

# SOCIAL EXCHANGE ON TEAMWORK AMONG TEACHERS

Joko Sumarsono<sup>a</sup>, Norliah Kudus<sup>b</sup>, Shahrulanuar Mohamed<sup>b</sup>, Literzet Sobri<sup>a</sup>, Moh.Setio Nugroho<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Universiti Teknikal Malaysia Melaka

<sup>b</sup> Universitas Islam Batik Surakarta

Corresponding author: [joko.sumarsono@gmail.com](mailto:joko.sumarsono@gmail.com)

*Presented at International Symposium on Research in Innovation and Sustainability 2019 (ISoRIS'19), Penang, Malaysia.*

**ABSTRACT:** Social exchange is the basic principle of teamwork. However, there are still no clearly stated effects of social exchange on teamwork, especially for educators' teamwork. Based on the factors of social exchange, namely reward and cost, several rules in conducting teamwork can be done and resources can be found. The rules include: a) reciprocity, b) folk belief, c) norm and individual orientation, and d) negotiated rules, while the resources involve: a) love, b) status, c) information, d) money, e) goods, and f) services. This article presents a review of selected articles by using the literature review method. It is found that there are rules and resources in teamwork, and, the rules and resources integrate into the shape of the relation among educators whether horizontally or vertically, and how they create rewards and costs for the members. Horizontally shared resources mean that the team members are of the same rank over each other, with no dominant role there, while vertically shared resources mean that the members are diverse in terms of power like civil servant teachers and contract teachers.

**Keywords:** social exchange, teamwork, literature review

## INTRODUCTION

A relationship is an association at least between two persons and no maximum limit, it can be in any number [1]. However, the term relationship is quite broad since it covers any kind of relation between two people or more; it can be between lecturer and farmer, teacher and labor, researcher and pilot, and other broad relationship. Henceforth, this relationship requires a certain framework or limitation in order to make the relation specific [2, 3, 4, 5]. The framework here is called a social exchange.

The term exchange is not merely an activity to trade something physical, but also something abstract like a social exchange. Social exchange theory (SET) is among the most influential conceptual paradigms for understanding workplace behavior. Generally, a social exchange involves a series of interactions that generate obligations [6]. Social exchange is also an interdependent action among people which is powerful to shape high-quality relationships. SET may well have the potential to provide a unitary framework for much of organizational behavior, including the behavior of team members during teamwork.

In general, teamwork is defined "as a cooperative process that allows ordinary people to achieve extraordinary results"[7]. The members of a team share the same purpose to which the members work together and develop effective, mutual relationships to achieve team goals [9]. Further, teamwork is defined as work done in a cooperative manner to achieve the same goal through knowledge and skill-sharing [8]. Many experts emphasize that the most essential element in teamwork is the sameness and clearness of a purpose [9, 10, 11, 12]. However, besides the emphasis on the purpose, good teamwork also has to be done in a supportive environment in which they are willing, participative, and contributive to do the work. Also, the team members themselves are required to be flexible in terms of adaptation to the purpose, the other members, and the environment; so, there will be no individualism among the members [13]. In other words, teamwork requires good relationships among the members. Thus, social exchange theory implicitly underlies the basis of teamwork.

Based on the background above, the problems of the research can be formulated as follows: 1) what are the factors underlying teamwork viewed from the social exchange, and 2) How do the social exchange factors contribute to teamwork among educators. The first research

problem is about defining the role of social exchange, from constructed social exchange theories, towards teamwork. The theories to make a construct are chosen since they have a close relationship in meanings and concepts of social exchange and teamwork. Meanwhile, the second research problem is to reveal the contribution of the constructed notions toward teamwork among educators.

This paper is divided into four sections. The first section is the introduction in which the background and the problem formulation are stated. The second section is a research methodology in which the researcher expounds on the method used in the research. The third section is used to expound on the results of the research used to answer the research problems. Meanwhile, the last part is about the conclusion of the research as well as the suggestions given by the researchers regarding the relevant figures.

## METHODOLOGY

This research will give a literature review on social exchange roles within teamwork. A literature review is an objective and point-by-point investigation of sources counting research-based and non-research-based sources which are significant to the subject being examined [14]. The most reason for the literature review is to create the scholars up to date on the current issue being examined as well as to form the researchers to be able to legitimize something for a long-run study. A literature review ought to contain fewer predispositions and is composed basically and methodically in arrange to form a clear look and choice [15]. A literature review involves four stages: 1) selecting a review topic, 2) searching the literature, 3) analyzing and synthesizing the literature, and 4) writing the review [14].

The first stage is selecting a review topic. in this phase, the researchers chose the topic to be analyzed in the further stages. The themes used in this research were social exchange and teamwork. Furthermore, these topics are the subject of further elaboration.

The second stage is searching the literature. After the topics are gotten, the researchers at that point sought for the subjects on the accessible media. These days, the foremost popular media to hunt for investigating themes are computers and electronic databases. Hence, the researchers utilized these media to look at the subjects. The analysts set Boolean administrator in arrange to discover the important point by typing in down the keywords by counting the three operational words 'AND', 'OR', and 'NOT'. The operational

word 'AND' is to seek for articles that incorporate all of the included keywords, 'OR' to search for articles that incorporate any of the distinguished catchphrases, and 'NOT' to avoid articles that contain this particular watchword. The electronic database utilized by the analysts is researchgate, scholar work, online library, SAGE Journals, and other databases.

The third stage is analyzing and synthesizing the literature. In this stage, the researchers read the majority of the got articles to make an amalgamation or build. The researchers utilized the PQRS strategy in this stage. "This simple method is referred to as the preview, question, read, summarize (PQRS) system and it not only keeps you focussed and consistent but ultimately facilitates easy

identification and retrieval of material particularly if a large number of publications are being reviewed"[14].

The last stage is writing the review. In this stage, the researchers framed the review so that the findings can be presented clearly and systematically. In writing the review, the researchers could use several approaches: 1) dividing the literature into themes or categories, 2) presenting the literature chronologically, 3) exploring the theoretical and methodological literature, and 4) examining theoretical literature and empirical literature in two sections. Therefore, the researchers used dividing literature into themes and categories approach since the purpose of the research is to find out the factors affecting the quality of interpersonal relationships

No	Authors	Year	Title	Main Idea
1	Blau, P. M. [15]	1964	Exchange and power in social life	The role of social exchange in social life
2	Bui, K.V.T., Peplau, L. A., & Hill, C. T. [27]	1996	Testing the Rusbult model of relationship commitment and stability in a 15-year study of heterosexual couples.	Testing the model designed by Rusbult over the studies progress and characteristics of a couple
3	Emerson, R. M.	1976	Social exchange theory	The basis and seminal reference on social exchange study
4	Fisher, S. G., Hunter, T. A., & Macrosson, W. D. K.	1997	Team or group? Managers' perceptions of the differences	Differentiating between team and group in terms of entrepreneur field
5	Gable, S. L., Reis, H. T., Impett, E. A., & Asher, E. R.	2004	What do you do when things go right? The intrapersonal and interpersonal benefits of sharing positive events	Mainly focused on the nature of the relationship, interpersonal and intrapersonal. More specifically, it is about sharing positive events to enhance the level of relationship.
6	Gouldner, A. W.	1960	The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement	The basic theory of reciprocity rule.
7	Harris, P. R., & Harris, K. G.	1996	Managing effectively through teams	Focusing on managing aspects of the team in order to maximize the outcome of the team.
8	Hartup, W. W., & Stevens, N.	1997	Friendship and adaptation in the life course	Focusing on social exchange in terms of friendship and adaptation.
9	Homans, G. C.	1961	Social behavior: Its elementary forms	Studying on the basic elements of basic behavior can be related to the theory of social exchange.
10	Luca, J., & Tarricone, P.	2001	Does emotional intelligence affect successful teamwork?	Investigating the effect of emotional intelligence among the members of a team.
11	Molm, L. D.	1994	Dependence and risk: Transforming the structure of social exchange	Studying social exchange in terms of the shapeshift of social structure viewed from the factors affecting the shift and the risk of the shift after its emergence.
12	Moore, G. E [28].	2004	Principia Ethica	Studying the main principles of social ethics that can be related to social exchange and teamwork.
13	Parker, G. M.	1990	Team players and teamwork	Focusing on the study of teamwork, especially on the characteristics of the members.
14	Scarnati, J. T.	2001	On becoming a team player	Investigating the team members' characteristics to meet the quality of teamwork.
15	Tarricone, P., & Luca, J.	2002	Successful Teamwork	Focusing on studying the characteristics of quality teamwork in relation to social exchange theory though rather implicit.
16	Tsui, A. S., & Wang, D. X.	2002	Employment relationships from the employer's perspective	Studying focused on the relationship among workers in terms of social exchange. However, this study is more on the literature review and future directions.
17	Wang, D., Tsui, A. S., Zhang, Y., & Ma, L.	2003	Employment relationships and firm performance: Evidence from an emerging economy	Quite similar to the previous study, but this study focuses more on the economic aspect of social exchange among workers.

Figure 1: Literature Review Summary

Figure 1, above, shows the summary of the literature reviewed.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the findings of the research of the literature review on the social exchange on teamwork. Through the analysis of social exchange, the researchers can know the factors underlying teamwork since the social exchange is the basis of teamwork.

### RQ1: What are the factors underlying teamwork viewed from the social exchange?

#### Rules

Since social exchange theory (SET) is the fundamental basis of teamwork, the pattern of social exchange results in the rules of teamwork. The rule itself is the guidance for teamwork to work as a team. This rule makes teamwork to be able to achieve the goals easier. There are several rules resulting from social exchange on teamwork.

#### Reciprocity Rule

The basic principle of this rule is the way the team members give each other help and advantages. However, there are three types of reciprocity rules since there are three different views on how team members help each other. The types are: (a) reciprocity as a transactional pattern of interdependent exchanges, (b) reciprocity as a folk belief, and (c) reciprocity as a moral norm

#### Interdependent Exchange

Before knowing what is an interdependent exchange, the nature of postures has to be known first. There are three basic postures in teamwork based on the theory of interdependence of social exchange. The posture itself is the tendency of a team member to the teamwork. The postures are (a) independence (outcomes are based entirely on one's solo effort), (b) dependence (outcomes are based entirely on the other's effort), and (c) interdependence (outcomes are based on a combination of parties' efforts) [15, 16]. Someone with an independent posture tends to do everything by themselves. Their solo effort tends to bring individualism within the group and it cannot be called a team anymore. Team members with a dependent posture tend to rely on the other team members while they just wait for the result of teamwork. Their reliance will break the concept of teamwork to always share and help each other to achieve the same goals. Therefore, complete independence and complete dependence do not imply a social exchange, so it cannot be called teamwork. This is because an exchange requires a bidirectional transaction—something has to be given and something returned. For this reason, interdependence, which involves mutual and complementary arrangements, is considered a defining characteristic of social exchange [17].

#### Folk Belief

Folk belief relates strongly to the cultural expectation of someone towards something, in this case, is the team members' expectation of the result of teamwork. Participants in these transactions accepted some combination of (a) a sense that over time all exchanges reach a fair equilibrium, (b) those who are unhelpful will be punished, and (c) those who are helpful will receive help in the future. Every member has their own perception of the teamwork and it can be one of those three, two, or even a single perception of the teamwork.

#### Norm and Individual Orientation

That is, a norm is a standard that describes how one should behave, and those who follow these norms are obligated to behave reciprocally. This logic is used to speculate that a norm of reciprocity is a universal principle, and this view is shared by others [18, 19, 20]. The key difference between a norm and a folk belief is that norms involve a quality that philosophers sometimes term ought [16]. Therefore, teamwork is unconsciously always obeys the existing norm, for example in Indonesia, they tend to respect the principle of *unggah ungguh* (respecting the elders), so if they team up with the elders, the younger tend to obey what the elders say.

#### Negotiated Rule

The second rule is negotiated rule in which the members make their own rules to obey during the teamwork. The rules have to be clear and detailed so that they cannot disobey the rules that have been negotiated. Since it is a made rule, it can be not suitable for the other team since it is very individual for just a certain team can be implemented.

#### Resources

Social exchange, as reflected by its name, it requires a resource to be exchanged with others. This notion happens in teamwork in which the team members exchange something with the others in order to optimize the result of the teamwork. There are six social exchange resources that also underline teamwork. The resources are: a) love, b) status, c) information, d) money, e) goods and f) services. Love as a resource in social exchange refers to the intimacy of the team members. Intimacy refers to someone's closeness to others, it can refer to the context of family, school, friends, opposite-sex peers, and situations in the street, shops, and public buildings [8]. The closer someone to the others, the higher the frequency of the relationship and the more open is the topic being talked about [21]. "Two studies found that close relationships in which one's partner typically responds to capitalization attempts enthusiastically were associated with higher relationship well-being" [22]. Therefore, if someone does not close enough, the interpersonal relationship is hard to be established and the teamwork does not work as it is expected. The second resource is status. Status mostly refers to the vertical relationship between the senior and junior. The third one, the common one, is information. Obviously, teamwork needs mainly is the sharing of information. If there is no information shared-nothing can be achieved. The last ones, that can be combined, are goods and services. The next resource is money. Majorly among entrepreneurs, the main reason they conduct teamwork is for money though it may be not direct. Thereby, it cannot be neglected that money is one of the main resources of teamwork. Goods here means the real product that can help the team to achieve the goals, for example, realia, blueprint, syllabus, presentation, and the other products. Meanwhile, services related to how they transfer the information of the products to the other members. Additionally, services also refer to the way the members treat each other.

### RQ2: How do the social exchange factors contribute to teamwork among educators?

After the social exchange factors that contribute to teamwork are found, the researchers try to relate it to teamwork among educators. Based on the previous section, social exchange is the basis of teamwork in terms of shaping the rules and providing resources for the

teamwork. Basically, the rule used by the educators during the teamwork is the reciprocity rule in which they try to help each other in order to fulfill educational needs, like finishing lesson plans, developing appropriate media, and other educational activities. However, this rule only happens if the resources are horizontally shared [23]; it means that the team members are of the same rank over each other, with no dominant role there. On the other side, if the members are diverse in terms of power like civil servant teachers and contract teachers, vertical relation happens and the negotiated rule takes place [24].

Besides resulting in horizontal and vertical relationships, educators' teamwork also begets reward and cost relations. Rewards are enjoyable or appreciated relational attributes like educators that can provide a good service to the team through the beautiful presentation, an educator that can share information with the others, and the efforts of the other [21]. Costs are relational attributes that are annoying or disliked like a teacher that is mocked by the senior and cannot do anything, or a potential teacher that is not given a chance to express ideas. Individuals are satisfied with relationships that provide high rewards and low costs. Empirical work testing Rusbult's [26] investment model confirmed that rewards and costs explained a significant proportion of the variance in satisfaction, with rewards being a substantially stronger predictor [16].

## CONCLUSION

The aim of this research is to study and investigate various research in relation to social exchange and its roles in teamwork among educators. The investigation is conducted to identify the social exchange factors underlying teamwork. Therefore, the researcher conducts a literature review of the selected articles. It is found that there are rules and resources in teamwork, and, the rules and resources integrate into the shape of the relation among educators whether horizontally or vertically, and how they create rewards and costs for the members.

Hopefully, this research might help the researchers in studying the nature of teamwork, relating social exchange to the other types of environments, and finding factors related to the social exchange, especially in the educational field. The research is also expected to help educators in understanding the nature of social exchange in doing teamwork in order to maximize the output.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We acknowledged the financial support from the Ministry of Education, Malaysia and the Universiti Teknikal Malaysia, Melaka for their assistance in this research. PJP (PJP/2015/PBPI(4D)/S01457).

## REFERENCES

1. Cropanzano, R. & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social Exchange Theory: Interdisciplinary Review. *Journal of Management*, 31 (3).
2. Cox, S. A. (1999). Group communication and employee turnover: How co-workers encourage peers to voluntarily exit. *Southern Communication Journal*, 64: 181.
3. Deckop, J. R., Cirka, C. C., & Andersson, L. M. (2003). Doing unto others: The reciprocity of helping behavior in organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 47: 101-114.
4. Ensher, E. A., Thomas, C., & Murphy, S. E. (2001). Comparison of traditional, step-ahead, and peer mentoring on proteges' support, satisfaction, and perceptions of career success: A social exchange perspective. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 15: 419-438.
5. Flynn, F. J. (2003). How much should I give and how often? The effects of generosity and frequency of favor exchange on social status and productivity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46: 539-553.
6. Emerson, R. M. (1976). Social exchange theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 2, 335-362. doi:10.1146/annurev.so.02.080176.002003
7. Scarnati, J. T. (2001). On becoming a team player. *Team Performance Management: An International Journal*, 7(1/2), 5-10.
8. Tarricone, P., & Luca, J. (2002). Successful teamwork: A case study. *Proceeding for HERDSA*, 2002.
9. Parker, G. M. (1990). *Team players and teamwork*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
10. Harris, P. R., & Harris, K. G. (1996). Managing effectively through teams. *Team Performance Management: An International Journal*, 2(3), 23-36.
11. Fisher, S. G., Hunter, T. A., & Macrosson, W. D. K. (1997). Team or group? Managers' perceptions of the differences. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 12(4), 232-242.
12. Johnson, P. R., Heimann, V. L., & O'Neill, K. (2000). The wolf pack: team dynamics for the 21st century. *Journal of Workplace Learning: Employee Counselling Today*, 12(4), 159-164.
13. Luca, J., & Tarricone, P. (2001). Does emotional intelligence affect successful teamwork? *Proceedings of the 18th Annual Conference of the Australasian Society for Computers in Learning in Tertiary Education at the ASCILITE*, p. 367 – 376, Melbourne: University of Melbourne.
14. Cronin, P., Ryan, F., & Coughlan, M. (2008). *Undertaking a literature review: a step-by-step approach*. British Journal of Nursing, (17) 1.
15. Carnwell R, Daly W. (2001). *Strategies for the construction of a critical review of the literature*. Nurse Educ Pract 1: 57–63.
16. Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: John Wiley. Bulletin, 121, 355-370.
17. Homans, G. C. (1961). *Social behavior: Its elementary forms*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
18. Molm, L. D. (1994). Dependence and risk: Transforming the structure of social exchange. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 57: 163-176.
19. Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25: 161-178.
20. Tsui, A. S., & Wang, D. X. (2002). Employment relationships from the employer's perspective: Current research and future directions. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology*: 77-114. Chichester, UK: Wiley.
21. Wang, D., Tsui, A. S., Zhang, Y., & Ma, L. (2003). Employment relationships and firm performance: Evidence from an emerging economy. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24: 511-534.

22. Gable, S. L., Reis, H. T., Impett, E. A., & Asher, E. R. (2004). What do you do when things go right? The intrapersonal and interpersonal benefits of sharing positive events. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87, 228-245.
24. Hartup, W. W., & Stevens, N. (1997). *Friendship and adaptation in the life course*. Psychological
25. Levinger, G. (1974). A three-level approach to attraction: Toward an understanding of pair relatedness. In T. L. Huston (Ed.) [25a], *Foundations of interpersonal attraction*. New York: Academic Press.
26. Rusbult, C. E. (1983). A longitudinal test of the investment model. The development and deterioration of satisfaction and commitment in heterosexual involvements. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22,1244-1257.
27. Bui, K.-V. T., Peplau, L. A., & Hill, C. T. (1996). *Testing the Rusbult model of relationship commitment and stability in a 15-year study of heterosexual couples*. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22(12), 1244-1257.
28. Moore, G. E. (2004). *Principia ethica*. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications