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Abstract: Multidisciplinary teams are becoming a common entity in modern organisations. At the same time, work teams are also becoming increasingly multicultural the world over. Interaction and interdependence in such complex teams creates the potential for confusion and errors. Consequently, quality and safety have emerged as prime foci in the delivery of organizational outcomes. A multiple identity perspective can help to understand and overcome such problems. We review recent research on identity interactions in work organizations with the intent of improving theoretical precision and implications for practice, developing a conceptual framework that affords a central role for identity interactions in the context of complex teams.
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Globalization and spread of communication technologies have led to emergence of complex organizations containing individuals with nested and cross-cutting identities (Ashforth, Harrison, & Corley, 2008; Hirsh & Kang, 2015). There is a growing awareness of the unique opportunities and challenges associated with multiple group identities (Bodenhausen, 2010; Crisp & Hewstone, 2007; Kang & Bodenhausen, 2015; Ramarajan, 2014). For example, highly skilled migrants are considered an important part of the global talent pool but integration of such skilled migrants into home organizations poses serious challenges. At the same time, the multidisciplinary model is increasingly being used in many industry settings the world over. However, interaction and interdependence of different disciplines creates the potential for confusion, errors and delays.

There is limited research on complex multidisciplinary and multicultural teams that explores the impact of multiple identity interactions, and there remain important issues unaddressed. Here, our central research question is, “how do members’ multiple identities combine and interact with each other in influencing relational processes and outcomes in complex teams?” We review and integrate the growing literature on multiple identities in order to develop a theoretical framework for complex multidisciplinary, multicultural teams. This framework extends existing models of teamwork, as well as the literature on identity interactions and suggests an agenda for future research and practice improvement.

RELATIONSHIPS AMONG IDENTITIES
Organisational research that examines the concept of multiple identities is still in its infancy (Kang & Bodenhausen, 2015; Ramarajan, 2014). Most research on multiple identities has focused on perceiving and experiencing one type of identity (such as multiple racial identities) or the intersection between two types of identities (such as a racial identity and a gender-based identity) and neglected the broader spectrum of multiple identities and the inter-relationships between them (Kang & Bodenhausden, 2015). This narrow conceptualization of identities provides only limited understanding of the complexity of multiple identity interactions, shedding little light, for example on how members of teams navigate cultural or professional identities alongside their other identities. It is these more complex interactions that are likely the most problematic in team interactions as these multiple affiliations may represent different priorities, values, and goals in one’s life, that may conflict or compete.

An ‘identity’ is a self-referential description that provides contextually appropriate answers to the question “who am I” or “Who are we?” (Ashforth et al., 2008). Hence, by multiple identities, we refer to the collection of identities available for individuals to identify with or be categorised according to (e.g. culture, organisation, profession, workgroup, team) (Kang & Bodenhausen, 2015). Research on the link between multiple identities and outcomes such as psychological well-being and intergroup relations has produced mixed results. Research has sometimes reported that multiple identities increase positive outcomes such as psychological well-being (Thoits, 1983; Linvelle, 1987); engagement and performance (Caza & Wilson, 2009; Cheng, Sanchez-Burks, & Lee, 2008; Tadmore, Tetlock, & Peng, 2009); and intergroup tolerance and cooperation (Brewer & Pierce, 2005; Richter, West, van Dick, & Dawson, 2006). Yet other research has indicated negative outcomes such as psychological stress (Brook, Garcia, & Fleming, 2008; Downie, Koestner, ElGeledi, & Cree, 2004); devaluation of one’s identity (Pratt, Rockmann, & Kaufmann, 2006); emergence of negative emotions and social division (Fiol, Pratt, & O’Connor, 2009; Settles, 2004; Shih & Sanchez, 2005).

Scholarly focus for long was on conceptualizing one identity at a time. This was partly because social identity theory suggests that identities are arranged in a hierarchy in such a way that the most salient identity in a given situation will direct behaviour (Stets & Burke, 2003; Ramarajan, 2014). However, recent research supports that multiple identities must combine to control the social
behaviour of the individual (Ashforth et al., 2008; Dutton, Roberts, & Bednar, 2010; Kang & Bodenhausen, 2015; Ramarajan, 2014). Scholars addressing the plurality of multiple identities recognise three kinds of relationships between identities: (1) conflict (2) enhancement (3) integration.

**Conflict Between Identities**

An identity conflict is an inconsistency in the values, goals, or norms of two or more identities, and may be endemic to organizational life, because most firms are made up of multiple nested groups and affiliations (Ashforth et al., 2008; Hirsh & Kang, 2015; Horton, Bayerl, & Jacobs, 2014). Negative impacts of identity conflict have been reported in studies on incompatibility between one’s gender and professional choice (London, Rosenthal, Levy, & Lobel, 2011; Settles, Jellison, & Pratt-Hyatt, 2009), and for bicultural identities (Benet-Martínez, Leu, Lee, & Morris, 2002; Miramontez, Benet-Martínez, & Nguyen, 2008; Stroink & Lalonde, 2009). Identity conflict becomes problematic for individuals, groups and the organization when the individual identifies sufficiently with each identity that dissonance is experienced (Burke, 2003; Brook et al., 2008; Cadsby, Servatska, & Song, 2013; Karelaia & Guillen, 2014; Mok & Morris, 2009; Rabinovic & Morton, 2016; Voss, Cable, & Voss, 2006), and to the extent that they feel they cannot satisfy role requirements in terms of time, behavior or resources (Creed, de Jordy, & Lok, 2010; Settles, 2004). When an individual feels s/he must give precedent to one set of meanings, values and behaviors over another in order to satisfy particular identity-based expectations, and thus cannot express the other identities they may hold, identity conflict ensues (Hewlin, 2009; Burke & Stets, 2009).

Identity conflict can have many deleterious effects. Previous research has documented negative psychological outcomes such as reduced life satisfaction, diminished well-being, lower self-esteem and depression (Brook et al., 2008; Downie et al., 2004; Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 2002; Settles, 2004), as well as poor job performance (Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 2002; Settles, 2004). Identity conflict may create a sense of psychological pressure that diminishes the effective use of coping strategies (Cooke and Rosseau, 1984) or overtax available cognitive resources (Fried, Ben-David, Tieg, Avital, & Yeverechyahu, 1998), reducing creativity (Williams & O’Reilly, 1998).
Identity conflicts have been shown to distort communication, which in turn results in errors, decreased learning, and increased turnover (Humphreys & Brown, 2002).

In the context of work teams, the very process of identifying with a social group may promote inter-group conflict, because it fosters within-group bias (Turner, 1999). That is, one means of maintaining a positive view of oneself is to hold a negative view of others who are not members of one’s social group. Scholars of team identification have often implied that having a salient team identity that take precedent over other identity affiliations that are represented in the group is beneficial (Mannix & Neale, 2005; Mitchell, Parker, & Giles, 2011). However, some scholars have emphasized that a single, salient common identity may imply that the views, knowledge, and priorities associated with one’s other identities must be sacrificed. This can be detrimental and frustrating for individuals (Anteby & Wrzesniewsky, 2014; Crisp, Stone, & Hall, 2006; Fiol et al., 2009).

**Integration of Identities**

Cross-cultural psychologists have proposed the concept of identity integration, which occurs when the two or more identities a person holds are seen as “one” (Benet-Martinez, 2012). Integration has also been viewed as blurring of spatial, temporal and cognitive boundaries that divide areas of a person’s life (Ashforth, 2001; Ramarajan, 2014; Syed 2010; Syed & McLean, 2016); this is very different from viewing the identities as “one”, hence we argue for distinct terminology and conceptualization of these two very different concepts.

Identity integration has been investigated in particular, in the case of ethnic identities, and shown to be generally associated with positive outcomes, such as creativity (Cheng et al., 2008; Leung, Maddux, Galinsky & Chiu, 2008; Maddux, Adam, & Galinsky, 2010; Mok & Morris, 2010a; Tadmor, Galinsky, Maddux, & King, 2012), enhanced integrative complexity (Ramarajan, 2014; Tadmor, Galinsky, & Maddux, 2012; Tadmor & Tetlock, 2006) and professional success (Tadmor et al., 2012) along with positive personal outcomes such as healthy psychosocial development (McAdams, 2001). Fitzsimmons (2013) suggests that ‘identity integration’, which ranges from separated to integrated, and ‘identity plurality’, which ranges from single to multiple, create a map of possible ways to organise multiple cultural identities.
However, acknowledging one’s multiple identities and encouraging the integration of those identities (such that distinctions are lost) may be detrimental for the individual. Identity theorists from post-modern and social constructivist orientations (e.g., Gergen & Gergen, 1986; Kraus, 2007; Schachter, 2004) have argued an integrated identity is not necessarily a desirable or an adaptive identity to maintain. Similarly, Ashforth, Kreiner and Fugate (2000) suggested that identity integration may often lead to confusion and anxiety over enacting different identities, and this may then translate into a loss of productivity. At least one empirical study has documented that biculturals with low identity integration have higher cognitive complexity, defined as the capacity to analyse and interpret people, ideas and objects in a multidimensional manner (Benet-Martinez, Lee and Leu, 2006).

The concept of “social identity complexity”, developed by Roccas and Brewer (2002), draws on ideas of overlap or integration in meaning and content across identities and suggests that high perceived overlap in group memberships implies that the different ingroups are actually conceived as a single convergent social identity. Social identity complexity emphasizes the subjective structure of multiple ingroup identities.

Synergy Among Identities

A third type of relationship among identities has been described by scholars suggesting that people experience benefits from multiple role identities (such as the ability to fulfil many work demands) when one role intersects with another and results in “identity synergy” (e.g. Caza & Wilson, 2009; Creary & Pratt, 2014; Gibson, Dunlop, Caprar, & Raghav, 2016; Pratt & Foreman, 2000; Rothbard & Ramarajan, 2009). Identity synergy is a term perhaps first used by Pratt and Foreman (2000) to describe organizational identities which a firm might develop which are synergistic, that is they work in concert to help ensure the viability and longevity of a firm. Fombelle, Jarvis, Ward & Ostrom (2012) empirically demonstrated that marketers can leverage customers’ multiple identities by using identity synergy as a driver of organisational identification; this study states that identity synergy occurs when individuals’ involvement with an organisation facilitates their pursuit of other important social identities. Social network theorists (e.g. Burt, 2000) and developmental process researchers (e.g. Higgins & Kram, 2001) suggest that individuals with multiple social identities have
better access to resources such as trust and information in organisations that strengthens them to endure stress and hardship and/or take on new and more demanding challenges. Likewise, identity fusion is defined as a form of alignment that entails a visceral feeling of oneness with the group (Swann & Buhrmester, 2015). This feeling is associated with unusually porous, highly permeable borders between the personal and social self. These porous borders encourage people to channel their personal agency into group behaviour, raising the possibility that the personal and social self will combine to motivate pro-group behaviour. The research literature indicates that measures of fusion are exceptionally strong predictors of extreme pro-group behaviour (Swann & Buhrmester, 2015; Swann, Jetten, Gomez, Whitehouse & Bestian, 2012).

Building upon the idea of simultaneous identity co-activation, Gibson et al., (2016) paper offers more clarity on the construct. The paper defines identity synergy as the degree of interaction, coordination and compatibility across multiple identities at the individual level. When multiple identities are co-activated and individuals view them as compatible, contribute perspectives, ideas, and views associated with each affiliation, then distinctiveness can be persevered, while also working in concert. This may enable a focus on the totality of the identities rather than on just their intersection (e.g., a female nurse who sees both female and nurse as highly salient despite their differences), thus preserving both differentiation and integration (Roccas & Brewer, 2002: 92).

AN IDENTITY-BASED FRAMEWORK FOR COMPLEX TEAMS

Drawing upon these various types of potential relationships among identities, we propose an identity-based model of effectiveness for complex teams. This model recognizes that simply focusing on the degree to which members identify with the team, which has been the focus in most of the prior research (e.g., Hinds & Mortensen, 2005; Ren, Kraut, & Kiesler, 2007; Levine, Prosser, Evans, & Reicher, 2005; Van der Vegt, Bunderson, & Oosterhof, 2006; Gibson, Gibbs, Stanco, Tesluk, & Cohen, 2011), fails to capture the variety of affiliations members hold and the many different ways in which these identities might inter-relate. Doing so creates the potential to draw upon these multiple affiliations as a source of strength in the team, but also acknowledges that the added complexity may present challenges that must be mitigated.
For example, multidisciplinary teams are becoming increasingly common in organisations (Mitchell, Tieman, & Shelby-James, 2008). Members of these teams may also have different cultural backgrounds, having been born, raised or spent significant time in other national cultural contexts beyond that in which they are currently located. Further, they often have differing professional or disciplinary focus. For example, a multidisciplinary, multicultural health care team may consist of physicians, nurses, allied health care staff, and administrators. They also have an affiliation to their organization. In the healthcare context, this might be a particular hospital. Finally, as members of a multidisciplinary team, team members interact with each other on a daily basis and develop an affiliation at the team level, and a sense of team identity. However, without acknowledging the other affiliations, we have a very incomplete picture of the identity dynamics in the team. Even more importantly, by only focusing on the team identity, scholars and practitioners might inadvertently suppress the valuable insights, views, perspectives, and knowledge associated with the other identities. In the sections that follow, we explain how our model addresses this limitation of prior theory. We employ the input-mediator-output-input (IMOI) model (Ilgen, Hollenbeck, Johnson, & Jundt, 2005), which suggest that team inputs (such as relationships among identities influence mediators, including team emergent states such as relational coordination, described below), which in turn influences team outputs such innovation, performance, and quality. Our model is depicted in Figure 1 and our specific propositions are listed in Table 1.

--- Insert Figure 1 and Table 1 here ---

**Nested Networks of Identity Relationships**

Each of the social groups that an individual team member affiliates with (e.g., culture, organisation, profession, and work team) represents a potential source of identity, and each identity might conflict, be integrated with, or have synergy among, each other identity. These relationships form a type of intrapersonal identity network (Ramarajan, 2014). Each identity constitutes a node in the intrapersonal network, and the relationships among them constitute the connections or ties in the network. Further, each individual intrapersonal network can be characterized by typical network indicators, such as size, density, as well as by the degree to which the ties tend to be conflictual, integrative or synergistic.
Importantly, a growing body of research examining social networks in teams suggests that teams can be meaningfully conceptualized as networks of individuals (e.g., Reagans, Zuckerman, & McEvily, 2004; Regans & Zuckerman, 2001; Cott, 1997). Hence, we can characterize a team based on the degree to which the team tends to consist of members with intrapersonal networks that are conflictual, integrative or synergistic. These relationships among team identities serve as a key input into the team.

**Relational Coordination as Mediator**

Teams are likely to develop different emergent states, depending on the amalgam of intrapersonal identity networks in the team. A key emergent state, which also poses a challenge in complex teams is relational coordination, defined as “a mutually reinforcing web of communication and relationships carried out for the purpose of task integration” (Gittell, 2002b: 300). It captures the coordination that occurs through frequent, timely, high quality and problem-solving communication, supported by shared goals, shared knowledge and mutual respect (Gittell, 2015). Research has established many benefits of relational coordination in multidisciplinary teams such as quality and efficiency of performance (Gittell, 2000; Gittell, 2002), increased job satisfaction (Gittell, 2008; Gittell, Weinberg, Pfefferle, & Bishop, 2008), improved relationships with patients (Gittell, 2015) as well as with family members (Weinberg, Lusenhop, Gittell, & Kautz, 2007).

Applying an identity perspective to the concept of relational coordination, one can argue that communication and relationship patterns associated with relational coordination will be negatively affected by the central tendency in the team for intrapersonal identity conflict. Conflict between multiple intrapersonal identities might negatively impact the communication and relationship patterns between members of complex teams and thus compromise effectiveness. For example, as the different disciplines or professions come into contact within a multidisciplinary team, this tends to produce in-group favouring social comparisons which can be threatening to the members of a devalued social identity subgroup (Aquino & Douglas, 2003; Chrobot-Mason, Ruderman, Weber, & Ernst, 2009; Hornsey & Hogg, 2000a; Jehn, Chadwick, & Thatcher, 1997; Jehn, Northcraft, & Neale, 1999). Social identity can also be threatened by implied loss of distinctiveness of the discipline-based social identity through immersion in a multidisciplinary team (Hornsey & Hogg 2000a; Steele,
Spencer, & Aronson, 2002). Those from higher status disciplines may feel threat through being positioned as psychologically equivalent with lower status groups (van Knippenberg, De Dreu, & Homan, 2004). This identity threat can engender competitive thoughts, feelings and behaviours within the multidisciplinary team (Li & Hambrick, 2005), which reduces coordination.

At the same time, having at least some degree of team identification is likely to contribute to relational coordination. In support of this, Mitchell, Parker and Giles (2011) investigated the moderating roles of team and professional identity in interprofessional effectiveness in health care. They found that in absence of a strong sense of team identity, professional diversity has a negative effect on effectiveness. Hence, we propose that apart from the effects of relationships among team identities, a strong team identity likely improves relational coordination.

**Managerial Points of Leverage**

Beyond inputs, mediators and outcomes, we propose a number of features of the organizational context that serve as moderators of these effects in complex teams. Because they mitigate some of the potential challenges associated with identity dynamics, these features serve as points of leverage for managers and organizations. For example, The organisational structures that predict high levels of relational coordination are those that connect across different functions rather than reinforcing the silos that separate them (Gittell, 2006; Gittell, Seidner, & Wimbush, 2010; Hartgerink et al., 2014; Romero, Senaris, Heredero & Nuijten, 2013). Identity conflict is often a result of entrenched in-group and out-group distinctions, where by the individuals perceives the goals and perspectives of each identity group they affiliate with as incompatible. Organizational practices can help to reduce in-group and out-group distinctions, promoting and emphasizing the accomplishment of shared organizational priorities. For example, Gittell, Godfrey and Thistlethwaite (2013) demonstrated that communication and relationship patterns are impacted by the self-concept that a person holds and organisational practices that can modify such patterns can be an important point of leverage for organisations. Here, we focus on three of these: multidisciplinary training, multidisciplinary meetings and use of boundary spanners.

*Multidisciplinary training.* Multidisciplinary training refers to training provided to all professionals together in a given unit to work as a team to promote competent and effective outputs.
For example, in a health care context, doctors, nurses, and allied healthcare staff, participate together in a training program to develop optimal patient care. A significant determinant of multidisciplinary team functioning may be a personal commitment to the multidisciplinary approach, that does not conflict with other priorities. For example, Cheung, Milliss, Thanakrishnan, Anderson & Tan (2009) concluded that within a multidisciplinary health care team, it cannot be assumed that different professions will work together in pursuit of patient goals, and problems can occur through disagreements about patient management and demarcation of roles and responsibilities. Therefore, multidisciplinary training becomes important to develop and nurture the team identity between different functions in a multidisciplinary team.

Multidisciplinary meetings. According to organization design theory, multidisciplinary team meetings are central for complex team work (Galbraith, 1974). Multidisciplinary meetings increase performance of interdependent work processes by facilitating interaction among professionals and are increasingly effective under conditions of high uncertainty (Galbraith, 1974). As such, team-meetings have high information processing capability; they are expected to facilitate frequent, timely, accurate and problem-solving communication and coordination among professionals in a work process (Leso et al., 2013; Gittell, 2006). Thus, multidisciplinary meetings strengthen the accuracy of communication as well as the shared goals and shared knowledge dimensions of relational coordination.

Boundary spanners. Finally, staff members whose primary work is to integrate the work of other people around a project, process or customer can serve a boundary spanning role (Galbraith, 1995; Korschun 2015). Multidisciplinary boundary spanners strengthen the frequency and timeliness of communication as well as the shared knowledge dimensions of relational coordination. For example, boundary spanners in health care settings can support the controlled transfer of specialized knowledge between groups, increased cooperation by liaising with people from different groups and improving efficiency by introducing ideas from one isolated setting to another (Long, Cunningham, & Braithwaite, 2013). The intrapersonal identity conflict that an individual experiences in workplace may also be attenuated with the help of boundary spanners, by providing relevant information to
individuals and reducing ambiguities about the goals and priorities of different groups that individuals may identify with.

DISCUSSION

Theory as to how identities interact within individuals is nascent, and extrapolating these within-person interactions to understand team dynamics has rarely been attempted. Specifically, research so far has not attempted to integrate ‘intrapersonal identity networks’ and ‘interpersonal relations and communications’ together in one framework to understand important work outcomes. Our model provides novel insights by connecting intrapsychic and interpersonal levels of analysis.

Our model makes contributions to theory regarding social identities, relational coordination, and team effectiveness in complex teams. First, with regard to social identification, we extend the network approach to understand identities important in multicultural and multidisciplinary contexts. Complex teams have become increasingly common in modern organisations (Crampton & Hinds, 2014) and several empirical studies about the determinants and success factors of such teams have been published in the recent years (Berg & Holtbrügge, 2010; Gibson & Gibbs 2006; Mockaitis, Zander, & De Cieri, 2015). However, there is limited research on complex teams that explores the impact of multiple identity interactions on team outcomes in organisations, and there remain important questions to be answered about the outcomes of multiple identity interactions in a team context. Our model helps in not only examining and understanding many intrapersonal identities at the same time but also analysing the structure or pattern of relationships between such multiple identities. We emphasize that it is not the number of identities per se but the configuration and structure of relationships among them that determines the intra-individual dynamics.

Second, with regard to relational coordination, we develop and test underlying mechanism pertaining to interpersonal processes. Our model proposes that one way to understand the psychology of complex teams is through application of the lens of the self and examining how interpersonal relationships may be a part of the extended self. There is limited research that has empirically investigated the role of specific emergent processes for navigating identity dynamics in the context of
multicultural and multidisciplinary teams. Relational coordination theory is limited in that it does not explicitly consider how the intra-individual identity dynamics might impact the communication and relationship patterns between members of complex teams. Our model attempts to fill that gap by extending the limited research on interactions between multiple identities and its outcomes by considering the mediating effect of relational coordination on the relationship and also exploring novel moderators of the relationship between identity patterns and relational coordination in multicultural and multidisciplinary teams.

Finally, with regard to team effectiveness, the managerial points of leverage such as multidisciplinary training, meetings and boundary spanning roles can potentially facilitate functional inter-relationships at both the intrapersonal and inter-personal levels, as well as the development of a strong team identity. It is generally acknowledged in literature that not all teams grow organically and many fail to thrive if not adequately nurtured (Jeffries & Chan, 2004; Onyett & Ford, 1996). There is limited research that has empirically investigated the role of multidisciplinary training, multidisciplinary meetings and boundary spanners alongside identity dynamics in context of complex team. Our framework helps to fill that lacuna.

The review on identity constructs and the proposed model can provide an agenda for future research. Identity scholars can examine how identities are connected within and between individuals and influence interpersonal and intergroup relationships in different contexts. Organisational outcomes of interest can be investigated using our model and novel antecedents, mediators and moderators can be considered to understand the identity dynamics specific to the context. Research on multiple identities is gaining momentum. Our model extends the intrapersonal network approach to provide a way of moving forward in the area of identity research.
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Table 1: Research propositions

| P1 | The mean level of conflict among cultural, organisational, professional and team identities in complex teams is negatively related to effectiveness; this relationship is mediated by relational coordination such that less identity conflict, the more relational coordination, and thus better work outcomes. |
| P2 | Team identity is positively related to relational coordination. |
| P3 | Multidisciplinary training moderates the relationship between the mean identity conflict in complex teams and relational coordination, such that multidisciplinary training reduces the negative consequences of identity conflict for relational coordination. |
| P4 | Multidisciplinary meetings moderate the relationship between the mean identity conflict in complex teams and relational coordination, such that frequent multidisciplinary meetings reduce the negative consequences of identity conflict for relational coordination. |
| P5 | Multidisciplinary boundary spanners moderate the relationship between mean identity conflict in complex teams and relational coordination, such that their presence reduces the negative consequences of identity conflict for relational coordination. |
| P6 | Multidisciplinary training, multidisciplinary meetings and use of boundary spanning positions in complex teams are positively related to strength of team identity, such that more prevalent is the use of such organisational/managerial techniques, the stronger the team identity. |
Figure 1: Research model
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