Maintaining Team Productivity, Insight from Military Team Members: The Impacts of Team Psychological Safety, Team Leadership, Team Emotional Stability, and Team Hierarchical Structure

Tadd Morrison

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science in Psychology

Purdue University Global

01 February 2025

Abstract

This study examined the extent to which team psychological safety, leadership, emotional intelligence, and hierarchical structures maintain team performance for experienced team members. The research explored how these dynamic factors correlate with team experience levels and the impact on team productivity. A quantitative survey collected data on team psychological safety, leadership, emotional intelligence, and hierarchical structures from 334 participants with diverse experience levels. Statistical analyses included descriptive, Spearman's rank correlation, cross-tabulation, and chi-squared analysis using IBM SPSS. Leadership emerged as the top response for maintaining team performance. All factors were viewed as performance-enhancing. Responses to the impact of hierarchical structure on team performance had the greatest variation. Different levels of team experience significantly correlated with perceptions of team psychological safety, leadership, emotional intelligence, and hierarchical structure, with more experienced team members showing a stronger recognition of leadership's impact on team performance. These findings suggest that organizations should prioritize leadership development and team psychology safety for training and development programs. This research indicates how different organizational dynamics interact with team experience to influence team performance.

Keywords: leadership, team, psychological safety, emotional intelligence, and hierarchical structure.

Table of Contents

Literature Review

The significance of this study is in finding the link between gaps in existing literature and providing actionable insights for organizations needing to maintain consistent performance. Even though there is extensive research on teams and groups, inconsistencies remain regarding the impact on team performance from optimizing team psychological safety, team leadership style, team emotional intelligence, and team structures. By combining these diverse research components, my thesis aims to offer a more comprehensive understanding of these factors that sustain team performance. This will enhance existing theoretical knowledge and provide practical strategies for enabling high-performance teams. This research provides the organization with solutions to create stable and sustainable team performance by gathering impactful information from team members and their years of experience in the team environment. This study will provide the most effective measures for maintaining team performance with low or no-cost solutions.

Team and Group Environment

In organizational teams, there is often a complicated and dynamic social environment that all team members must navigate for the team to be stable and successful. Team behavior and performance emerge as a primary component of organizational success. This thesis aims to find the indicators of maintaining team performance by exploring the impacts of team psychological safety, leadership, emotional stability, and team structure variations.

The characteristics of teams are varied backgrounds, age, sex, experience, and skills. A variety of skills and experiences can be a source of innovation and adaptation to change; it can also challenge team coordination and agreement. The team's dynamics range beyond simple performance metrics of job satisfaction and motivation. Ineffective teams reduce the

organization's productivity, decrease personnel retention, and introduce undue stress on the team. High-performing teams maintain productivity through challenges. The significance of this study is to identify the team factors with a literature review and provide insight for organizational teams to maintain performance.

Although there is substantial research on team performance, discrepancies remain relative to the impacts and importance of psychological safety in teams, team leadership, team emotional intelligence, and team structure. In examining these research components, this thesis aims to present an understanding of the factors that maintain team performance. This approach presents theoretical knowledge combined with examining team members with at least five years of experience to present strategies for maintaining team performance and productivity for teams in various organizations. This literature review sent me on a journey that explores findings from comprehensive studies that sought to find factors influencing team stability and performance across various companies, industries, and sports teams to gain insight into the dynamics of maintaining performance in teams.

Leadership Style Impact on Teams

Leadership primarily consists of determining behaviors, directing strategies for actions, and influencing control over team dynamics to shape and set the foundation for team performance (Salcinovic, 2022). Ahmed et al. (2019) aimed to identify factors influencing team performance, such as leadership, organizational culture, team communication, and team dynamics, researching which components impact team performance in various organizational environments. The study analyzed existing literature, initially finding 11,734 articles for review, and 46 studies were selected for a systematic scoping review that discussed factors influencing team performance. They identified relevant articles, collected data, and analyzed content to find

common factors influencing team performance. The researchers' results indicated factors influencing team performance across industries and the potential for application in sports teams. Effective communication, leadership, cohesive teams, and a supportive organizational culture are suggestions where high-performing sports teams could institute effective practices. The authors did not find causal connections between these factors to elevate a sports team's performance. Still, they provided a starting point where high-performance sports teams can elevate team functioning and a path to follow to elevate performance.

Researchers Salcinovic et al. (2022) explored the factors influencing team function and performance across many industries, identifying the main variables that can influence practical application to high-performance sports teams. Their main variables are leadership styles, supportive team behavior, communication, and performance feedback. Leadership styles are the behaviors a leader utilizes to influence team interaction and productivity. Supportive team behavior is the ability of the team to predict and support each other. Communication is the quality of team interaction, and performance feedback is how feedback is used to elevate team performance. The authors performed a systematic scoping review of 46 empirical studies from January 2000 to November 2021 across many business sectors, sports, military, engineering, and education. Of the 46 studies, 25 percent examined the impact of leadership that displayed those leaders with elevated cognitive ability, personality characteristics of conscientiousness, and appeal that influenced team productivity. Teams with strong group communication, cohesion, and identity were highly effective in resolving conflict. Efficient communication was a key to team performance in sports teams, increasing player involvement. A few studies showed feedback on performance strengthened team culture and performance standards among team members. This research did not establish the cause between identified variables and

performance. Still, it may help focus my study on the influence of leadership styles and what the most influential leadership style is to maintain performance on teams with atypical turnover rates.

Psychological Safety in a Team Environment

Psychological safety in a team is described as the feeling that the team environment is safe, one in which to interact with a low risk of negative reactions or judgment (Edmondson, 1999). Psychological safety in teams is often shown as a strong contributing factor to team performance (Kundi & Shahid, 2023). This belief in psychological safety tends to be assumed and often not given consistent attention by individuals or the entire team. A psychologically safe environment gives team members a shared understanding to take risks, innovate, and admit errors. In innovative fields, such as research and development teams, longevity in the team is linked to how psychologically safe personnel perceive the team environment to be, and enduring team members have elevated organizational citizenship behavior due to safe interactions within the team (Liu & Keller, 2021). This helps innovative teams in the development environment take risks in advancing technology to innovate new outcomes and services. The increased performance results from the team sharing information with which to innovate (Liu & Keller, 2021).

Kim et al. (2020) researched how psychological safety impacts team performance. They did not find a direct link, but team safety is combined with elevating team learning behaviors and the desire to acquire appropriate skills; then, the group believes in the efficacy of performing assigned responsibilities, which elevates team performance. Their variables of team efficacy and learning behavior display how a psychologically safe team environment enables members to pursue the learning behaviors to excel and assess team members' ability to accomplish the right

objectives. The researchers utilized 282 teams with over 1,400 members of the workforce. It hypothesized that psychological safety in a team environment is a critical component of team performance. Psychological safety influences team performance by enabling team processes that are facilitated by learning behavior and team ability. The study utilized a quantitative research design; the researchers received 529 surveys from 282 teams with just over 1,400 employees in South Korea. The study's results did not indicate that psychological safety directly affected team effectiveness, but when facilitated by learning behavior and team efficacy, an effect was indicated. This indicates that psychological safety elevates team performance by positively influencing learning behavior and team efficacy.

The authors concluded that psychological safety is critical for team performance because a safe psychological team environment enables team members to contribute to group performance (Kim et al., 2020). They indicate that psychological safety is essential for creating an effective team environment that is conducive to learning and team efficacy, elevating performance. The authors showed empirical evidence for the contributing role of team learning behavior and efficacy in the relationship between team performance and psychological safety in the team environment. My study can build on this research by linking the relationship between the psychological stability of teams and finding how impactful psychological safety of the team environment regulates team stability and elevates or maintains team performance.

Liu & Keller (2021) explored psychological safety in research and development teams to find the impact on performance, team knowledge-sharing behavior, team social behavior, and the amount of team turnover. Their study’s participants comprised 320 team members and 80 team leaders from 36 organizations. They utilized modeling from their four hypotheses to see the impact of psychological safety conditions on varying aspects of team productivity. The authors

found that a psychologically safe team environment positively influences task performance and team knowledge sharing while also being connected to elevated levels of organizational citizenship behavior and reduced employee turnover. This highlights the importance of creating a team environment where members feel psychologically safe to voice ideas, ask hard questions, and take risks in discussions about complex problems without concerns of retribution. This shapes how to operationalize team environments. For this study, a central component is to research how this should be prioritized among experienced team members to find how team psychological safety is a pivotal factor in helping teams navigate complex organizational challenges.

Joint/Participative Team Decision-Making

When considering factors that influence team performance, specifically the connection between team decision-making, leader involvement, and team creativity, Kundi & Shahid's (2023) research centered on the psychological safety of teams, which was positively linked to team decision-making and team innovation. They showed the link between team psychological safety and joint decision-making and how this enables innovation. Leaders who utilize participative decision-making in creative, psychologically safe team environments allow team creativity and innovation. The higher the participative leadership elevated both psychological safety and joint team decision-making, the leadership with low participation increased, but it was just not as significant. The more team personnel participate in team decisions, the higher they believe in the psychological safety of the team environment. Joint, or participation, team decision-making is defined as sharing with hierarchical leaders and the subordinates in the team. The sample participants for their study are 540 team personnel from 75 teams in French companies. Of the companies, 22 were in technology, 18 in education, 18 in finance, and 17 in

communications. These teams had a leader who gave broad guidance but was responsible for overall team performance. Three hundred seventy-two questionnaires were received back: 44 percent from women and 56 percent from men, and just under 85 percent had a master's degree or higher education level. The authors showed that joint decision-making in a team enabled an innovative team environment.

Emotional Intelligence within Teams

Emotional intelligence (EI) is the personality trait that optimizes emotional balance to build team trust, regulates social interaction, elevates thinking, and maintains self-management of emotions, enabling team connection (Lee & Wong, 2019). Lee and Wong's (2019) research investigated the impact of team emotional intelligence on team processes, conflict, and the influences on team effectiveness and productivity. The main variables are team emotional intelligence, task conflicts, relationship conflicts, and team effectiveness. The research explored 79 teams, the average age of which was just under 35 years old, and almost 38 percent were female and 62 percent male. The average age of leaders was almost 45, with nearly 13 percent female and 87 percent male. The study utilized survey methods and administered questionnaires to team members. Leaders answered questions on performance and innovation, and team members' questions evaluated emotional intelligence, team cohesion, conflict, and connectivity. Team emotional intelligence was negatively connected to task conflict. Task and relationship conflicts both had a negative relationship to team performance. EI moderated the connection between task and relationship conflict, task conflict, and team performance. EI can potentially decrease the effects of task conflict and relationship conflict, increasing performance. This study assists my focus on how EI can increase team effectiveness and maintain performance. Team EI

can manage team disputes, elevating team effectiveness. By investing in team EI, organizational teams can improve cohesion, productivity, and innovation.

Shafique and Naz (2023) investigated the connection between EI and team performance, focusing on the mediating aspects of team trust and the moderating role of task independence. Their research covered 53 teams with 302 personnel and 55 leaders, 88 percent male, ages 25 to 55. Leaders were almost 75 percent male, with an average of 13 years in the role. The authors utilized survey methods with structured questionnaires. The major variables were team EI, performance, trust, and task interdependence. Their results showed that team EI directly connects to team performance and indirectly affects team trust. Task interdependence moderated the connection between team EI and team performance, and too much task interdependence decreased the positive effect. Team EI moderated the connection between task and relationship conflict. The cross-sectional design utilized limits explaining the cause between variables, but the study highlights factors that influence team performance of team EI, trust, and interdependence.

Team Hierarchical Structure, Team Size, and Team Composition

Team structure refers to the team's arrangement; longevity is the time team members have worked together; coordination is the process by which they interact and manage tasks, and performance is the effectiveness of achieving goals. Team composition is similar and describes the characteristics of members, the mix of ability, skill, and personalities, and how individuals work actions come together to enable team outcomes (Stewart, 2006). Team structure and form show how team members utilize and interact with individual knowledge to complete team goals for organizational objectives (Salcinovic et al., 2022).

Greg Stewart (2006) quantitatively reviewed the relationship between team design features and team performance. This synthesizes findings from 93 studies to determine how team design influences team effectiveness. The author's variables were aggregated member characteristics, such as team skills and abilities of team members. Team member diversity is demographics, expertise, and personalities. Team size is how many team members there are. Task meaningfulness is if the team task is considered purposeful. Team autonomy is the level of team independence in decision and management. Intrateam coordination is how well team processes and interactions synchronize efforts on the team. Leadership is explained as the guidance, influence, and collaboration leadership styles utilized. Aggregated member characteristics, team size, task meaningfulness, team autonomy, and collaborative leadership show positive relationships. Smaller team sizes showed a positive relationship. Aggregated member characteristic is the only variable with a significant relationship with team performance. This indicates that the most significant factor in maintaining or elevating team productivity is team members' skills and abilities. The strength of Stewart's (2006) research is that it provides a quantitative assessment from a large number of studies of the relationship between team design and factors that elevate performance. For my study, this research displays how team performance can be enhanced and at least maintained by focusing on member characteristics, meaningful tasks, autonomy, good intra-team dynamics, and utilizing collaborative leadership.

Gray et al. (2023) showed the stability of hierarchical systems. Structures in teams influence a team's ability to balance diverse knowledge efficiently and effectively. The primary variables are hierarchy stability, knowledge diversity, and team performance. Hierarchical stability is the clarity of hierarchical roles and responsibilities in the team through time. Knowledge diversity refers to the range of skills, knowledge, and expertise personnel bring to the

team. Team performance measures the team's effectiveness in achieving team and organizational goals. The study survey went out to 198 teams and collected responses from 170 teams across 122 organizations with 1,243 team member responses. They used three individual surveys: one leader survey and two team personnel surveys, in which every team member provided information on their perception of the work team stability of hierarchy, education level, jobs, demographics, their level of influence, and respect for team members. The team consisted of 13 different types of businesses, including finance, communications, education, governmental, service, manufacturing, and property sales. Just over a quarter of the organizations they studied employed under 20 personnel; just under 25 percent had 20 to 100 employees. Almost 30 percent had up to 500 employees, and just over 20 percent had over 500 employees. Teams averaged seven members, with an average employee tenure of just under five years and an average age of 42 years. Just over 50 percent are female, and almost 99 percent have a job or career qualification or higher. The main positive finding was that stability in the team hierarchy forecasted elevated information sharing. The study results displayed that stability within a team hierarchy allows a team to utilize its diverse knowledge, which elevates team performance potentially. This indicates that an organization should consider maintaining a clear and stable hierarchical structure to maximize potential knowledge within the teams. Focusing the study on how to maintain the stability of team hierarchy and balancing components of the skills, abilities, and knowledge among team members will provide a component of how my research will maintain performance and productivity. As discussed by Greg Stewart (2006), team hierarchy must be balanced with team autonomy and aggregated member characteristics, the team skills, and the abilities of team members.

The aim of Ji and Yan's (2020) research was to find how team structure elevates performance. They focused on the effects of team longevity and the mediating components of team coordination. The variables were team structure, longevity, coordination, and performance. The researchers describe team structure as the arrangement of the team, longevity as the time team members have worked together, coordination as the process by which they interact and manage tasks, and performance as the effectiveness of achieving goals. The research involved two independent field studies. The first study was on 56 engineering teams from 20 manufacturers with 242 team members. Study two comprised 67 work teams from many industries with 348 team members. The researchers used surveys to collect data on the variables. Ji and Yan (2020) distributed surveys to team leaders and members. The study involved correlation and observation mechanisms to compare relationships between variables. The results showed that team structure positively affects team performance by increasing team coordination. Their regression analysis found a significant relationship between team structure and team performance and showed that team longevity moderates the connection between team structure and team coordination.

Greer et al. (2018) conducted a meta-analysis to investigate the reasons and environment where hierarchy impacts team effectiveness. They linked different explanations for whether hierarchy helps or limits team effectiveness. The main variables are team hierarchy, team performance, team viability, conflict states, and coordination-enabling processes. They define hierarchy as the "vertical differences among members of socially valued resources" (Greer et al., 2018, p. 591). Team performance is how well a team achieves its objectives. Team viability is the ability of the members to remain members of the team. Conflict-enabling states are described as the inability to reconcile differences within the team. A coordination-enabling

process is the team behavior and approach utilized to unify team action, skills, and knowledge to achieve team goals. The authors compiled data from 54 studies across 13,914 teams among many different industries. The study used a meta-analytical approach, including studies with current teams analyzing tasks and reporting team completion metrics. Their meta-analysis indicated that team hierarchy diminishes team performance due to increases in team conflict-enabling conditions. Coordination-enabling process and conflict-enabling states both had negative impacts on team hierarchy and the effectiveness of the team. This study again shows the consequences: strict hierarchy structures can potentially elevate team conflict, limit resolution measures, and decrease team effectiveness. This influences my study methods, showing the dynamics of the hierarchical structure within teams and that organizational teams should consider horizontal and flat team structures that can elevate team effectiveness and maintain performance.

Summary and Research Question

In exploring how to maintain team productivity, I focused on the impacts of psychological safety, leadership styles, emotional intelligence, and team structure. Researchers Ahmed et al. (2019) found that the most influential factors for team performance across industries are team leadership style, effective communication, cohesive teams, and supportive organizational culture. Salcinovic et al. (2022) showed that leaders with elevated cognitive ability, personality characteristics of conscientiousness, and appeal influenced team productivity. Stewart's (2006) results show that team members' skills and abilities are the only variables showing a significant relationship with team performance.

Greer et al. (2023) found through meta-analysis that team hierarchy diminishes team performance from increases in team conflict-enabling conditions. Gray et al. (2023) results

displayed that stability within a team hierarchy allows a team to utilize its diverse knowledge, which elevates team performance potentially. Ji and Yan (2020) showed that team structure positively affects team performance by increasing team coordination, and team longevity moderates the connection between team structure and team coordination.

Kim et al. (2020) indicate that psychological safety increases team performance by positively influencing learning behavior and team efficacy. Kundi and Shahid (2023) showed the link between team psychological safety and team joint decision-making and how this enables team innovation. Liu and Keller (2021) discovered that a psychologically safe team environment positively influences task performance and team knowledge sharing while also being connected to elevated levels of organizational social behavior and reduced employee turnover. Team EI moderated the connection between task and relationship conflict and team performance (Lee & Wong, 2019). Shafique and Naz's (2023) results showed that team EI is directly connected to team performance and indirectly influences team trust.

The psychological safety of the team environment is a critical factor for team members' ability to interact effectively and exchange information to solve organizational problems. Leadership styles that effectively create and promote this environment have the necessary means with team formation to accomplish organizational objectives. Team emotional intelligence is an essential element, but I did not capture the significant details on how team EI accomplishes the resolution of moderating team members' task and relationship conflicts. There need to be measures to better indicate team EI skills and their abilities to resolve team conflict. To what extent does team psychological safety, leadership, team emotional intelligence, and team hierarchical structures maintain productivity in experienced teams?

Method

This study will identify the best factors from four variables to maintain team performance by surveying experienced team members. The primary variables under investigation are team psychology safety, team leadership, team emotional intelligence, and team hierarchical structures (see Appendix D and E). The aim is to understand team members' experience by categorizing how many years they have worked in a team setting (under 5 years, 5 to 10, 10 to 15, 15 to 20, 20 to 25, 25 to 30 years, and 30 years or more). My hypothesis focuses on four primary variables: team psychological safety, team leadership style, team emotional intelligence, and team hierarchical structure. The study will also consider the impact of team members' years of experience. Given the high annual turnover in the organization's environment, understanding the best influential team dynamics is essential for developing enduring strategies to elevate team stability and maintain organizational productivity.

Participants

The study participants are military, government civilians, and contractors. I do not plan to exclude any survey participants. The team experience level of participants is elevated within my organization; most likely, all personnel will have over ten years of team experience. If there is no significant difference in experience levels and participants' responses do not have more than ten years of experience, I will use the collected data to indicate the most influential factor for maintaining team performance. Personnel with different experience levels may respond differently to team dynamics that they believe are more relevant. This will be a relevant variable; team behavior theory has evolved over the last few decades; leaders have been responsible for team dynamics; new research has shown how important a stable team culture is, by investing in better team psychological safety and team emotional intelligence increases self-

efficacy and team member social interaction behaviors. Participants' demographics are similar to the demographics of the United States. The U. S. Military has over 30 percent minority groups compared to the overall U. S. Population demographics of 25 percent (Military One Source, 2022). African Americans represent over 20 percent of active-duty personnel and 14 percent of the U. S. population. Latino or Hispanics are almost 18 percent, and Asian Americans are five percent, which is very similar to their representation in the U. S. population. Women are only 18 percent of the military and just over 50 percent of the U. S. population. The expected age of my participants is 25 to 65 years old. The research will be announced in an online survey, and the participants will complete the survey through Survey Monkey. The primary sample population is 3,000 to obtain a 95% confidence level with a 5% margin of error, the sample size needs to be 341 (Survey Monkey, 2024).

Data Collection

All participants' responses will not have identifiable information to ensure anonymity and protect confidentiality. Data collected will be stored securely on Survey Monkey's password-protected system. The survey takes approximately five minutes to complete. Descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, and regression analysis will be conducted to examine connections and relationships between variables.

Ethical Considerations

Participants will be fully informed of the study's purpose, benefits, procedures, and potential risks. Participants will provide acknowledgment of consent before participating in the survey. Participation is completely voluntary, and personnel can withdraw from the study anytime. The survey is anonymous; I will utilize the SurveyMonkey function not to collect internet protocol addresses of the participants. I will get informed consent explaining the

purpose, length of the survey, and procedures (APA, 2017). The participants can decline and stop the survey at any time, with no concerns or consequences. There are no potential risks or discomfort involved in answering the survey.

Legal Considerations

The Institutional Review Board reviewed and approved the study to ensure successful ethical and legal compliance. The online format ensures that the study is accessible to participants with different preferences and access needs. The study will comply with data regulations and relevant federal and state laws on personally identifiable information. The organization's Staff Judge Advocate has authorized the study to be distributed on the online networks.

Individual / Socio-Cultural Considerations

Survey questions will be reviewed for culturally sensitive and appropriate content. The survey uses inclusive and respectful language that avoids assumptions or stereotypes about different groups. When authorized, there will be a pilot test with military participants from diverse experiences to identify potential issues in the employment and interpretation of the study. The online format will enable access to participants with different preferences and needs.

Procedures

The survey will be conducted online, utilizing Survey Monkey's services to enable a smooth and standardized data collection process. Participants will receive the survey link embedded at the bottom of the email with information regarding why participants are being asked to conduct the survey. The SurveyMonkey landing page for the survey link will state the purpose of the research, potential risks, discomforts, and potential benefits of taking part in the survey. Next, it will include a statement about privacy and confidentiality, a statement on how to

withdraw from the study, contact information if there are any questions, and the participants' rights as research participants with the Institutional Review Board name and contact email. I will identify and contact potential participants through email, provide the survey information described above and the survey link, and assure participants of the anonymity of their responses. The initial section of the survey will collect information on the participants' years of team experience. The survey I have created will elicit team members' experiences on the importance of team psychological safety, team leadership, team emotional intelligence, and team hierarchical structure, seeking responses on which is the most effective at enabling teams to maintain performance. Survey responses will be securely stored on Survey Monkey. Choosing the appropriate rating scale is essential in designing the survey, as rating scales can impact the data quality. A seven-point Likert scale was utilized in this survey for consistent validity and the ability to have a standard data collection mechanism to enable the variables to be compared against each other. The most common rating scales are the traditional rating scale (0,1,2,3,4) and the Likert scale, which usually uses 5 or 7 points. Recent research suggests that both a traditional scale and the Likert scale have around 90% reliability and validity (Darnton, 2023). Taherdost (2019) indicates that scale length has minimal impact on results, and Lozano et al. (2008) concluded that scales with seven options are optimal when centering on the criteria of reliability and validity. Likert-type formats are easier for participants and data retrieval.

The initial question defines what a team is and asks participants how many years of team experience they have (see Appendix D and E). The question has adequate face validity due to directly asking about the participant's years of team experience (Bordens, 2021), which is a key variable of the study. The participant's response options are under 5, 10 to 15, 15 to 20, 20 to 25, 25 to 30, and 30 plus years of team experience. The second question asks respondents how

important they consider psychological safety for maintaining team productivity. This question has good face validity due to directly asking about the perceived importance of psychological safety for team productivity and construct validity because it is designed to effectively obtain participants' attitudes or perceptions of the influence of psychological safety on maintaining team performance. Question four has good face and content validity as it directly asks participants about their experience of leadership and the influence it has on maintaining team performance. Ranking the different leadership styles in order of effectiveness provides insight into the participants' preferences based on what they have experienced and learned. Question five has high content validity by defining team emotional intelligence and directly asking about the perceived significance of team emotional intelligence for team productivity. Question six has appropriate content validity by having participants rank in order which variable (team psychological safety, team leadership, team emotional intelligence, and team hierarchical structure) is most impactful for maintaining team productivity. The response options cover relevant organizational hierarchical structures defined in the survey. Overall, the survey questions have appropriate face and content validity as they directly address the key variables of interest and cover a comprehensive range of relevant aspects. The seven-point Likert scale provides appropriate and good range of response options. Utilizing the Likert scale is optimal for capturing the survey participants' views on the impacts of team psychological safety, team leadership, team emotional intelligence, and team hierarchical structure. The consistency of utilizing the Likert scale for responses is convenient for participants and easy to use.

Statistical Analysis Plan

The statistical analysis plan will be conducted using IBM SPSS software version 29. Participants begin the survey by sharing their length of time in organizational teams using time

categories broken into five-year intervals, up to 30 plus years (under 5 years, 5-10, 10-15, 15-20, 20-25, 25-30, and 30 plus). These seven categories will be displayed on a bar chart showing the mean, median, mode, and variance. The next four questions use Likert scales and will be displayed with response frequencies, percentages, the median for each question, and the distribution, presented with bar charts. Survey participants ranked which factor was most impactful, again represented in a bar chart, and ranked highest to lowest for each team factor.

Survey response data was uploaded to SPSS software from Survey Monkey and coded one to seven for the following variables: team experience timeframes, psychological safety (PS), leadership (L), emotional intelligence (EI), and hierarchical structure (HS). A cross-tabulation table is utilized for the years of team experience and PS, L, EI, and HS to see different responses based on the years of team experience. For correlation analysis, a Spearman's rank correlation was performed between PS, L, EI, and HS responses to see the strength and direction of the relationship. For question 6, the Friedman test will determine if there is a significant relationship difference and how the participants rank team factors.

If there is a significant relationship, a post-hoc comparison will be conducted with a Bonferroni correction to see which factors differ significantly in their rankings. The final step is to conduct a chi-square test between participants' experience of each variable: PS, L, EI, and HS, to determine if perceptions differ based on participants' team experience levels. Data will show if there is a predictive analysis on whether the duration an individual works within a team forecasts responses on team factors.

This plan will provide data to answer the research question, from a team member's perspective, to what extent team psychological safety, leadership, team emotional intelligence, and team hierarchical structures maintain team productivity. The premise is to determine

whether each team factor is positively or negatively associated with team productivity. The cross-tabulation will determine if participants' team experiences have significantly different insights on team factors that influence team performance. The Friedman test will show if there is a significant difference in how participants rank team factors. The Spearman ranking confirms if there is a significant correlation between the team factors. The Chi-square and potential predictive relationship will see if team experience is a significant predictor.

Results

Three hundred fifty-four participants responded to the survey, with 17 removed due to missing responses on key variables, leadership and psychological safety ratings, and overall ranking of team factors 1 to 4. Thus, the final survey data set was 334 responses from military, government civilian, and contractors. The specific participants' demographic was not collected, but the organization mirrors the United States military representation, with 20% African American, 18% Latino/Hispanic, and 5% Asian American. Females are notably lower at 18% compared to the general population of 50%. The sample consisted of 57.2% team members with over 25-plus years of experience. The distribution of team members was over 30 years (n=124; 37.1%), 25 to 30 years (n=67; 20.1%), 20 to 25 years (n=67; 20.1%), 15 to 20 years (n=38; 11.4%), 10 to 15 years (n=18; 5.4%), 5 to 10 years (n=19; 5.7%) and under 5 years (n=7, 2.1). Figure 1 and Table 1 (Appendix F) show frequency by team experience.

Figure 1

Survey Participants Years of Team Experience

Team members' experience, defined as tenure with the company, team members under 5 years team experience were coded – 1, 5-10 years - 2, 10-15 years – 3, 15-20 years – 5, 20 to 25 years – 5, 25 to 30 years – 6 and 30 plus years – 7, the mean was 5.46 (20 to 25 years team experience).

Participants' response options for questions 2 through 5 were asked what effect psychological safety, leadership, emotional intelligence, and hierarchical structure have on team performance. The team dynamics were coded 1 to 7 (1 - greatly hinders performance, 2 - moderately hinders performance, 3 - slightly hinders performance, 4 - no effect on performance, 5 - slightly enhances performance, 6 - moderately enhances performance, and 7 - greatly enhances performance). Team leadership emerged with the highest mean of 6.63 out of 7,

indicating the highest effect on team performance. Team psychological safety and emotional intelligence ranked second and third on enhancing team performance with means of 6.39 and 6.38. Team hierarchical structure had a mean of 5.64. The descriptive statistics for survey responses had a sample size of n=334 for responses to all variables (Table 2).

Table 2

Descriptives

					Bootstrap[a]			
							95% Confidence Interval	
			Statistic	Std. Error	Bias	Std. Error	Lower	Upper
Team Experience Years	Mean		5.4671	0.08911	0.0042	0.0875	5.2927	5.6372
	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Lower Bound	5.2918					
		Upper Bound	5.6424					
	5% Trimmed Mean		5.5978		0.0052	0.0945	5.4128	5.7815
	Median		6.0000		-0.0015	0.0274	6.0000	6.0000
	Variance		2.652		-0.007	0.208	2.261	3.083
	Std. Deviation		1.62852		-0.00339	0.06389	1.50375	1.75593
	Minimum		1.00					
	Maximum		7.00					
	Range		6.00					
	Interquartile Range		2.00		0.45	0.49	2.00	3.00
	Skewness		-0.948	0.133	-0.003	0.102	-1.161	-0.737
	Kurtosis		0.046	0.266	0.020	0.277	-0.453	0.622
Team Psychological Safety	Mean		6.3922	0.05444	0.0045	0.0529	6.2976	6.5048
	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Lower Bound	6.2851					
		Upper Bound	6.4993					
	5% Trimmed Mean		6.5246		0.0040	0.0511	6.4281	6.6271
	Median		7.0000		0.0000	0.0000	7.0000	7.0000
	Variance		0.990		-0.009	0.141	0.751	1.278
	Std. Deviation		0.99491		-0.00700	0.07099	0.86666	1.13063
	Minimum		1.00					
	Maximum		7.00					
	Range		6.00					
	Interquartile Range		1.00		0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00

	Skewness		-2.046	0.133	0.017	0.241	-2.558	-1.602
	Kurtosis		4.760	0.266	-0.133	1.618	2.133	8.303
Team Leadership	Mean		6.6377	0.04938	0.0004	0.0479	6.5389	6.7305
	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Lower Bound	6.5406					
		Upper Bound	6.7349					
	5% Trimmed Mean		6.7951		-0.0005	0.0353	6.7228	6.8637
	Median		7.0000		0.0000	0.0000	7.0000	7.0000
	Variance		0.814		-0.001	0.170	0.477	1.154
	Std. Deviation		0.90239		-0.00587	0.09605	0.69030	1.07433
	Minimum		1.00					
	Maximum		7.00					
	Range		6.00					
	Interquartile Range		0.00		0.05	0.22	0.00	1.00
	Skewness		-3.488	0.133	0.020	0.309	-4.110	-2.886
	Kurtosis		13.934	0.266	0.001	2.953	8.787	20.674
Team Emotional Intelligence	Mean		6.3802	0.04785	0.0018	0.0470	6.2844	6.4629
	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Lower Bound	6.2861					
		Upper Bound	6.4744					
	5% Trimmed Mean		6.4790		0.0016	0.0402	6.3972	6.5589
	Median		7.0000		-0.0060	0.0668	7.0000	7.0000
	Variance		0.765		-0.004	0.126	0.553	1.034
	Std. Deviation		0.87458		-0.00549	0.07186	0.74355	1.01681
	Minimum		1.00					
	Maximum		7.00					
	Range		6.00					
	Interquartile Range		1.00		0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00
	Skewness		-2.068	0.133	0.086	0.340	-2.600	-1.291
	Kurtosis		6.775	0.266	-0.668	2.321	1.563	10.513
Team Structure	Mean		5.6497	0.07808	-0.0014	0.0767	5.4770	5.8012
	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Lower Bound	5.4961					
		Upper Bound	5.8033					
	5% Trimmed Mean		5.7974		-0.0038	0.0790	5.6196	5.9468
	Median		6.0000		0.0000	0.0000	6.0000	6.0000
	Variance		2.036		0.009	0.204	1.656	2.450
	Std. Deviation		1.42691		0.00126	0.07159	1.28686	1.56531
	Minimum		1.00					

Maximum	7.00					
Range	6.00					
Interquartile Range	2.00		-0.01	0.07	2.00	2.00
Skewness	-1.362	0.133	0.000	0.110	-1.563	-1.133
Kurtosis	1.530	0.266	0.012	0.470	0.613	2.487

a. Unless otherwise noted, bootstrap results are based on 334 bootstrap samples

The relationship between team experience levels and variables only showed significance in the relationship between team experience and team leadership $\chi^2(36, N=334) = 51.76$, $p = .043$ with 78% of respondents rating leadership as greatly enhancing performance. No significant relationships were found between experience times and psychological safety χ^2 (36, N=334) = $p = 0.888$, emotional intelligence $\chi^2(36, N = 334) = 38.677$, $p = 0.350$ and hierarchical structure $\chi^2(36, N = 334) = 44.283$, $p = 0.162$. The cross-tabulation analysis can be viewed in Table 3 (Appendix F)

The Spearman rank correlation reveals several significant relationships between team factors. The strongest positive correlation exists between team psychological safety and team emotional intelligence ($rs(332) = 0.407$ and $p < 0.001$), displaying a moderate relationship between variables, which means that as team psychological safety increases, team emotional intelligence tends to also increase and vice versa. Team leadership shows two significant correlations, one moderate correlation with team hierarchical structure ($rs(332) = .279$ and $p < 0.001$) and one weak correlation with team emotional intelligence ($rs(332) = .207$ and $p < 0.001$). Team hierarchical structure has a weak but significant correlation with team psychological safety, $rs(332) = .154$ and $p = 0.005$. There was no significant correlation between team leadership and psychological safety ($rs(332) = .031$, $p = 0.578$). All the significant correlations were positive, meaning that as one variable increased, the other increased as well. Table 4 below shows all Spearman rank correlations.

Table 4

Spearman's correlation ranking

			Team Psychological Safety	Team Leadership	Team Emotional Intelligence	Team Hierarchical Structure
Spearman's rho	Team Psychological Safety	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	0.031	.407**	.154**
		Sig. (2-tailed)		0.576	0.000	0.005
		N	334	334	334	334
	Team Leadership	Correlation Coefficient	0.031	1.000	.207**	.279**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	0.576		0.000	0.000
		N	334	334	334	334
	Team Emotional Intelligence	Correlation Coefficient	.407**	.207**	1.000	.162**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000		0.003
		N	334	334	334	334
	Team Hierarchical Structure	Correlation Coefficient	.154**	.279**	.162**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	0.005	0.000	0.003	
		N	334	334	334	334

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The cross-tabulation shows comprehensive patterns across four team factors in relationship to the experience level categories. The survey asked participants to rank team factors of psychological safety, leadership, emotional intelligence, and hierarchical structure from highest (1) to lowest (4). The team factor ranking revealed patterns in how team members prioritize the different aspects of team dynamics. Team leadership had the highest ranking (229 out of 334 participants) at 68.6 percent, and 47 ranked it second. Team psychological safety consistently ranked second in importance across experience levels, getting 116-second rankings from participants. Team emotional intelligence was ranked third with 126 participants. Team hierarchical structure was consistently ranked as the least important factor, with 192 participants ranking it fourth. The statistical analysis using the chi-square test showed no significant relationships leadership: $\chi^2(18, N = 334) = 14.313, p = 0.708$), psychological safety[2] $\chi^2(18, N =$

334) = 10.768, p = 0.904, emotional intelligence $\chi^2(18, N = 334) = 10.768$, and hierarchical structure $\chi^2(18, N = 334) = 14.458$, p = 0.699. Since all p-values are greater than 0.05 (from 0.699 to 0,904), this indicates rejecting the null hypothesis. This means that years of team experience did not significantly impact how participants ranked the team factors. Details can be viewed in table 5, Appendix F.

Discussion

The survey analysis revealed several key factors influencing team dynamics across team members' experience levels. Survey participants had over 20 years of professional team experience, which creates a unique organizational dynamic. Extensive team experience likely contributes to the strong positive correlations observed, specifically in team leadership and psychological safety. Leaders significantly influence team psychological safety through their behaviors and leadership characteristics. Supportive leadership styles positively impact psychological safety by showing concern for team wellbeing. Leaders create a team environment where team members can question decisions, take risks, and freely express opinions without fear of job consequences (Shahid & Din, 2021). Leaders who create a strong team climate with supportive behaviors elevate collaboration and improve problem-solving and team decision-making.

A well-established team relationship enhances emotional intelligence among members, and stable leadership characteristics provide performance results for an organization. The data shows a significant correlation between psychological safety and emotional intelligence (rs = 0.407), which aligns with previous research from Zhou et al., (2020), which showed a significant positive correlation between psychological safety and emotional intelligence indicating that teams with higher emotional intelligence develop stronger psychological safety, teams that

displayed higher emotional intelligence were able to identify and regulate emotions allow team members open express and feeling safe to take social interaction risk.

Leadership emerged as the top-ranked (68.6%) in influencing team performance. Leadership had the highest mean score (6.63 out of 7), with psychological safety scoring second (6.39 out of 7). This indicates both variables are performance-enhancing, with leadership being more pronounced. Participants with longer team experience showed a stronger recognition of team leaders' impact on team performance $\chi^2(36, N=334) = 51.76$, $p = .043$. The data indicates that psychological safety is the foundational component for team effectiveness, while team leadership is one of the catalysts for creating and maintaining a safe team environment. This is evident by psychological safety consistently ranking second from 116 participants across experience levels. Leaders who create psychologically safe team environments will enable an elevated team performance.

The varied responses for hierarchical team structure with an overall positive team environment may indicate different interpretations of organizational structure based on one's experience level. Well-connected teams do not feel inhibited by the hierarchical structure within the organization when the members are encouraged to voice their opinions or concerns on the team and organizational matters. There are likely generational differences within the organization, as there are currently four generations in the military workforce (Weathers, 2023). The newer workforce generations do not have the same regard for communicating within the team hierarchy as older generations. Older generations of workers may see how new team dynamics have caused changes in modern team dynamics. To encourage team performance, organizations need to establish a flexible work culture that understands the critical social components across the different generations of the workforce.

The findings suggest that team member experience significantly influences team effectiveness through organizational understanding and knowledge. The study's results show that an organization may benefit by leveraging experienced team members to mentor and onboard new team members and enhance the knowledge transfer of organizational processes and practices. Organizations should maintain leadership practices that promote psychological safety and emotional intelligence. Leadership skills in intervention and team communication can create a culture of team psychological safety that focuses on the relevant perspectives that identify the context of the team's work (Hugander & Edmondson, 2024). This will provide initial performance increases and enduring team benefits of higher innovation, inclusion, and quick team transformation. This study finds several areas worthy of future study exploration. An organization must install methods to accelerate psychological safety development among organizational teams.

The strong correlation between team psychological safety and team emotional intelligence ($r_s = 0.407$, $p < 0.001$) aligns with behavioral theories about team psychological safety's role in team effectiveness. The findings support Edmondson's psychological framework, which emphasizes the importance of interpersonal trust and mutual respect within team dynamics. The research confirms that psychological safety goes beyond basic trust by creating an environment where team members are confident in being themselves and communicating their authentic thoughts. The correlation between psychological safety and emotional intelligence ($r_s = 0.407$) validates Edmondson's theory by showing how team trust and emotional awareness where team members feel secure to voice concerns, admit mistakes, challenge ideas, and share innovative solutions. Edmondson and Bransby (2023) indicated that psychological safety plays a meaningful part in maintaining performance. The framework allows conditions for personnel to

voice positions, share knowledge, and question ideas. Psychological safety among teams enables communication and direction. The leadership ratings across experience levels align with transformational leadership theory, suggesting that the value of leadership rises above experience gaps (Eaton et al., 2024). The primary assessment for high responses to leadership was from the excessive inclusion of leadership in the continuum of professional military training. For many decades, leadership has been reinforced throughout the military as the vital component for successful leadership tours, no matter the size or complexity of the team or organization. The most likely indication for the strong response is that humans crave leadership.

Limitations

There are limitations to the methods utilized, such as survey design limitations, sample distribution issues, military-specific environment, and measurement limitations. The self-reporting nature of the surveys has a potential for response bias. The sample size (N=334) provides adequate statistical power. Still, newer employees were underrepresented (2.1% < 5 years of team experience) with higher experience employees (75.5% > 20 years of team experience), which limits generalizability due to the skewed experience distribution. This causes external validity concerns for organizations with different experience distributions. The military-specific environment may not translate to other business industry sectors. Survey measurements only show a specific point in time, with no longitudinal insights. For example, we could have team members' insights into team dynamics change as their experience develops over time.

Several social-culture impacts include generational differences in leadership preferences, cultural influences on hierarchical structure perceptions, and social interaction of extended tenure employees that accumulate social capital within the team and organization. Research highlights significant differences between traditional and modern approaches to leadership. Older

generations favor more hierarchical traditional leadership styles emphasizing hard work and organizational loyalty (Weathers, 2023). Newer generations prefer collaborative, flexible approaches centered on inclusion and team-oriented decision-making processes.

Recommendations for implementing the findings from this research would be to have mentoring programs that leverage experienced team members who are present in the workforce. The mentoring framework should be included in leadership development programs by emphasizing creating and maintaining psychological safety in team environments. The program must show how to measure and assess psychological safety through valid metrics such as team climate surveys and team 360-degree feedback mechanisms. There should also be a mechanism to evaluate and develop leadership team competencies over time to ensure new generations of organizational leaders understand the crucial connection between psychological safety and maintaining team performance.

Future research should focus on the impact to organization culture, organizational strategies on distribution of workforce experience, and generational dynamics. The primary recommendation would be understanding how organizational team culture moderates team performance across different experience levels. The research could examine various team cultures (collaborative, innovative, hierarchical, etc.) and interact with team members of different experience levels to elevate performance. To determine optimal team composition among varying experience levels, future research should explore if there are performance variations from teams with low and high experience levels across team members. Review performance of focused expertise for specific job roles (sales, operations, accounting, logistics, etc.) against mixed team configurations based on job task requirements or product development, such as cross-function teams. The significant findings across experience levels (75%>20 years

vs. 2.1% < 5 years of team experience) require further investigation into the generational difference in team performance. The research should examine if there is a preference for leadership styles across generations, different attitudes toward hierarchical organizations, and if psychological safety needs differ across age groups. This would provide organizations with a framework for building multigenerational teams while maintaining team performance.

Conclusion

The significance of this study extends beyond theoretical impacts by offering substantial, real-world implications for organizational development and team management practices. The strong correlation between team psychological safety and emotional intelligence shows the importance of creating supportive team environments. The high leadership ranking across experience levels shows that it is wise for organizations to invest in continuous leadership development. The military context allows opportunities for cross-industry studies to validate findings or see if they are specific to military organizations. Additional studies are needed to investigate generation differences in team preference and views of leadership styles. This research significantly contributes to theoretical knowledge and a particular application for team management, offering valuable insight for practitioners who want to develop more effective team environments. The findings suggest that team leadership emerged as a dominant factor, but data showed a significant correlation between psychological safety and emotional intelligence, which indicates that these two team dynamics are a fundamental component for team performance and effectiveness.

References

Ahmed, I., Poole, M. S., & Pilny, A. (2019). Stability of membership and persistence in teams: Impacts on performance. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, *23*(3–4), 156–169. https://doi.org/10.1037/gdn0000109

American Psychological Association. (2017). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct. *American Psychological Association.* https://www.apa.org/ethics/code/index

Bordens, K. S. (2021). *Research Design and Methods: A Process Approach (11th Edition)*. McGraw-Hill Higher Education (US). https://mbsdirect.vitalsource.com/books/9781264169634

Darnton, G. (2023). Likert scales and questions - uses and abuses. *22nd European Conference on Research Methods in Business & Management* / ECRM 2023, 22(1), 44–49.

Eaton, L., Bridgman, T., & Cummings, S. (2024). Advancing the democratization of work: A new intellectual history of transformational leadership theory. *Leadership* (17427150), 20(3), 125–143. https://doi.org/10.1177/17427150241232705

Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 44*(2), 350–383. https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999

Edmondson, A. C., & Bransby, D. P. (2023). Psychological safety comes of age: Observed themes in an established literature. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 10*(1), 55-78. https://annurev-orgpsych-120920-055217.pdf

Flynn, S. I. (2021). Transformational leadership and transactional leadership. *Research Strarters: Sociology.*

Greer, L. L., de Jong, B. A., Schouten, M. E., & Dannals, J. E. (2018). Why and when hierarchy

impacts team effectiveness: A meta-analytic integration. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 103*(6), 591–613. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000291

Gray, S. M., Bunderson, J. S., van der Vegt, G. S., Rink, F., & Gedik, Y. (2023). Leveraging knowledge diversity in hierarchically differentiated teams: The critical role of hierarchy stability. *Academy of Management Journal, 66*(2), 462–488. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2020.1136

Hugander, P., & Edmondson, A. C. (2024). Skills training links psychological safety to revenue growth. *MIT Sloan Management Review* (Online), 1-4. https://go.openathens.net/redirector/purdueglobal.edu?url=https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/skills-training-links-psychological-safety/docview/3107503251/se-2

IBM. (2024). *IBM SPSS statistics - features*. https://www.ibm.com/products/spss-statistics/features#:~:text=The%20IBM%20SPSS%20Base%20edition%20offers%20robust%20data%20management%20and

Ji H, & Yan J. (2020). How team structure can enhance performance: Team longevity's moderating effect and team coordination's mediating effect. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*, 1873. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01873

Keenan, M. (2022). Collaborative leadership. *Salem Press Encyclopedia*

Kim S, Lee H, & Connerton TP. (2020). How psychological safety affects team performance: Mediating role of efficacy and learning behavior. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*, 1581. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01581

Kundi, Y. M., & Shahid, S. (2023). Joint decision-making and team outcomes: Examining

cross-lagged relationships and the roles of psychological safety and participative leadership. *Human Performance, 36*(3), 89–108. https://doi.org/10.1080/08959285.2023.2208362

Lee, C., & Wong, C.-S. (2019). The effect of team emotional intelligence on team process and effectiveness. *Journal of Management & Organization, 25(*6), 844–859. https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2017.43

Liu, Y., & Keller, R. T. (2021). How psychological safety impacts R&D project teams' performance: In a psychologically safe workplace, R&D project teams perform better, more readily share knowledge and engage in organizational citizenship behavior, and are less likely to leave. *Research Technology Management, 64*(2), 39–45. https://doi.org/10.1080/08956308.2021.1863111

Louangrath, P. I. & Sutanapong, C. (2018). Validity and reliability of survey scales. *International Journal of Research & Methodology in Social Science,* 4(3), 99-114.

Lozano, L. M., García-Cueto, E., & Muñiz, J. (2008). Effect of the number of response categories on the reliability and validity of rating scales. *Methodology: European Journal of Research Methods for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, 4*(2), 73–79. https://doi.org/10.1027/1614-2241.4.2.73

Mazzei, M. (2022). Servant leadership. *Salem Press Encyclopedia.*

Military One Source (2022). *2022 Demographic Profile*. https://www.militaryonesource.mil/data-research-and-statistics/military-community-demographics/2022-demographics-profile/

Salcinovic, B., Drew, M., Dijkstra, P., Waddington, G., & Serpell, B. G. (2022). Factors

influencing team performance: What can support teams in high-performance sport learn from other industries? A systematic scoping review. *Sports Medicine - Open, 8*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40798-021-00406-7

Shafique, S., & Naz, I. (2023). A mediating and moderating an analysis of the relationship between team emotional intelligence and team performance. *SAGE Open, 13*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231155074

Stewart, G. L. (2006). A meta-analytic review of relationships between team design features and team performance. *Journal of Management, 32*(1), 29–55. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305277792

SurveyMonkey. (2024). Sample size calculator, formula and examples. SurveyMonkey. https://www.surveymonkey.com/mp/sample-size-calculator/

Taherdoost, H. (2019). What is the best response scale for survey and questionnaire design: Review of different lengths of rating scales/attitude scale / Likert scale. *International Journal of Academic Research in Management, Vol. 8, No. 1,* 2019, https://ssrn.com/abstract=3588604

Weathers, C. (2023). Military culture shift: The impact of war, money, and generational perspective on morale, retention, and leadership (pp. 21-23). Elva Resa Digital.

Zhou, W., Zhu, Z., & Vredenburgh, D. (2020). Emotional intelligence, psychological safety, and team decision making. *Team Performance Management, 26*(1), 123-141. https://doi.org/10.1108/TPM-10-2019-0105

Appendix A

Letter of Authorization from Research Site

Redacted for Privacy/Copyright Reasons

Appendix B

Research Announcement

Hello, my name is Tadd Morrison.

I am conducting research through Purdue University Global to obtain a Master's Degree in Psychology.

The purpose of the research is to explore insight from experienced team members of how team psychological safety, team leadership style, team emotional intelligence and team hierarchical structure enables maintaining team performance.

If you are interested in participating in the survey, click this link: Survey Link

The survey will take about five minutes of your time. This study is anonymous, no one will know that you participated, and no one will ever be able to connect you answers to your identity.

Appendix C1
Purdue University Global
Consent for Participation in Research

Maintaining Team Productivity, Insight from Military Teams: The Impacts of Team Psychological Safety, Team Leadership, Team Emotional Stability, and Team Hierarchal Structure

CONCISE SUMMARY

The purpose of the study is to find the key factors for maintaining team performance. Previous academic research indicates the team psychological safety, team leadership style, team emotional intelligence and team hierarchical structures have influences on team performance. This research will have a brief survey of experienced team members to gain understanding of which factor is the best to maintain team performance. There is a slight inconvenience of five minutes to complete the survey questions. The survey provides insight for members of teams and will influence societal interaction within teams.

Why am I being asked?
You are being asked to be a participant in a research study about maintaining team performance through team psychological safety, team emotional intelligence, team leadership styles and team hierarchical structure. This research study is being conducted by Tadd Morrison, a Master's of Science in Psychology student at Purdue University Global. You have been asked to participate in the research because of your experience as a team member. We ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the research.

Your participation in this research is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with Purdue University Global. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without affecting that relationship.

What is the purpose of this research?
The purpose of this research is:
The influence of team psychological safety, team leadership styles, team emotional intelligence, and team hierarchical structure on maintaining team performance.

What procedures are involved?
If you agree to be in this research, we would ask you to do the following things:
Take a five-minute survey.
Approximately 200 personnel may be involved in this research at Purdue University Global.

What are the potential risks and discomforts?
The research may include a slight time inconvenience.

Are there benefits to taking part in the research?
Participating in this research may not directly benefit individual participants. The results will be available to gain insight into what factor team member perceive that are the most beneficial for maintaining team performance. The information gathered may benefit society by advancing understanding of the psychology of teams and factors affecting productivity and team interaction.

What about privacy and confidentiality?
No one will know that you are a research subject because this research is totally anonymous. No information about you, or provided by you during the research, can ever be disclosed to others because no information that can possibly identify you as an individual will be collected. When the results of the research are published or discussed in conferences, no information will be included that could ever reveal your identity.

Can I withdraw from the study?
You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. You may also refuse to answer any questions you do not want to answer.

Whom should I contact if I have questions?
The researcher conducting this study is Tadd Morrison. You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you may contact the researchers at: Phone: 813 826- 2315. You may also contact the researcher's instructor, Dr. Timothy Legg at Timothy.legg@purdueglobal.edu.

What are my rights as a research subject?
If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, you may contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Purdue University Global through the following representative:

Susan Pettine, IRB Chair
Email: spettine@purdueglobal.edu

Remember: Your participation in this research is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with Purdue University Global. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without affecting that relationship.

You may keep a copy of this form for your information and your records.

Signature of Subject
I have read (or someone has read to me) the above information. I have been given an opportunity to ask questions and my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in this research. I have been given a copy of this form.

Signature Date

Printed Name

Signature of Researcher Date (must be same as subject's)

Appendix D

Table 1.
Survey Development Plan

Objective	Operational Definition	Number and Type of Items
Example: To assess satisfaction with the job	Example: I define job satisfaction as the degree to which participants are content with the following aspects of their work: - Opportunities to apply their key talents - Experiencing joy when completing work tasks - Feeling energized by their work - Finding their work meaningful	Example: I will measure this objective using four Likert scale items. These items comprise Q1 - Q4 of my survey.
To assess years of team experience	I define team experience as working with others to complete tasks or achieve organizational goals and objectives.	These will be numbers representing years of team experience to choose from. Q1
To assess team psychological safety for maintaining team productivity	I define psychological safety in a team as the feeling that the team environment is safe, one in which individual social interaction, discussion, dispute, and expression of new ideas will have a low risk of negative reactions or judgment (Edmondson, 1999).	This will be measured utilizing a seven-point Likert rating scale. Q2
To assess the leadership	I define leadership as a trait that primarily consists of determining	This will be measured using a

influence on maintaining team productivity	behaviors, directing strategies for actions, and influencing control over team dynamics to shape and set the foundation for team performance (Salcinovic, 2022).	seven-point Likert scale: Q3
To assess team emotional intelligence for maintaining team productivity	I define team emotional intelligence is the personality trait that optimizes emotional balance to build team trust, regulates social interaction, elevates thinking, and maintains self-management of emotions, enabling team connection (Lee & Wong, 2019).	This will be measured using a seven-point Likert scale: Q4
To assess how hierarchy team influences team's ability to maintain productivity	I define team hierarchical structure as the formed team process and behaviors for decision making, how team members utilize and interact with individual knowledge to complete team goals for organizational objectives. (Salcinovic, et al., 2022).	This will be measured using a seven-point Likert scale: Q5
To assess what variable is most effective at maintaining team performance	Definitions for team psychological safety, leadership, team emotional intelligence and team hierarchical structure remains same as previously stated. Participants rank in order from most effective to least effective.	This will be measured using ranking of 1-4: Q6

Appendix E

Copy of All Measures

Team experience is working with others to complete tasks, to achieve organizational goals and objectives.

1. Approximately how many years of team experience do you have? Under 5, 5-10, 10-15, 15-20,20-25, 25-30, and 30+

Psychological safety in a team is described as the feeling that the team environment is safe, one in which to interact with a low risk of negative reactions or judgment (Edmondson, 1999).

2. How important do you consider psychological safety for maintaining team productivity?

- Greatly enhances performance
- Moderately enhances performance
- Slightly enhances performance
- No impact
- Slightly hinders performance
- Moderately hinders performance
- Greatly hinders performance

Leadership primarily consists of determining behaviors, directing strategies for actions, and influencing control over team dynamics to shape and set the foundation for team performance (Salcinovic, 2022).

3. From your experience, how does leadership affect team performance?

- Greatly enhances performance
- Moderately enhances performance
- Slightly enhances performance
- No impact
- Slightly hinders performance
- Moderately hinders performance
- Greatly hinders performance

Emotional intelligence (EI) is the personality trait that optimizes emotional balance to build team trust, regulates social interaction, elevates thinking, and maintains self-management of emotions, enabling team connection (Lee & Wong, 2019).

4. How significant is team emotional intelligence in your team members for maintaining team performance?

- Greatly enhances performance

- Moderately enhances performance
- Slightly enhances performance
- No impact
- Slightly hinders performance
- Moderately hinders performance
- Greatly hinders performance

Team hierarchical structure is defined as the team's forms of decision processes, structured authority and behaviors for decision-making, and how team members utilize and interact with individual knowledge to complete team goals for organizational objectives (Salcinovic, et al., 2022).

5. From your experience, how does hierarchy team structure affect team performance?
   - Greatly enhances performance
   - Moderately enhances performance
   - Slightly enhances performance
   - No impact
   - Slightly hinders performance
   - Moderately hinders performance
   - Greatly hinders performance

6. From your experience, rank which factor is most critical for maintaining team productivity.
   - Team Psychological Safety ___
   - Leadership ___
   - Team Emotional Intelligence ___
   - Team Hierarchical Structure ___

Appendix F

TABLE 1

Team Experience Years

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Under 5,	7	2.1	2.1	2.1
	5-10,	19	5.7	5.7	7.8
	10-15,	18	5.4	5.4	13.2
	15-20,	38	11.4	11.4	24.6
	20-25,	61	18.3	18.3	42.8
	25-30,	67	20.1	20.1	62.9
	30+	124	37.1	37.1	100.0
	Total	334	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 3

Team Experience – Psychological Safety

Crosstab

		Team Experience Years															
		Under 5,		5-10,		10-15,		15-20,		20-25,		25-30,		30+		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TPS	GEP	4	57.1%	11	57.9%	10	55.6%	23	60.5%	40	65.6%	44	65.7%	78	62.9%	210	62.9%
	MEP	2	28.6%	4	21.1%	5	27.8%	10	26.3%	16	26.2%	15	22.4%	25	20.2%	77	23.1%
	SEP	1	14.3%	2	10.5%	2	11.1%	4	10.5%	2	3.3%	5	7.5%	9	7.3%	25	7.5%
	NI	0	0.0%	2	10.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.6%	2	3.0%	10	8.1%	15	4.5%
	SHP	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	5.6%	1	2.6%	1	1.6%	0	0.0%	2	1.6%	5	1.5%
	MHP	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.5%	0	0.0%	1	0.3%
	GHP	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.3%
Total		7	100.0%	19	100.0%	18	100.0%	38	100.0%	61	100.0%	67	100.0%	124	100.0%	334	100.0%

Note. TPS = Team Psychological Safety. GEP = Greatly Enhances Performance; MEP = Moderately Enhances Performance; SEP = Slightly Enhances Performance; NI = No Impact; GHP = Greatly Hinders Performance; MHP = Moderately Hinders Performance; SHP = Slightly Hinders Performance;

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.079[a]	36	0.888
Likelihood Ratio	27.038	36	0.860
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.009	1	0.924
N of Valid Cases	334		

a. 36 cells (73.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymptotic Standard Error[a]	Approximate T[b]	Approximate Significance
Ordinal by Ordinal	Kendall's tau-b	-0.011	0.048	-0.230	0.818
	Spearman Correlation	-0.012	0.056	-0.222	.825[c]
Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	-0.005	0.054	-0.095	.924[c]
N of Valid Cases		334			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Based on normal approximation.

Team Experience - Leadership

Crosstab

		Team Experience Years															
		Under 5,		5-10,		10-15,		15-20,		20-25,		25-30,		30+		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TL	GEP	5	71.4%	11	57.9%	13	72.2%	29	76.3%	53	86.9%	53	79.1%	99	79.8%	263	78.7%
	MEP	2	28.6%	4	21.1%	3	16.7%	5	13.2%	6	9.8%	12	17.9%	15	12.1%	47	14.1%
	SEP	0	0.0%	1	5.3%	2	11.1%	2	5.3%	2	3.3%	1	1.5%	4	3.2%	12	3.6%
	NI	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	3.2%	4	1.2%
	SHP	0	0.0%	2	10.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%	3	0.9%
	MHP	0	0.0%	1	5.3%	0	0.0%	2	5.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%	4	1.2%
	GHP	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.5%	0	0.0%	1	0.3%
Total		7	100.0%	19	100.0%	18	100.0%	38	100.0%	61	100.0%	67	100.0%	124	100.0%	334	100.0%

Note. TL = Team Leadership; GEP = Greatly Enhances Performance; MEP = Moderately Enhances Performance; SEP = Slightly Enhances Performance; NI = No Impact; GHP = Greatly Hinders Performance; MHP = Moderately Hinders Performance; SHP = Slightly Hinders Performance;

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	51.756[a]	36	0.043
Likelihood Ratio	37.887	36	0.383
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.009	1	0.083
N of Valid Cases	334		

a. 38 cells (77.6%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymptotic Standard Error[a]	Approximate T[b]	Approximate Significance
Ordinal by Ordinal	Kendall's tau-b	-0.056	0.051	-1.077	0.282
	Spearman Correlation	-0.064	0.059	-1.168	.244[c]
Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	-0.095	0.064	-1.740	.083[c]
N of Valid Cases		334			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Based on normal approximation.

Team Experience – Emotional Intelligence

Crosstab

		Team Experience Years															
		Under 5,		5-10,		10-15,		15-20,		20-25,		25-30,		30+		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TEI	GEP	4	57.1%	7	36.8%	9	50.0%	20	52.6%	40	65.6%	39	58.2%	67	54.0%	186	55.7%
	MEP	2	28.6%	8	42.1%	7	38.9%	12	31.6%	17	27.9%	20	29.9%	40	32.3%	106	31.7%
	SEP	0	0.0%	3	15.8%	2	11.1%	5	13.2%	4	6.6%	8	11.9%	11	8.9%	33	9.9%
	NI	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	3.2%	4	1.2%
	SHP	1	14.3%	1	5.3%	0	0.0%	1	2.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	0.9%
	MHP	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%	1	0.3%
	GHP	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%	1	0.3%
Total		7	100.0%	19	100.0%	18	100.0%	38	100.0%	61	100.0%	67	100.0%	124	100.0%	334	100.0%

Note. TEI = Team Emotional Intelligence; GEP = Greatly Enhances Performance; MEP = Moderately Enhances Performance; SEP = Slightly Enhances Performance; NI = No Impact; GHP = Greatly Hinders Performance; MHP = Moderately Hinders Performance; SHP = Slightly Hinders Performance;

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	38.677[a]	36	0.350
Likelihood Ratio	30.604	36	0.723
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.412	1	0.521
N of Valid Cases	334		

a. 34 cells (69.4%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymptotic Standard Error[a]	Approximate T[b]	Approximate Significance
Ordinal by Ordinal	Kendall's tau-b	-0.011	0.049	-0.225	0.822
	Spearman Correlation	-0.013	0.056	-0.228	.819[c]
Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	-0.035	0.065	-0.641	.522[c]
N of Valid Cases		334			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Based on normal approximation.

Team Experience – Hierarchical Structure

Crosstab

		Team Experience Years															
		Under 5,		5-10,		10-15,		15-20,		20-25,		25-30,		30+		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
THS	GEP	2	28.6%	2	10.5%	5	27.8%	13	34.2%	24	39.3%	20	29.9%	38	30.6%	104	31.1%
	MEP	5	71.4%	5	26.3%	5	27.8%	13	34.2%	21	34.4%	22	32.8%	48	38.7%	119	35.6%
	SEP	0	0.0%	7	36.8%	2	11.1%	9	23.7%	11	18.0%	15	22.4%	14	11.3%	58	17.4%
	NI	0	0.0%	2	10.5%	3	16.7%	0	0.0%	1	1.6%	3	4.5%	11	8.9%	20	6.0%
	SHP	0	0.0%	1	5.3%	1	5.6%	0	0.0%	3	4.9%	2	3.0%	8	6.5%	15	4.5%
	MHP	0	0.0%	2	10.5%	2	11.1%	2	5.3%	1	1.6%	2	3.0%	3	2.4%	12	3.6%
	GHP	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	2.6%	0	0.0%	3	4.5%	2	1.6%	6	1.8%
Total		7	100.0%	19	100.0%	18	100.0%	38	100.0%	61	100.0%	67	100.0%	124	100.0%	334	100.0%

Note. THS = Team Hierarchical Structure; GEP = Greatly Enhances Performance; MEP = Moderately Enhances Performance; SEP = Slightly Enhances Performance; NI = No Impact; GHP = Greatly Hinders Performance; MHP = Moderately Hinders Performance; SHP = Slightly Hinders Performance;

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	44.283[a]	36	0.162
Likelihood Ratio	48.619	36	0.078
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.366	1	0.545
N of Valid Cases	334		

a. 31 cells (63.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .13.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymptotic Standard Error[a]	Approximate T[b]	Approximate Significance
Ordinal by Ordinal	Kendall's tau-b	-0.021	0.045	-0.476	0.634
	Spearman Correlation	-0.027	0.055	-0.484	.629[c]
Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	-0.033	0.054	-0.604	.546[c]
N of Valid Cases		334			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Based on normal approximation.

TABLE 5

Team Experience Years * Team Leadership Ranking

Crosstab

		Leadership								Total	
		1		2		3		4			
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Team Experience Years	Under 5,	4	1.7%	2	4.3%	0	0.0%	1	7.7%	7	2.1%
	5-10,	15	6.6%	2	4.3%	2	4.4%	0	0.0%	19	5.7%
	10-15,	11	4.8%	2	4.3%	4	8.9%	1	7.7%	18	5.4%
	15-20,	27	11.8%	6	12.8%	4	8.9%	1	7.7%	38	11.4%
	20-25,	42	18.3%	7	14.9%	11	24.4%	1	7.7%	61	18.3%
	25-30,	41	17.9%	12	25.5%	12	26.7%	2	15.4%	67	20.1%
	30+	89	38.9%	16	34.0%	12	26.7%	7	53.8%	124	37.1%
Total		229	100.0%	47	100.0%	45	100.0%	13	100.0%	334	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.313[a]	18	0.708
Likelihood Ratio	14.904	18	0.669
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.001	1	0.975
N of Valid Cases	334		

a. 14 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .27.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymptotic Standard Error[a]	Approximate T[b]	Approximate Significance
Ordinal by Ordinal	Kendall's tau-b	-0.013	0.047	-0.277	0.782
	Spearman Correlation	-0.015	0.054	-0.274	.784[c]
Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	0.002	0.055	0.031	.975[c]
N of Valid Cases		334			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Based on normal approximation.

Team Experience Years * Team Psychological Safety Ranking

Crosstab

		Team Psychological Safety								Total	
		1		2		3		4			
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Team Experience Years	Under 5,	1	1.9%	3	2.6%	3	2.9%	0	0.0%	7	2.1%
	5-10,	1	1.9%	8	6.9%	5	4.9%	5	7.9%	19	5.7%
	10-15,	4	7.5%	5	4.3%	5	4.9%	4	6.3%	18	5.4%
	15-20,	7	13.2%	12	10.3%	14	13.7%	5	7.9%	38	11.4%
	20-25,	12	22.6%	23	19.8%	15	14.7%	11	17.5%	61	18.3%
	25-30,	15	28.3%	21	18.1%	15	14.7%	16	25.4%	67	20.1%
	30+	13	24.5%	44	37.9%	45	44.1%	22	34.9%	124	37.1%
Total		53	100.0%	116	100.0%	102	100.0%	63	100.0%	334	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.923[a]	18	0.598
Likelihood Ratio	17.728	18	0.474
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.356	1	0.551
N of Valid Cases	334		

a. 8 cells (28.6%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.11.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymptotic Standard Error[a]	Approximate T[b]	Approximate Significance
Ordinal by Ordinal	Kendall's tau-b	0.042	0.043	0.982	0.326
	Spearman Correlation	0.051	0.053	0.938	.349[c]
Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	0.033	0.052	0.596	.551[c]
N of Valid Cases		334			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Based on normal approximation.

Team Experience Years * Team Emotional Intelligence Ranking

Crosstab

		Team Emotional Intelligence									
		1		2		3		4		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Team Experience Years	Under 5,	1	2.4%	2	2.0%	2	1.6%	2	3.0%	7	2.1%
	5-10,	3	7.1%	8	8.0%	7	5.6%	1	1.5%	19	5.7%
	10-15,	3	7.1%	7	7.0%	7	5.6%	1	1.5%	18	5.4%
	15-20,	3	7.1%	13	13.0%	13	10.3%	9	13.6%	38	11.4%
	20-25,	6	14.3%	16	16.0%	28	22.2%	11	16.7%	61	18.3%
	25-30,	9	21.4%	19	19.0%	26	20.6%	13	19.7%	67	20.1%
	30+	17	40.5%	35	35.0%	43	34.1%	29	43.9%	124	37.1%
Total		42	100.0%	100	100.0%	126	100.0%	66	100.0%	334	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.768[a]	18	0.904
Likelihood Ratio	12.159	18	0.839
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.330	1	0.249
N of Valid Cases	334		

a. 9 cells (32.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .88.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymptotic Standard Error[a]	Approximate T[b]	Approximate Significance
Ordinal by Ordinal	Kendall's tau-b	0.045	0.046	0.974	0.330
	Spearman Correlation	0.053	0.055	0.962	.337[c]
Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	0.063	0.055	1.154	.249[c]
N of Valid Cases		334			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Based on normal approximation.

Team Experience Years * Team Hierarchical Structure

Crosstab

		Team Hierarchical Structure								Total	
		1		2		3		4			
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Team Experience Years	Under 5,	1	10.0%	0	0.0%	2	3.3%	4	2.1%	7	2.1%
	5-10,	0	0.0%	1	1.4%	5	8.2%	13	6.8%	19	5.7%
	10-15,	0	0.0%	4	5.6%	2	3.3%	12	6.3%	18	5.4%
	15-20,	1	10.0%	7	9.9%	7	11.5%	23	12.0%	38	11.4%
	20-25,	1	10.0%	15	21.1%	7	11.5%	38	19.8%	61	18.3%
	25-30,	2	20.0%	15	21.1%	14	23.0%	36	18.8%	67	20.1%
	30+	5	50.0%	29	40.8%	24	39.3%	66	34.4%	124	37.1%
Total		10	100.0%	71	100.0%	61	100.0%	192	100.0%	334	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.458[a]	18	0.699
Likelihood Ratio	16.764	18	0.539
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.484	1	0.062
N of Valid Cases	334		

a. 14 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .21.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymptotic Standard Error[a]	Approximate T[b]	Approximate Significance
Ordinal by Ordinal	Kendall's tau-b	-0.083	0.045	-1.838	0.066
	Spearman Correlation	-0.098	0.053	-1.798	.073[c]
Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	-0.102	0.052	-1.874	.062[c]
N of Valid Cases		334			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Based on normal approximation.