0.885	0.562
WtS	0.774	0.871	0.692
TP	0.848	0.891	0.622

Table 1 exhibits that all measurements' Cronbach alpha, composite reliability, and AVE value have met their required value, thus making it all valid and reliable. The next test is the inner model test. The inner model test uses the R-Square values.

Table 2: R Square

Variable	R-Square	Adjusted R-Square
WtS	0.621	0.612
TP	0.835	0.834

The data analysis shows that 62.1% of individual's willingness to support is affected by their relationship with their leaders and how they feel compared to others regarding support from the organization. Other factors not covered in this study influence the remaining 37.9%. Table 2 shows that 83.5% of team performance is affected by a willingness to support, leader-member exchange, social comparison, and relative perceived organizational support. Variables not used in this research impact the remaining 16.5%.

Table 3: Hypothesis testing

Hypotheses	Path	Path Coefficient	T-value	p-value	Decision
H1	LMXSC-WtS-TP	0.021	0.278	0.781	Not Supported
H2	RPOS-WtS-TP	0.272	2.969	0.003	Supported
H3	LMXSC x HP-WtS-TP	0.149	2.201	0.028	Supported
H4	RPOS x HP-WtS-TP	-0.033	0.502	0.611	Not Supported

Table 3 shows that Hypothesis 1 (H1), which stated that LMXSC affects team performance with willingness to support as a mediator, is not supported. A path coefficient value of 0.021, t-value of 0.278, and p-value of 0.781 all indicate a lack of support for H1. Hypothesis 2 (H2), which suggested RPOS affects team performance with willingness to support as a mediator, is supported with a path coefficient value of 0.272, t-value of 2.969, and p-value of 0.003. Hypothesis 3 (H3), which suggested hubristic pride moderates LMXSC's effect on willingness to support and team productivity, is supported with a path coefficient value of 0.149, t-value of 2.201, and p-value of 0.028. Hypothesis 4 (H4), which suggested hubristic pride moderates RPOS's effect on willingness to support and team productivity, is not supported with a path coefficient value of -0.033, t-value of 0.502, and p-value of 0.611.

Table 4: Q² Valuation

Variables	Q ²
Willingness to Support	0.570
Team Performance	0.702

The value of Q² for the Willingness to Support variable is $0.570 > 0.000$, meaning that this variable has predictive relevance. The value of Q² for the Team Performance variable is $0.578 > 0.000$, meaning that this variable has predictive relevance.

4.2. Discussions

Based on the results above, the study shows that Hypothesis 1 is unsupported. This indicates that Leader-Member Exchange Social Comparisons (LMXSC) do not significantly increase employees' willingness to positively support their organization and their respective team performance. This result denies the proposed idea that willingness to support is influenced by the socially compared levels of relationship between supervisors and their subordinates. On an individual level, LMXSC should have ramifications that exceed individual employees and affect team dynamics (Schriesheim et al., 1998). LMXSC also positively impacts team performance, affecting employees' self-esteem and perceived obligations (Yang et al., 2023). Our findings limit these previous studies by demonstrating that LMXSC alone does not merit changes in employees' willingness to support the organization. While it positively affects employees individually and how they interact with their teams, LMXSC does not significantly merit employees' beneficial behaviors for the organization. Furthermore, this finding supports previous studies which concluded that LMXSC motivates coworker-directed behaviors (Reizer et al., 2023), not organization-directed behaviors (i.e., destructive, beneficial), hence limiting the expected positive effects when taken to an organizational scope of metric, which is team performance as a whole.

Looking at the data processing results above, we find that Hypothesis 2 is supported. RPOS significantly increases employees' willingness to support the organization, along with positive team performance. These results support the hypothesis that has been proposed where RPOS positively influences team performance with willingness to support acting as a mediator. When employees perceive that the organization treats them more favorably than others, they engage in a self-enhancement process that fosters a sense of unity with their organization (Tsachouridi & Nikandrou, 2019). Furthermore, as proven by Avanzi et al. (2014), employees who experience a positive association with their business are more likely to feel a sense of identification with the organization and see it as being more supportive. There is a direct correlation between RPOS and the motivation of employees to support the organization. As a result, team performance improves since teams are more motivated to contribute and actively support the organization in the long term, significantly increasing their influence and showing appreciation for the organization's support.

Through the findings above, this study shows that Hypothesis 3 is supported. The results show that with hubristic pride, LMXSC significantly increased employees' willingness to support. Hubristic Pride also positively impacts LMXSC's effect on willingness to support and team performance.

Employees with high hubristic pride actively seek opportunities to gain or maintain superior status over their peers (Tracy et al., 2014). Such action can be done by withholding resources, intimidating coworkers, coercing peers to comply with their demands, or providing valuable material or social resources (Cheng et al., 2010). Subordinates with high hubristic pride will do anything to keep or take superior status with little empathy for others (Tracy et al., 2014, p. 303). Hence, in an organizational setting, high hubristic pride subordinates demonstrate a high willingness to support the organization. Their superior status discourages them from quitting their jobs to maintain their status. As shown in the results section, high hubristic pride subordinates also promote extra effort to fulfill obligations and please their supervisors. Therefore, they will satisfy the supervisor's request and tasks delegated to them by any means possible, such as utilizing and/or intimidating other employees for their benefit, increasing team performance.

Looking at the test results from Table 3, we find that Hypothesis 4 is unsupported. These results indicate that with hubristic pride, RPOS does not significantly increase willingness to support and team performance. Hubristic pride influences usually are found on individual levels, while RPOS provides impact seen through an enormous team scope. Organizations that offer better treatment make employees believe that they have a strong relationship with the company, where this relationship is established directly between the employee and the company by comparing them with other employees (Tsachouridi & Nikandrou, 2019). However, this study points out that high-hubristic pride employees feel content with their status and undo the positive effect of RPOS. High hubristic pride and social undermining regresses and wrecks team dynamics, ruining any positive effects found through RPOS in organizations. Misplaced support from the organization further promotes low-achievement individuals and hinders proper rewards to those who earned it. Therefore, team morale is decreased, as reflected by willingness to support and quality team performance.

5. CONCLUSION

To conclude, this study examines how LMXSC and RPOS affect employees' willingness to support the organization with hubristic pride as a moderating factor. This study also investigates how willingness to support will impact team performance in Indonesia's multinational FMCG company. This study adds to research on social comparison theory by focusing on different parts of an organization and the factors that influence them from a social comparison perspective. On an individual level, personality traits such as hubristic pride and superior relationship status influence coworker-directed behavior. This study shows that this behavior benefits the company if viewed through a strict team performance valuation. On the contrary, this individual-level behavior does not alter the team performance without hubristic pride as an acting moderator. This study further supports the idea that the team's overall performance will not significantly increase if there is no supporting motivation for individuals to perform better, a phenomenon known as the effect of hubristic pride in achieving superior status. At the same time, in an organizational setting, different levels of relative support for the employees do influence and increase employees' willingness to support the organization. Employees who feel more supported than their peers have a higher POS and feel identified by the organization (Tsachouridi & Nikandrou, 2019). Hence, employees who feel supported will demonstrate beneficial behaviors and actions for the company and increase team performance. This study also shows that RPOS significantly affects employees' willingness

to support, but it does not apply to individuals with high hubristic pride. Employees with high hubristic pride feel that the company recognizes their superior status. In an organizational setting, those employees will not exert more effort due to the lack of demand from the organization, which is otherwise obtained from direct supervisors. This supports our previous finding, showing that hubristic pride motivates employees strictly on an individual level and does not act as a motivation on an organizational level.

This research offers a valuable perspective that the preliminary studies haven't addressed. This study adds to what has already been written about how LMXSC and RPOS can be used and what results can be expected in different parts of an organization. As previously discussed, LMXSC only affects employees and team performance through individual interactions. This further shows that LMXSC, especially when affected by hubristic pride, only impacts individual outcomes. Hence, organizations should apply this method when segmented tasks are present to achieve a unifying team outcome. On the contrary, RPOS is the opposite of LMXSC, affecting the team interactions as a whole and their long-term commitment to the organization (as reflected by the significant effect of willingness to support). Therefore, organizations should implement this approach when they anticipate improving team performance through shared collaborative tasks. This study does not contradict any preliminary studies on this topic. However, it provides a crucial perspective on when to apply these theories to achieve the desired outcomes outlined in the preliminary studies. This study also has its limitations. First, the conclusions of this research are solely relevant to multinational FMCG firms in Indonesia and may not be immediately applicable to other industries or countries. The research findings lack generalizability to other industries or different types of firms. The organizational culture in international FMCG companies may differ from that of local organizations or companies in other sectors. Furthermore, constraints on the size and features of the sample employed in the investigation may impact the external validity of the results. In addition, utilizing a sample from a single company or industry may diminish the population's diversity and restrict the results' applicability. There may be uncontrollable exogenous factors that can impact the link between the variables under investigation, such as fluctuations in market conditions or unforeseen corporate policies. This cross-sectional study also hinders the ability to effectively observe causality in the relationships between the variables evaluated throughout time. Further research could use a longitudinal approach to validate findings over some time. Finally, future studies should include socio-psychological metrics obtained from lower values of LMXSC, RPOS, and hubristic pride. Because the RPOS and LMXSC theories used in this study were new, more research is needed to verify the results and determine their FMCG industry applications.

REFERENCES

- Afshan, G., Serrano-Archimi, C., Landry, G., & Javed, U. (2022). Am I worthy to my leader? Role of leader-based self-esteem and social comparison in the LMX-performance relationship. *Human Systems Management, 41*(3), 341–356. <https://doi.org/10.3233/hsm-211226>
- Anand, S., Vidyarthi, P. R., & Park, H. P. (2015). LMX Differentiation: Understanding relational leadership at individual and group levels. In T. N. Bauer, & B. Erdogan (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of leader-member exchange* (pp. 263–293). New York: Oxford

University Press.

- Avanzi, L., Fraccaroli, F., Sarchielli, G., Ullrich, J., & Van Dick, R. (2014). Staying or leaving. *the International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management/International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 63(3), 272–289. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijppm-02-2013-0028>
- Cheng, J. T., Tracy, J. L., & Henrich, J. (2010). Pride, personality, and the evolutionary foundations of human social status. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 31(5), 334–347. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2010.02.004>
- Cheng, J. T., Tracy, J. L., Foulsham, T., Kingstone, A., & Henrich, J. (2013). Two ways to the top: Evidence that dominance and prestige are distinct yet viable avenues to social rank and influence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 104(1), 103–125. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030398>
- Colakoglu, U., Culha, O. & Atay, H. (2010). The effects of perceived organizational support on employees' affective outcome: Evidence from the hotel industry. *Tourism and Hospitality Management*, 16(1), 125–150.
- Collins, C., Ericksen, J., & Allen, M. (2005). Employee outcomes: Human resource management practices and firm performance in small businesses. *CAHRS Working Paper Series*.
- Corcoran, K., Crusius, J., & Mussweiler, T. (2011). Social comparison: Motives, standards, and mechanisms. In D. Chadee (Ed.), *Theories in social psychology* (pp. 119–139). Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Crusius, J., & Lange, J. (2014). What catches the envious eye? Attentional biases within malicious and benign envy. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 55, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2014.05.007>
- Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 13(1), 46–78. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(75\)90005-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(75)90005-7)
- Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D. C., & Pagon, M. (2002). Social undermining in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal/the Academy of Management Journal*, 45(2), 331–351. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3069350>
- Dulebohn, J. H., Bommer, W. H., Liden, R. C., Brouer, R. L., & Ferris, G. R. (2011). A Meta-Analysis of Antecedents and Consequences of Leader-Member Exchange. *Journal of Management*, 38(6), 1715–1759. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311415280>
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500–507. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500>
- Eisenberger, R., Jones, J.R., Aselage, J., & Sucharski, I.L. (2004). Perceived Organizational Support. In J.A.M. Coyle- Shapiro, L.M. Shore, M.S. Taylor, & L.E. Tetrick (Eds.), *The employment relationship: Examining psychological and contextual perspectives* (pp. 206–225). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Eisenberger, R., Shanock, L. R., & Wen, X. (2020). Perceived organizational support: Why caring

about employees counts. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 7(1), 101–124. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012119-044917>

- Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, F., Vandenberghe, C., Sucharski, I. L., & Rhoades, L. (2002). Perceived supervisor support: Contributions to perceived organizational support and employee retention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 565–573. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.3.565>
- Eman, G., Hernández, A., & González-Romá, V. (2024). Charismatic leadership, intra-team communication quality, and Team Performance: The role of average leadership perceptions and their homogeneity. *European Management Journal*, 42(5), 735-744. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2023.04.011>
- Erdogan, B., & Bauer, T. N. (2010). Differentiated leader–member exchanges: The buffering role of justice climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(6), 1104–1120. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020578>
- Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations*, 7(2), 117–140. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872675400700202>
- Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-Analytic review of leader–member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(6), 827–844. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.6.827>
- Goodman, P. S., & Haisley, E. (2007). Social comparison processes in an organizational context: New directions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 102(1), 109–125. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2006.10.005>
- Greenberg, J., Ashton-James, C. E., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2007). Social comparison processes in organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 102(1), 22–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2006.09.006>
- Hart, D., & Matsuba, M. K. (in press). The development of pride and moral life. In J. L. Tracy, R. W. Robins, & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *The self-conscious emotions: Theory and research*. New York: Guilford.
- Henderson, D. J., Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., Bommer, W. H., & Tetrick, L. E. (2008). Leader–member exchange, differentiation, and psychological contract fulfillment: A multilevel examination. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(6), 1208–1219. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012678>
- Hu, J., & Liden, R. C. (2012). Relative Leader–Member Exchange Within Team Contexts: How and when Social Comparison Impacts Individual Effectiveness. *Personnel Psychology*, 66(1), 127–172. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12008>
- Ilgen, D. R. (1999). Teams embedded in organizations: Some implications. *American Psychologist/the America Psychologist*, 54(2), 129–139. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.54.2.129>
- Ilies, R., Nahrgang, J. D., & Morgeson, F. P. (2007). Leader-member exchange and citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 269–277.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.269>

- Kim, T., Liden, R. C., Liu, Z., & Wu, B. (2022). The interplay of leader–member exchange and peer mentoring in teams on team performance via team potency. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 43(5), 932–945. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2590>
- Korman, B. A., Tröster, C., & Giessner, S. R. (2023). LMXSC Elicits Hubristic Pride and Social Undermining in Individuals with High Trait Dominance. *Journal of Management Studies*, 61(6), 2662–2693. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12983>
- Kozlowski, S. W. J., & Klein, K. J. (2000). A multilevel approach to theory and research in organizations: Contextual, temporal, and emergent processes. In K. J. Klein & S. W. J. Kozlowski (Eds.), *Multilevel theory, research, and methods in organizations: Foundations, extensions, and new directions* (pp. 3–90). Jossey-Bass/Wiley.
- Kozlowski, S. W., & Ilgen, D. R. (2006). Enhancing the effectiveness of work groups and teams. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 7(3), 77–124. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1529-1006.2006.00030.x>
- Lange, J., Weidman, A. C., & Crusius, J. (2018). The painful duality of envy: Evidence for an integrative theory and a meta-analysis on the relation of envy and schadenfreude. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 114(4), 572–598. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000118>
- Lee, K., Kim, E., Bhawe, D. P., & Duffy, M. K. (2016). Why victims of undermining at work become perpetrators of undermining: An integrative model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101(6), 915–924. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000092>
- Liden, R. C., Erdogan, B., Wayne, S. J., & Sparrowe, R. T. (2006). Leader-member exchange, differentiation, and task interdependence: implications for individual and group performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27(6), 723–746. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.409>
- Matta, F. K., & Van Dyne, L. (2020). Understanding the disparate behavioral consequences of LMX differentiation: the role of social comparison emotions. *Academy of Management Review*, 45(1), 154–180. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2016.0264>
- Matta, F. K., Dyne, L. V. (2020). Understanding the Disparate Behavioral Consequences of LMX Differentiation: The Role of Social Comparison Emotions. *Academy of Management Review*, 45(1). <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2016.0264>
- Mohammed, S., & Ringseis, E. (2001). Cognitive diversity and consensus in group decision making: the role of inputs, processes, and outcomes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 85(2), 310–335. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.2000.2943>
- Pan, J., Zheng, X., Xu, H., Li, J., & Lam, C. K. (2021). What if my coworker builds a better LMX? The roles of envy and coworker pride for the relationships of LMX social comparison with learning and undermining. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 42(9), 1144–1167. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2549>
- Peccei, R., & Van De Voorde, K. (2016). The application of the Multilevel Paradigm in human resource management–outcomes research: Taking stock and going forward. *Journal of*

- Management*, 45(2), 786–818. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316673720>
- Posada, M., Martín-Sierra, C., & Perez, E. (2017). Effort, satisfaction and outcomes in organisations. *JASSS*, 20(2), 9. <https://doi.org/10.18564/jasss.3418>
- Reizer, A., Schechter, O., & Ein-Dor, T. (2020). The effect of attachment diversity on team performance and the moderating role of perceived organizational support. *Applied Psychology*, 70(4), 1405–1434. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12280>
- Saavedra, R., Earley, P. C., & Van Dyne, L. (1993). Complex interdependence in task-performing groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(1), 61–72. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.1.61>
- Salas, E., DiazGranados, D., Klein, C., Burke, C. S., Stagl, K. C., Goodwin, G. F., & Halpin, S. M. (2008). Does team training improve team performance? A Meta-Analysis. *Human Factors*, 50(6), 903–933. <https://doi.org/10.1518/001872008x375009>
- Salas, E., Dickinson, T. L., Converse, S. A., & Tannenbaum, S. I. (1992). Toward an understanding of team performance and training. In R. W. Swezey & E. Salas (Eds.), *Teams: Their training and performance* (pp. 3–29). Ablex Publishing
- Salcinovic, B., Drew, M., Dijkstra, P. et al. Factors Influencing Team Performance: What Can Support Teams in High-Performance Sport Learn from Other Industries? A Systematic Scoping Review. *Sports Med - Open* 8, 25 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40798-021-00406-7>
- Schriesheim, Chester & Neider, L. & Scandura, Terri. (1998). Delegation and leader-member exchange: Main effects, moderators, and measurement issues. *Academy of Management Journal*. 41(3). 298-318. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256909>
- Spence, J. R., Ferris, D. L., Brown, D. J., & Heller, D. (2011). Understanding daily citizenship behaviors: A social comparison perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(4), 547–571. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.738>
- Suls, J., Martin, R., & Wheeler, L. (2002). Social comparison: why, with whom, and with what effect? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 11(5), 159–163. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.00191>
- Tannenbaum, S. I., Beard, R. L., & Salas, E. (1992). Chapter 5 Team Building and its Influence on Team Effectiveness: an Examination of Conceptual and Empirical Developments. *Advances in psychology*, 82. 117–153. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0166-4115\(08\)62601-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0166-4115(08)62601-1)
- Thompson, B. M., Levine, R. E., Kennedy, F., Naik, A. D., Foldes, C. A., Coverdale, J. H., Kelly, P. A., Parmelee, D., Richards, B. F., & Haidet, P. (2009). Evaluating the Quality of Learning-Team Processes in Medical Education: Development and validation of a new measure. *Academic Medicine*, 84(Supplement), S124–S127. <https://doi.org/10.1097/acm.0b013e3181b38b7a>
- Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2007). The psychological structure of pride: A tale of two facets. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92(3), 506–525. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.92.3.506>
- Tracy, J. L., Weidman, A. C., & Martens, J. P. (2014). Pride: The fundamental emotion of success,

- power, and status. In M. M. Tugade, M. N. Shiota, & L. D. Kirby (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Emotions* (pp. 294–310). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Tsachouridi, I., & Nikandrou, I. (2018). Integrating Social Comparisons into Perceived Organisational Support (POS): The Construct of Relative Perceived Organisational Support (RPOS) and its Relationship with POS, Identification and Employee Outcomes. *Applied Psychology*, 68(2), 276–310. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12161>
- Van de Ven, N., Zeelenberg, M., & Pieters, R. (2009). Leveling up and down: The experiences of benign and malicious envy. *Emotion*, 9(3), 419–429. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015669>
- Van Dun, D. H., & Wilderom, C. P. (2021). Improving high lean team performance through aligned behaviour-value patterns and coactive vicarious learning-by-doing. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 41(13), 65–99. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijopm-11-2020-0809>
- Vidyarthi, P. R., Liden, R. C., Anand, S., Erdogan, B., & Ghosh, S. (2010). Where do I stand? Examining the effects of leader–member exchange social comparison on employee work behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(5), 849–861. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020033>
- Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychological Review*, 92(4), 548–573. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295x.92.4.548>
- Wert, S. R., & Salovey, P. (2004). A social comparison account of gossip. *Review of General Psychology*, 8(2), 122–137. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.8.2.122>
- Wood, J. V. (1989). Theory and research concerning social comparisons of personal attributes. *Psychological Bulletin*, 106(2), 231–248. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.106.2.231>
- Yang, C., Chen, Y., Chen, A., & Ahmed, S. J. (2023). The integrated effects of leader–member exchange social comparison on job performance and OCB in the Chinese context. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1094509. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1094509>

APPENDIX

The items used to measure each of the constructs.

LMXSC (Vidyarthi et al., 2010)	
LM1	When my manager cannot make it to an important meeting, it is likely that s/he will ask me to fill in
LM2	The working relationship I have with my manager is more effective than the relationships most members of my group have with my manager
LM3	My manager is more loyal to me compared to my coworkers
LM4	My manager enjoys my company more than he/she enjoys the company of other group members
RPOS (Tsachouridi & Nikandrou, 2019)	
RP1	Compared to my coworkers I feel that my company considers more strongly my own goals and values
RP2	Compared to my coworkers I consider that my company shows more concern for me
RP3	Compared to my coworkers I consider that my company helps me more when I have a problem and I need help
RP4	Compared to my coworkers I consider that my company helps me more when I need a special favor
HUBRISTIC PRIDE (Tracy & Robins, 2007)	
HP1	I feel like I am arrogant
HP2	I feel like I am conceited
HP3	I feel like I am egotistical
HP4	I feel like I am smug
HP5	I feel like I am snobbish
HP6	I feel like I am stuck-up
WILLINGNESS TO SUPPORT (Tsachouridi & Nikandrou, 2019)	
WT1	If asked to do something to help the company, I would do this even if it might involve extra responsibility
WT2	If asked to do something to help the company, I would do this even if it might bring me some discomfort
WT3	If it was proposed a temporary pay-cut and benefit reduction from all employees, I would agree

TEAM PERFORMANCE (Thompson et al., 2009)	
TP1	Team members shared and received criticism without making it personal
TP2	My team actively elicited multiple points of view before deciding on a final answer
TP3	Team members willingly participated in all relevant aspects of the team.
TP4	Team members used feedback about individual or team performance to help the team be more effective.
TP5	Team members seemed attentive to what other team members were saying when they spoke