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ABSTRACT
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The question of whether team diversity leads to increased or reduced team functioning and through which mechanisms continues to receive a lot of attention in the literature (Jackson, Joshi & Erhardt, 2003; Horwitz & Horwitz, 2007; Knippenberg & Shippers, 2007). The major arguments for a positive impact of diversity in teams have been that the more diverse team members are the greater the potential amount of information, skills, competencies, and a variety of points of view that can be pooled towards better decisions (Guzzo & Dickson, 1996; Jackson, 1992; Jackson, May, & Whitney, 1995; Sessa & Jackson, 1995, Williams & O’Reilly, 1998) or towards increased innovation and creativity (Albrecht & Hall, 1991; Milliken, Bartel, and Kurtzberg, 2003; Payne, 1990). The major arguments for a negative impact of diversity in teams are that to realize team diversity potential the diversity of perspectives, skills, expertise, opinions, have to be integrated or managed, along with all the other characteristics of surface-level diversity, such as gender or ethnicity (Harrison, Price, and Bell, 1998). Without this integration, diversity is expected to lead to divergence, including dissent, disagreement, or conflict (Amason & Schweiger, 1994; Jehn, Northcraft & Neale, 1999; Pelled, 1996; Pelled, Eisenhardt & Xin, 1999; Tsui & Gutek, 1999).

The view that the negative effects of diversity on teams emanate from negative social categorization and identification processes has been the dominant perspective (Brewer, 1995; Chatman, Polzer, Barsade & Neale, 1998; Northcraft, Polzer, Neale, & Kramer, 1995, Randel, 2002; Tsui, Egan & O’Reilley, 1992). Traditionally, researchers have applied concepts from the social identity approach (self-categorization and social identity theories) to predict that team member differences, particular visible differences, will inevitable increase ingroup-outgroup categorizations that cross-cut team composition producing intragroup conflict and miscommunication (Jehn, Northcraft, & Neale, 1999; Pelled, Eisenhardt, & Xin, 1999; Tsui et al., 1992). In their review of over 40 years of research on diversity in organizations Williams
and O’Reilly (1998) offered strong support to this position by suggesting that the negative effects of diversity in workgroups were mostly associated to negative categorization processes such as stereotyping and intergroup biases. These authors came to the disquieting conclusion that “unless steps are taken to actively counteract these negative effects, the evidence suggests that, by itself, diversity is more likely to have a negative than positive effects on group performance” (Williams & O’Reilly, p. 121).

However, in a more recent review of workgroup diversity research, Van Knippenberg and Schippers (2007) point the fact that few empirical studies have directly addressed categorization and identification processes. These authors maintain that existing results remain unequivocal as to whether social categorization processes are actually in operation and are directly responsible for reduced team performance in diverse teams. In the past 5 years the view that the mere presence or even salience of diversity in the team does not necessarily have these dire social categorization and group identification consequences has been gaining attention (Chattopadhyay, Tluchowska, & George, 2004; Garcia-Prieto, Bellard & Schneider, 2003; Van Knippenberg, De Dreu & Homan, 2004; Randel, 2002; Randel & Jaussi, 2003; Stewart & Garcia-Prieto, 2008). In their review Van Knippenberg and Schippers call for a “more fine-grained analysis of the factors that elicit social categorization as well as of the factors that translate social categorization into intergroup bias” (p. 527). Given the more sophisticated theoretical analyses of the psychological antecedents and contingencies of categorization and particularly identification processes that have recently appeared in the team diversity literature (Van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007) we felt it was particular timely to explore how social categorization may translate into intergroup behavior in diverse teams through intergroup (i.e., group based) emotion.

In this paper we apply Intergroup Emotion Theory (IET, Mackie, Devos & Smith, 2000; Smith, 1993; 1999) – a theory that considers emotion as a group-based phenomenon -
to argue that the way diverse team members cognitively appraise a situation (concerning relationships or the task at hand) and react emotionally about it, and the extent to which they intend to act on it or not, will be a function of their identification with a salient categorization. The proposed extension by applying IET offers the advantage of being able to predict more specifically when and why individual members in a diverse team may come to experience emotions on behalf of a shared salient social categorization potentially leading to shared emotions in the team, and when they will experience emotion on behalf of varied salient social categorizations, potentially leading to variation of emotions in the team. Essentially we argue that IET allows the integration of emotion as a key moderator in models of diverse teams that connect categorization and identification processes to team functioning.

In the next section we will briefly outline the major tenets of IET and review empirical evidence before describing the major contributions of applying IET to the area of diverse teams. We then elaborate propositions about the nature and role of intergroup emotion in diverse team functioning before discussing potential consequences of shared and varied intergroup emotions for team information sharing.

**INTERGROUP EMOTION THEORY**

The theory of intergroup emotions (Mackie, Devos & Smith, 2000; Smith, 1993; 1999) was founded on the assumption that an individual who identified him or herself as a member of a social group appraised and interpreted events as relevant not to the self but to that group membership, that such appraisals generated group-based emotion directed toward both the ingroup and relevant outgroups, and that those emotions in turn acted as motivating conditions for in-group directed or outgroup directed behaviors.

The appraisal processes that are proposed to generate intergroup emotions are thought to be identical to appraisal processes that have been identified as generating emotion for individuals, with the important difference that the appraisal involves the individual’s “social
identity” instead of his or her “personal identity” (Smith, 1993; also see Garcia-Prieto & Scherer, 2006). If cognitive appraisal theories of emotion (Frijda, 1986; Lazarus, 1991; Roseman, 1984; Scherer, 1984a, 1984b, 2001; Smith & Ellsworth, 1985) posit that emotions are experienced by individuals because an event has relevance to them as individuals, IET posits that intergroup emotions are experienced by individual group members because an event has relevance to them as members of a social group. Intergroup appraisals evaluate the implication of events or situations for the ingroup (me as a “Woman”), rather than for the self (me as “Mary”). To put it simply, when a social identification is “switched on” it blurs the distinction between ourselves and the ingroup (Smith & Henry, 1996) and emotions are experienced on behalf of the ingroup (Smith, Seger & Mackie, 2007).

To clarify the distinction between interpersonal and intergroup emotion we refer to Parkinson, Fischer & Manstead (2005) who proposed to distinguish on the one hand, between the subject and the object of emotion, and on the other hand, whether the subject or object is an individual or a group (see Fig 1). Because individuals vary in their level of identification with social groups (e.g., I could identify with being a male from weakly to very strongly), intergroup emotion theory posits that the more an individual identifies with a group the more easily, frequently and intensely he/she will experience intergroup emotion (Mackie, Silver, & Smith, 2004).

What are the consequences of intergroup emotion on behavior? IET argues that intergroup emotions regulate behavior directed toward the ingroup and outgroup. Just as emotion theory assumes that emotional responses are adaptive signals that prepare the individual to take action because a relevant event is occurring (Lazarus, 1991; Frijda, 1986),
IET argues that intergroup emotions are motivators of action tendencies directed toward others as members of the ingroup or the outgroup. Such intergroup emotions make particular intergroup behaviors more or less salient, likely, and/or desirable. When those behaviors are inhibited, facilitated, or blocked, feedback processes intensify, dampen, or eliminate the triggering emotional reaction in a continuous process of emotional and behavioral regulation (Maitner, Mackie, & Smith, 2007a and b).

**Empirical Evidence**

In the last 15 years an impressive body of research has provided support for the nature and function of intergroup emotions (for a recent review see Mackie, Silver, & Smith, 2004; Parkinson, Fisher & Manstead, 2005). We focus here on reviewing those studies that have specifically demonstrated that categorization and social identification are necessary antecedents of intergroup emotion.

The most comprehensive data in this regard come from two studies in which Smith, Seger, & Mackie (2007) asked participants to first think about themselves in terms of individual identity and then in terms of particular relevant group memberships (Americans, Republicans, men, and so forth) and to report the emotions they felt when thinking about themselves in those ways. The results across the two studies were compelling. For each social categorization activated, participants produced separate emotional profiles, which were both distinct from one another and distinct from the emotional profiles participants produced when thinking about themselves as unique individuals. That is, even though a particular individual might report feeling happy and relaxed as an individual, that same individual might report feeling angry and anxious as an American and guilty and depressed as a Democrat. Moreover, similar patterns of emotions were shown by other individuals in the same social category, so that the emotional experience of any one Republican participant, for example, was more closely aligned to the emotional experiences of other Republicans than to his or her
own emotional experience as an individual. Social categorization clearly dictated the
emotions reported by group members just as the theory predicted. Also as predicted by IET,
the relation between category membership and emotion was moderated by identification.
Across the several groups studied, greater identification with a particular group membership
(as measured by centrality and importance of the membership to the self) was associated with
more intense positive ingroup-directed emotion and more anger toward outgroups, as well as
with reduced negative emotions toward the ingroup. Finally, these data provided converging
evidence for the regulatory function of intergroup emotions. For each categorization
activated, participants reported their desire to engage in a wide range of behaviors reflecting
affiliation with the ingroup and confrontation with the outgroup. Intergroup emotions and
intergroup anger in particular, were powerful predictors of these desires. For example, anger
at the outgroup predicted the desire to both criticize the outgroup and to confront an outgroup
member critical of the ingroup.

Research by Yzerbyt and colleagues (for a review see Yzerbyt, Dumont, Mathieu,
Gordijn & Wigboldus, 2006) has also clearly demonstrated that variations in social
categorization and the level of social identification can have a strong impact on the experience
of intergroup emotion. For example, Yzerbyt, Dumont, Wigboldus, & Gordijn (2003)
confronted students at a French-speaking Belgium university with a press article that
described a situation of intergroup conflict between university students and professors at a
Dutch-speaking Belgian university. The article described that Professors at the Dutch-
speaking university wanted to impose English as the only language for students. Participants
were either categorized into a common group with the victims (by telling them their responses
would be compared to those of professors) or categorized into a different group than the
victims (by telling them their responses would be compared to those of students at the Dutch-
speaking University). Results showed that participants who saw themselves as sharing a
common group membership with the victims felt stronger anger than participants in the other conditions. In addition, the more participants identified with the shared group membership, the stronger the reported anger and the stronger the action tendencies to confront the outgroup (see also Gordijn, Wigboldus and Yzerbyt, 2001).

Other studies have confirmed the powerful role that intergroup emotions play in regulating intergroup behavior. In one such set of studies (Maitner, Mackie, & Smith, 2007 a) participants were reminded of acts of aggression perpetrated on an outgroup by their ingroup. Ingroup members who reacted with guilt to such events were motivated to end such attacks and their guilt became even more intense when the ingroup failed to do so. In contrast those who felt satisfaction at the attacks were more motivated to attack again, and satisfaction increased when the ingroup did so. Importantly, highly identified members of the group were more likely to appraise the original acts of aggression as justified and more likely to react to them with satisfaction which explained why highly identified group members found ingroup aggression even more desirable than group members who were not so highly identified. In another set of studies (Maitner, Mackie, & Smith, 2007 b), anger provoked by an outgroup insult was intensified by the ingroup’s failure to confront the outgroup but ameliorated when the ingroup went on the offensive. Thus intergroup emotions acted as motivators for specific types of intergroup behavior, and whether or not this behavior occurred had important consequences for either increases in the instigating emotional state (when the desired behavior did not occur) or its decrease (when the desired behavior did occur) demonstrating its regulatory role.

In sum, this growing body of research confirms the main tenets of intergroup emotion theory. Social categorization determines the experience of intergroup emotion, a relation that is mediated by group level appraisals and moderated by social identification. The triggering of distinct ingroup and outgroup directed emotions in turn motivates specific and predictable
behaviors toward the ingroup and the outgroup, and are in turn regulated by whether or not those behaviors are executed.

**INTERGROUP EMOTIONS IN DIVERSE TEAMS**

Elsewhere, IET has been applied to reflect on the conditions under which individuals in workgroups in general may come to experience intergroup emotions (Garcia-Prieto, Mackie, Tran, & Smith, in press). This paper proposes that the theoretical links made by IET between categorization, identification, cognitive appraisals, emotions and intergroup behavior described in the previous sections contribute to the existing diverse team literature in two specific ways. First, they integrate emotion into conceptualizations of diverse team functioning that have focused on the antecedents and contingencies of categorization and identification in diverse teams but have not elaborated on emotions (e.g., Chattopadhyay, Tluchowska, & George, 2004; Van Knippenberg, De Dreu & Homan, 2004). Second, they extend previous models of diverse team functioning that have elaborated on emotions but a) have only focused the impact of a few emotions, positive/negative affect or team affective-tone (Phillips & Lount, 2007); b) have only examined the negative affective outcomes of team diversity such as lowers satisfaction, and lower commitment (Milliken & Martin, 1996); c) have only studied the disruptive nature of emotions resulting from relational conflict (e.g., Jehn et al., 1999; Pelled et al., 1999); or d) that have integrated emotion as a moderator, but have failed to fully articulate the link between emotion processes and categorization and identification processes (Garcia-Prieto, Bellard & Schneider, 2003). In the following sections we outline what we see as the major advantages of applying IET to the diverse team literature and elaborate some propositions for research.

But before going any further we would like to address the question of what would an intergroup emotion look like in the context of a diverse team? Let us take the example of a cross-functional team located in Brussels from a multinational company with headquarters in
the US, composed of 5 people, with a mix of functional expertise, (marketing, sales, production, research and development, HR), a mix of nationalities (France, US, Australia, Nigeria, Chile), and both genders represented (2 women, 3 men). Depending on the context, any membership, whether team, gender, age, or ethnic or national demographic categories or professional occupation might be salient and relevant to any of the team members, with cross-cutting consequences of shared membership for different members (Ashforth & Johnson, 2001; Foreman & Whetten, 2002; Pratt & Foreman, 2000; Pratt & Rafaeli, 1997). Thus as a function of the context a member of this diverse team might feel like an individual (e.g; I am Giselle), a member of this specific team, or as woman, as being French, or a member of the sales department, and see others in the organization as individuals, or members of another work team, or men, or Australian, or representing another function. Going back to the criteria that determine what is an intergroup emotion (see figure 1), in this paper we are not concerned with those the emotions that one member, say Giselle may have toward another member of her team, Mike (i.e.; interpersonal emotion). Nor are we concerned neither with the idiosyncratic emotions that Giselle may have toward Americans in general (i.e; individual emotions toward a group), nor with those emotions that she may share with others in her team about their CEO (i.e; group emotion toward an individual). We are only concerned with those emotions that will be elicited when one of Giselle’s social categorizations becomes salient and she identifies with it to the extent of leading her to appraise an event or entity and thus to experience emotion as a member of that in-group toward an event or entity as representing an out-group. For example, imagine this diverse team receives information that top management has finally approved the budget necessary to support the sales of a new product developed by the team that clearly targets the Asia-Pacific. This event may be appraised as particularly conducive by Giselle if she strongly identifies as a member of the sales department categorization. As a result she could feel “Sales” group-based emotions like relief and hope or
satisfaction about this event. If she feels relief, she may feel like relaxing (Lazarus, 1991) and if she feels hope she may feel like further committing to the teams actions (Paez, Asun, & Gonzales, 1995). Thus, for Giselle feeling “Sales” group-based relief and hope are likely to make her want to remain engaged in her diverse team activities. This budget, however, may also be seen as a threat to the needs or goals of France/Western Europe if her French categorization is salient and she strongly identifies with it, thus eliciting “French” group-based envy or sadness, depending on other relevant appraisals. If associated with anger, her envy may lead to want to become aggressive toward those team members who she may perceived as representing the regional outgroup (e.g; the Australian team member) and if felt for a long period of time, it may poison her relationships with the team in general (Lazarus, 1991; Lazarus & Cohen-Charash, 2001). If associated with sadness, given that sadness is associated with withdrawal tendencies (Scherer and Tran, 2001), “French” group-based envy may lead her to withdrawal from team activities and restrained participation. Thus, for Giselle experiencing “French” group-based envy, whether associated with anger or sadness, may lead to behavioral opposition to team collaboration.

The prevalence of Intergroup Emotions in Diverse Teams.

In diverse teams, we expected that members have the potential of a more varied range of demographic and professional categorizations or group memberships that may be salient and to which they feel identification with at any given time (Garcia-Prieto, Bellard & Schneider, 2003; Jackson, May, & Whitney, 1995). The more an individual in a diverse team identifies with any of those social categorizations the more easily, frequently and intensely he/she will experience intergroup emotion (Mackie, Silver, & Smith, 2004). Thus we propose that:

_Proposition 1: Diverse team members may more often than not appraise situations and respond to them emotionally bearing in mind that they are members of these multiple social categorizations rather than unique individuals._
Proposition 2: The more an individual in a diverse team identifies with any of those multiple social categorizations the more easily, frequently and intensely he/she will experience intergroup emotion.

As discussed in the sections above these intergroup emotional reactions are expected to be quite different and have different behavioral consequences compared to interpersonal emotional reactions that would be provoked by the same event or entity if diverse team members were focused on their “unique” personal self.

Conditions for Shared and Varied Intergroup Emotions in Diverse Teams.

The claims that emotions are linked to categorization and identification, and that intergroup emotions are differentiated are the two most central and important theoretical claims IET makes. Social categorization determines the type of emotional reaction and identification moderates the strength of this reaction. Since in diverse teams individuals might differentially identify with any of multiple social categories or group memberships (i.e., the organization, the team, their nationality, the profession, gender, etc.), (Harrison, Price & Bell, 1998) teams members are capable of showing shared or varied intergroup emotion reactions to the same person or entity which could have important consequences for diverse team functioning. Hence,

Proposition 3a: Diverse team members who share a categorization and share similar levels of ingroup identification with that categorization, are more likely to share emotional reactions to the same event or entity.

Proposition 3b: Diverse team members who see themselves in terms of varied categorizations and have varied identifications with any of the potential multiple group memberships available to each individual, are more likely to have varied emotion reactions to the same event or entity.

Proposition 3c: The intensity of members’ emotional reactions might be amplified or suppressed when identification with a categorization varies.
Prediction of distinct and differentiated intergroup emotions in diverse teams.

Another important contribution it that the IET approach moves beyond past diversity research which proposed a positive or negative evaluation of categorization of individual members in diverse teams into ingroups and outgroups (Van Knippenberg, De Dreu & Homan, 2004) or team diversity models which have integrated emotion but have only focused on a few emotions or on the impact of positive/negative affect or team affective tone evoked by being with dissimilar others (Phillips & Lount, 2007). The focus of IET is on being able to predict a whole range of distinct and differentiated emotional reactions that can be provoke members of ingroups and outgroups, but also by events and issues relevant to ingroups and outgroups. In addition, IET’s approach to emotion entrains the view of appraisals as readiness for action, as the intention to strike out when angered, to shun when disgusted, to nurture when affectionate, or to flee when frightened. From this perspective, the theoretical focus is what ingroup or outgroup members in diverse teams want to do to one another rather than what they think of one another (which might well follow rather than provoke action) and the theoretical urgency is to be able to intervene between team members emotions (fear) and readiness to act (wanting to more away from) to enhance diverse team functioning, and not how to make diverse team members’ actions consistent with their attitudes.

Such a view requires a rethinking of traditional views of stereotyping processes and prejudice in diverse teams. Whereas stereotypes and prejudice are regarded as stable over time and context, emotional reactions vary over both. As discussed, the iterative chaining among appraisal, emotion, and behavior, allows for similar situations and entities in diverse teams to be appraised and responded to differently depending on changes in the perceiver’s categorization and identity, in the context and event, and in the number and intensity of emotions generated.

*Proposition 4a: In diverse teams a whole range of distinct and differentiated emotional reactions to the same event are possible.*
Proposition 4b: In diverse teams the distinct type of intergroup emotion experienced by a given member about an event or entity will be a function of the relevance of that event or entity to that member’s salient categorization.

Focus on the Regulatory Function of Intergroup Emotion for Diverse Team Behavior.

As discussed in the introduction team diversity researchers have focused on the negative consequences of categorization and identification (for a review see Knippenberg & Shippers, 2007) and on the disruptive impact of negative affective outcomes of interacting with dissimilar others (Jehn et al., 1999; Pelled et al., 1999; Milliken & Martin, 1996). The IET approach to team diversity moves away from this pessimistic view and is complementary to recent models which either have argued for a detailed models of categorization and identification (Van Knippenberg, De Dreu & Homan, 2004) or have offered a more functional view of the role of both positive and negative team affect in diverse team functioning for example with regard to information sharing (e.g., Phillips & Lount, 2007). IET sees emotion as functionally regulatory at the group level just as emotion is functionally regulatory at the individual level. Indeed, such group-level functionality is to be expected, for group living is evolutionarily ancient in humans as well as related primate species. Just as emotion has changed from being seen as inherently disruptive of the best functioning of the individual to being understood as part of an intricate system that promotes adaptive functioning, so does IET view intergroup emotion as occurring for adaptive reasons and not merely as an event inherently disruptive to intragroup or intergroup relations. We believe that understanding the regulatory function of intergroup emotion in diverse teams regardless of its negative or positive consequences; will ultimately serve the area of diverse teams well in its attempt to ameliorate team processes and functioning. Thus,

Proposition 5: In diverse teams the consequences of positive and negative intergroup emotions might be disruptive and destructive, but might also serve connectedness and sustaining team functions.
Consequences of intergroup emotion on information sharing in diverse teams

The specific intergroup appraisals and intergroup emotions aroused by identification with a shared or with any of possibly multiple social categories in a diverse team lead to intergroup behaviours that can affect team functioning. In this section we will illustrate more precisely in which ways intergroup emotions may impact intergroup behaviours concerning team information sharing.

Information sharing, i.e., the disclosure of factual, task-relevant information to other members (Stasser & Titus, 1985; Stasser, 1992) has been positively linked to team performance (Jehn & Shah, 1997; Saavedra, Early & Van Dyne, 1993). It has been argued that the pooling and coordination of information is expected to lead to better team decisions (Gigone & Hastie, 1993). In longer-term established workgroups, information sharing is also expected to reduce relational and task related conflict increasing team performance (Moye & Langfred, 2004). A key finding in this area of team research is that in decision-making teams sub-optimal decisions are often made because discussions tend to be biased in favor of exchanging *shared information* (information already known to all members) at the expense of *unshared or “unique” information* (know by only one or a few members; Stasser & Titus, 1985).

But recent research has suggested that diverse decision-making teams, composed of categorically diverse members (i.e., in-group and out-group coworkers) may be less susceptible to these biases and have less coordination loss (Phillips & Loyd, 2006; Phillips, Northcraft, & Neale, 2006; Sommers, 2006). In fact there is growing evidence that the mere presence of visible diversity (because of the anticipation of interacting with dissimilar others) might elicit greater use of alternative perspectives and more throughout processing of information (Antonio et al. 2004; Phillips & Loyd, 2006; Philips, Northcraft and Neale, 2006; Sommers, 2006). It has also been shown that unique information is more likely to be used in
the discussion if held by a social outsider (someone likely to be categorized as an outgroup member) especially if he or she is alone (Phillips, Mannix, Neale & Gruenfeld, 2004). In line with these results, Van Hiel & Schittekatte (1998) showed that mixed-sex groups (i.e., where one would expect greater ingroup-outgroup categorization based on sex) mentioned more unique information than same-sex groups. Mennecke and Valacich (1998) also showed that groups composed of members with an established relationship tended to mention less unique information than groups of strangers. Taken together, these results offer the intriguing possibility that information sharing is one domain in which the varied categorization and social identification of diverse teams might promote positive outcomes.

Unfortunately, researchers working on information sharing in workgroups have not yet fully explored the potential impact of identification (for recent reviews see Wittenbaum & Stasser, 1996; Wittenbaum, Hollingshead & Botero, 2004). Similarly, the question of whether and to what extent emotions (interpersonal or intergroup) may actually moderate information sharing behaviour in workgroups remains to be explored empirically (see Raus & Liu, 2004).

A model recently propose by Phillips & Lound (2007) offers some promising insights as to why diverse teams may have an advantage when it comes to information sharing. These authors build on research showing that negative emotions and affect can lead to more controlled, cautious, detailed analytic systematic processing (Bodenhausen, Mussweiler, Gabriel & Moreno, 2001; Bodenhausen, 1993; Tiedens & Linton, 2001) and that positive emotions and affect can lead to less effortful information processing strategies (Boddenhausen et al., 2001; Mackie & Worth, 1989) to propose that the advantages of team diversity may stem from the more negative affective reactions (e.g., uncertainty and anticipation of relational conflict) that team members may typically associate with diversity. The two propositions that stem from their model are that working in diverse teams will lead to more negative affective tone which may enhance systematic information processing.
enhancing decision-making, and working in homogenous teams will lead to more positive affective tone which may lead to reduced cognitive complexity decreasing decision-making.

Using an IET approach offers the advantage of being able to predict a whole range of differentiated intergroup emotions (beyond positive and negative) and the extent to which they will be shared or varied in the diverse team as a function of which categorizations members identify with more strongly in the context of a decision-making task. This gives us the possibility of being able to predict more specifically how shared and varied intergroup behaviours associated with an intergroup emotion may differentially affect information sharing in during a decision-making task.

As illustrated in tables 1 and 2 building on IET we can easily elaborate predictions about how a specific intergroup appraisal leading to intergroup anger or sadness (felt at varying intensities) may elicit intergroup behaviours which can directly impact information sharing behaviours.

Insert tables 1 and 2 about here

Implications for leaders

Conceptualizing emotion processes in diverse teams through IET will facilitate leaders thinking of emotion as a source of useful information that they can use strategically to enhance diverse team functioning. For instance, intergroup emotions can serve as indicators for leaders with regard to subgroup or committee assignment. Perhaps members expressing more active emotions such as anger and or joy are desired for some initiatives (e.g., selling an issue, timely action), while members expressing sadness may be desired for other aspects (e.g., data gathering, decision making).
Moreover, shared intergroup emotional responses may be indicative/predictive of potential or future faultline formation (Lau & Murnighan 1998; 2005) among group members who are perceiving/reacting to a given issue in similar fashion. For example if we go back to the example we discussed in this paper of the cross-functional multinational team in Brussels, if the leader notices during a meeting that some members reacts to an issue expressing “ingroup emotions” against an “outgroup” this could be indicative of coalition formation. Leaders could thus utilize information about intergoup emotions to develop appropriate action measures to mitigate negative effects of the coallition formation. For example by cross-cutting the observed ingroup / outgroup categories during subgroup/committee assignments.

Intergroup emotional responses may also signal leaders as to what is the appropriate communication strategy for particular group members. In other words, enthusiastic or interested ingroup emotional responses may signal that individuals identifying strongly with the ingroup are ready to engage immediately. Ingroup sadness may signal to leaders that the need to allow or otherwise facilitate time and space for particular group members to process the relevant information and gather themselves if appropriate. Expressions of intergroup anger between ingrups and outgroups may also signal that dyadic interaction with sufficient confidentiality and space (removed from other group members) is necessary or a preferable strategy allowing for differences to be expressed through emotion (as opposed to wanting to contain the expression).

Intergroup emotional responses can indicate who among the group holds different perspectives about a particular issue (interest, resistance, approach/avoidance), providing specific data gathering points for leaders to facilitate gathering of unique information. “It appeared as though you were excited about this issue… what is it that you see…?” “It appeared as though you didn’t think very highly of this suggestion/I though I sensed anger/resistance to the issue… what is it that you see…?” Through this process, leaders can
take a strategic approach to gathering representative diverse perspectives to issues at hand. Of course, this doesn’t have to be based on intergroup emotion only – it is likely that an effective leader strategy may be to seek out each group member individually when it comes to any important issue to identify relevant perspectives, however, group-based emotional responses may serve as cues when resources are limited, or when trying to strategically identify and explore particular perspectives (e.g., interest versus anger).

Considering the faultline and communication comments above, a leader that recognizes opposing emotional reactions among members of a group, and potential faultline/coalition formation, may then effectively serve as a mediator, or have the opportunity to engage in sufficient data gathering to otherwise mitigate or resolve potential conflict, or even serve as a conduit for information/perspective gathering and sharing across subgroups (boundary management role).

**CONCLUSIONS**

In sum, in this paper we have elaborated propositions about when and why intergroup emotions may be more prevalent, frequent and intense in diverse teams (propositions 1 and 2), when there will be instances of shared and varied intergroup emotion and when these will be amplified or suppressed (propositions 3a, 3b, 3c), how a whole range of distinct and differentiated emotions can potentially occur in diverse teams (propositions 4a, 4b), and about the importance of focusing on the regulatory (functional nature) of positive and negative intergroup emotions in diverse team functioning (proposition 5). In addition we have discussed in which ways intergroup emotions may impact specific intergroup behaviours, specifically information sharing behaviours (see tables 1 and 2).

Emotion researchers have previously drawn attention to the need to pay closer attention to the links between diversity and emotion in general (Ashkanasy, Härtel & Daus, 2002) and
in teams (Garcia-Prieto Bellard & Schneider, 2003). Diversity researchers (Van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007) have also called for more focus on how social categorization processes may translate into intergroup behavior in diverse teams. Thus the perspective proposed here answers these calls and provides a fresh and more functional insight into the nature and role of social identity and emotion processes in diverse team functioning.
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FIGURE 1

Distinction between experiencing Interpersonal, Group and Intergroup Emotions as a Function of the Subject and the Object of the Emotion

(adapted from Parkison, Fischer & Manstead, 2005)
Table 1. If ANGER is directed at a team member who is categorized as an “outgroup”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intergroup appraisals</th>
<th>Intergroup emotion</th>
<th>Intergroup action tendencies /behaviors</th>
<th>Consequences for “unique information” sharing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Slightly</strong></td>
<td>Low intensity anger/irritation</td>
<td>MAY WANT TO BE REACTANT (move against) • May want to display ingroup assertiveness to go against outgroup • May want to display aspects of positive ingroup differentiation</td>
<td>• + May share “unique” ingroup information to display ingroup assertiveness • + May share “unique” ingroup information to show positive ingroup differentiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event or interaction slightly obstructing ingroup goal</td>
<td>Event or interaction slightly appraised as being caused by outgroup, intentionally</td>
<td>Event or interaction slightly appraised as violating ingroup standards of fairness and justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderately</strong></td>
<td>Medium intensity anger</td>
<td>MAY WANT TO BE ANTAGONISTIC (move against) • May want to attack/retaliate or hurt the outgroup • May want to attack outgroup through verbal or symbolic aggression like insults • May show passive aggressive behaviors</td>
<td>• + May share “unique” ingroup information to humiliate or insult the outgroup • + May share “unique” ingroup information to gain competitive advantage over the outgroup (retaliation) → is positive if action remains within ethical boundaries (in terms of business practices) • - May hold back “unique” ingroup information to hinder outgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event or interaction moderately obstructing ingroup goal</td>
<td>Event or interaction moderately appraised as being caused by outgroup, intentionally</td>
<td>Event or interaction moderately appraised as violating ingroup standards of fairness and justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly</strong></td>
<td>High intensity anger/rage</td>
<td>WANTS TO BE ANTAGONISTIC (move against) • Wants to attack/retaliate or hurt the outgroup • Wants to attack outgroup through verbal or symbolic aggression like insults • Wants to show passive aggressive behaviors</td>
<td>• + Shares “unique” ingroup information to humiliate or insult the outgroup • + Shares “unique” ingroup information to gain competitive advantage over the outgroup (retaliation) → is positive if action remains within ethical boundaries (in terms of business practices) • -Holds back “unique” ingroup information to hinder outgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event or interaction strongly obstructing ingroup goal</td>
<td>Event or interaction strongly appraised as being caused by outgroup, intentionally</td>
<td>Event or interaction strongly appraised as violating ingroup standards of fairness and justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. If SADNESS is caused by a team member who is categorized as an “outgroup”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intergroup appraisals</th>
<th>Intergroup emotion</th>
<th>Intergroup action tendencies /behaviors</th>
<th>Consequences for “unique information” sharing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Slightly</strong></td>
<td>Low intensity sadness /disappointment</td>
<td>MAY WANT TO ATTEND</td>
<td>• + May share “unique” ingroup information to clarify, understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event or interaction slightly obstructing ingroup goal</td>
<td>• Event or interaction perceived as a slight  loss to ingroup</td>
<td>May want to observe well, to understand, to pay attention to consider possibility for the ingroup to adjust to new events, review objectives realistically</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event or interaction perceived as a slight  loss to ingroup</td>
<td>• Slightly low coping potential of ingroup to deal with consequences of event or interaction</td>
<td>MAY WANT TO AVOID (move away)</td>
<td>• - May hold back “unique” ingroup from outgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderately</strong></td>
<td>Medium intensity sadness</td>
<td>MAY WANT TO ATTEND</td>
<td>• + May share “unique” ingroup information to clarify, understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event or interaction moderately obstructing ingroup goal</td>
<td>• Event or interaction perceived as a moderate loss to ingroup</td>
<td>May want to observe well, to understand, to pay attention to consider possibility for the ingroup to adjust to new events, review objectives realistically</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event or interaction perceived as a moderate loss to ingroup</td>
<td>• Moderately low coping potential of ingroup to deal with consequences of event or interaction</td>
<td>MAY WANT TO AVOID (move away)</td>
<td>• - May hold back “unique” ingroup information from outgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly</strong></td>
<td>High intensity sadness /dispair</td>
<td>WANTS TO ATTEND</td>
<td>• + Shares “unique” ingroup information to clarify, understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event or interaction strongly obstructing ingroup goal</td>
<td>• Event or interaction perceived as a strong loss to ingroup</td>
<td>Wants to observe well, to understand, to pay attention to consider possibility for the ingroup to adjust to new events, review objectives realistically</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low coping potential of ingroup to deal with consequences of event or interaction</td>
<td>• Very low coping potential of ingroup to deal with consequences of event or interaction</td>
<td>WANTS TO AVOID (move away)</td>
<td>• - Holds back “unique” ingroup information only from outgroup, only shares with ingroup members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WANTS TO BE WITH (Moving toward)</td>
<td>• - Holds back “unique” ingroup information and shares only common information to feel comforted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wants to be with ingroup for social bonding and supportHELPLESSNES</td>
<td>• - Stops sharing any information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wants to do something but not know what, may feel ingroup helplessness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sense of ingroup failure, like nothing can be done</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>