



## **GROUP DYNAMICS AND LEADERSHIP: A COLLECTIVE PROCESS CONSTRUCTION**

*Dinâmica de grupo e Liderança: uma construção coletiva de processos*

Danilo Nunes, Neusa Maria Bastos Fernandes dos Santos, Fernando Fukunaga  
Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil  
e-mails: [professordanilonunes@gmail.com](mailto:professordanilonunes@gmail.com) ; [admneusa@pucsp.br](mailto:admneusa@pucsp.br) ; [fernandofukunaga@me.com](mailto:fernandofukunaga@me.com)

### **ABSTRACT**

The human being is the true source of a competitive advantage. If so understood, it is necessary to break with some paradigms that guide the traditional management models. The current posture requires aptitude and willingness for change, whether in the forms of vision, action or thought. The objective of this study was to score some of these variables that should be perceived by the leader who wants to do a good job and aims to improve their skills to work with and for the groups. The research was based on productions that address this issue and what possible changes we may have in organizational environments. Everything is moving so that we have a scenario different from what we find today in organizational contexts. There will be a change in the conception of work, and with this there will be a need to review organizational practices, including the dynamics of groups and the relationship with the leadership process. This discussion calls into question the very concept of a group, and of course it is not exhausted here and, judging by the changes and future scenarios, it would not be audacious or reckless to say that they will never be exhausted. It is a continuous and uninterrupted path of discussion.

**Keywords:** Leadership. Groups. Organization. Collective.

**ACEITO EM: 15/12/2019**

**PUBLICADO: 30/12/2019**



## DINÂMICA DE GRUPO E LIDERANÇA: UMA CONSTRUÇÃO COLETIVA DE PROCESSOS

*Group dynamics and leadership: a collective process construction*

Daniilo Nunes, Neusa Maria Bastos Fernandes dos Santos, Fernando Fukunaga  
Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo, São Paulo, Brasil  
e-mails: professordanilonunes@gmail.com ; admneusa@pucsp.br ; fernandofukunaga@me.com

### RESUMO

O ser humano é a verdadeira fonte de uma vantagem competitiva. Se assim for entendido, é necessário romper com alguns paradigmas que norteiam os modelos tradicionais de gestão. A postura atual exige aptidão e vontade de mudar, seja nas formas de visão, ação ou pensamento. O objetivo deste estudo foi pontuar algumas dessas variáveis que devem ser percebidas pelo líder que deseja fazer um bom trabalho e tem como objetivo aprimorar suas habilidades para trabalhar com e para os grupos. A pesquisa foi baseada em produções que abordam esse problema e que possíveis mudanças podemos ter nos ambientes organizacionais. Tudo está se movendo para que tenhamos um cenário diferente do que encontramos hoje em contextos organizacionais. Haverá uma mudança na concepção do trabalho e, com isso, será necessário revisar as práticas organizacionais, incluindo a dinâmica dos grupos e o relacionamento com o processo de liderança. Essa discussão põe em questão o próprio conceito de grupo e, é claro, não está esgotado aqui e, a julgar pelas mudanças e cenários futuros, não seria audacioso ou imprudente dizer que eles nunca se esgotarão. É um caminho contínuo e ininterrupto de discussão.

**Palavras-chave:** Liderança. Grupos. Organização. Coletivo.

**ACEITO EM: 15/12/2019**

**PUBLICADO: 30/12/2019**

## INTRODUCTION

The groups propose explicitly and implicitly to the consummation of a task that constitutes its purpose, interacting through structures of adjudication and assumption of roles. Massmann (2011) explores the central idea that it is necessary always to defend a point of view, so we cannot think about the individual without taking into account their different circumstances, their different moments and their influence in the construction of the roles assumed in their lives. Since our birth we are inserted in some group, the family is the first one and, among others, the organizations and their agents, in this study, leaders and leaders.

In companies, human interaction occurs at two distinct but concomitant and interdependent levels: that of task and the social-emotional (MOSCOVICI, 1994). The first is characterized by being that of the activities defined in a rational way and that allows its measurement by means of the evaluation of the agreed results. The socio-emotional level permeated by multiple sensations and feelings is determined by the coexistence and activities of the group or even influenced by the constant dynamics of the inclusion of new members or changes in the rules with which the group operates. Thus, it is a level that determines some basic knowledge of psychology, philosophy, sociology, as well as all the knowledge that cast glances on the complex task of living.

We live in constant relation, for it is precisely in the relation and conception of our ties to the people that we structure our thinking, we choose or inherit our values and we constitute ourselves as people. The procedure of interaction between human beings is present in all human organization and is what implies in the direction of the activities and their results (Nunes, Hoyos Guevara, 2018).

But to what extent are organizations, through their leaders, prepared and organized to understand group work with a source of competitiveness and as a process that feeds organizational culture? The objective of this article is to explore the processes of integration between leaders and leaders leading to the construction of a dynamic and participative collective work.

Carnielli and Epstein (2011) argue that we need to have good reasons for the accepted premises to be accepted, and these, in turn, should be more plausible than their own conclusions, seeking to defend the importance of collective work and what differences that each person has. It is understood that organizations, through their leadership, have to understand and be responsible for the variables that influence human interactions in order to, minimally, enable the individuals who are part of their teams to understand the functioning of the intricate intra and interpersonal dimension, that is, of the constant internal communication, the relations of alterity and the group dynamics. All these aspects constantly influence the groups, compromise all their members and delimit the possibilities of the organization.

## INTERDEPENDENCE: LEADERS AND TEAMS

The relationship between leaders and leaders is a form of coexistence that more than a surrounded relation of rules, policies and other elements externalizes values that can be abstract or concrete. Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca (2014) define as concrete values those that are linked to a being, a group or even an object, when observed the singularity of these. Already the abstract value is presented in the contraposition of this absolute reality.

The relationship between leaders and leaders should be understood as a social process built on these values and personal characteristics, in accordance with institutional policies. This thought leads us to the idea of the authors mentioned when they suggest that when establishing links, it is possible to include also differentiated publics. The universal character is thus characterized so that the individual characteristics gain naturalness and can also feed the collective yearnings. Therefore, individual needs and desires are valued and the result of this process feeds the group concept.

Human coexistence is inherent in all of its existence, so we are affected by our ability to relate to others, individually or with groups. It is understood by interpersonal relations the relationship between people, understanding them and respecting their personalities. Within the business system, it can be said that there is technical organization and human organization, which are interrelated and interdependent.

Bergamini (2009) believes that the most accepted leaders, therefore more positively considered by the leaders, have previously chosen a model of leadership. One cannot improvise from one moment to another, the best way to direct people of a certain group. Good leadership requires understanding of the world in which the leaders live. When people work in an organizational community, it is necessary to feel that this community cares for them, and likewise expects their employees to be interested in their corporate destiny as well.

Human organization is not just a group, a team, a set of individuals, for each one has its own feelings, interests, desires, frustrations, physical and social needs related to its own life history. True human relationships are useful and important to practice, because they avoid misconduct, which were generated by dissatisfaction, maintaining individual and collective well-being.

Modern educational and management theories show a tendency to ascribe increasing importance to emotional factors and creativity in learning, leadership, and group participation. Emotions and feelings are now considered as essential as ideas and knowledge in any human situations and are constituted in facts or variables of a situation, no more neglected accessory elements. There is also a need to focus on the preparation to deal effectively with the role of the "social man" in the organization, that is, to respect and recognize its need for growth, autonomy and participation and achievement.

Human beings and companies are, in their daily lives, interdependent and therefore need to be willing to cooperate with each other constantly. The ideal of integration is to ensure that there are not two distinct entities but only two parts of the same whole. This awareness makes possible the existence of conflicts and ideas, beneficial and enriching, and not the existence of conflicts between people, evil and impoverishing. Thus, the need for a deeper understanding of these relationships and how power can construct or deconstruct these environments, that is, the extent to which the roles of leaders and leaders or dominant and dominated are configured.

## **CULTURE AS A FACTOR IN THE FORMATION OF GROUPS AND THEIR RELATION TO THE LEADERSHIP PROCESS**

Dias (2012) states that the issue of change is present in the discussions that involve organizational culture. Culture is seen as a process and, as such, is constantly changing. What has to be discussed is what variables should be changed or included so that the process goes by the expected path.

But there is always a blockage when we come across some organizational structures. For example, the current trend is the disappearance of organizations with more cast structures, to give place to organizations with more flexible models. There is no formula for developing an ideal organizational culture under any circumstances, but in general there are some procedures that can be followed in business organizations that will favor their development. The author supports some actions, among them: giving autonomy and increasing the decision-making power of leaders in order to encourage the emergence of innovative leadership in the organization. But how can we define innovative leadership? We may not have a standard answer to this question, nor can we have it, but this study goes on to validate that the dynamics of collective work tend to create a strong relationship with culture and, therefore, aims to strengthen the leadership process thus legitimizing the decisions of its leaders.

Schein (2009) states that when we examine culture and leadership, we realize that they are two sides of the same coin, so neither could be understood just by itself. It also emphasizes that if we could use a single argument to explain the role of leaders, it would be based on the ability to understand and work with culture. Reinforcing this concept establishes that the difference between leadership and management lies in the fact that the former creates and changes, the latter acts on culture, so culture is the result of a complex process of group learning, covering the emotional, behavioral elements, cognitive of the psychological functioning of its members, being partially influenced by the behavior of the leader. Perhaps we will better understand this concept if we analyze how culture can emerge when forming groups. Schein (2009) states that cultural formation occurs around efforts to deal with the anxieties characterized by shared basic assumptions that emerge at each stage of formation of a group that divides it:

Table 1 Stages of Evolution of a Group

Stage	Assumption	Socioemotional Focus
Formation of the group	Dependence: the leader knows what we should do	Self-orientation: focus on inclusion; power and influence; acceptance and intimacy; and identity and role
Construction of the group	Fusion: we form a large group, we like each other	Group as an idealized object: harmony; conformity and pursuit of intimacy. Members' differences are not valued
Group work	Work: we can play because we know each other and accept each other	Mission and tasks of the group: achievement; teamwork and order. Differences between members are valued
Maturity of the group	Maturity: we know who we are and what we want. We are successful, so we must be right.	Survival and comfort of the group: preservation of the group and its culture. Differences are seen as threats.

Source: prepared by the authors, adapted from Shein, 2009, p.63

We realize that in the first stage the members of a group are more concerned with their intrinsic looks, each taking care of their own feelings as if that were possible. In the second stage there is an apparent escape from the interpersonal conflicts, where the members seek an approximation between themselves and the slogan becomes solidarity. In the third stage there is an emotional change, where the union of efforts and experience leads to a degree of mutual learning. Already in the fourth and last stage is the preservation of culture and Shein feeds the thesis that culture, being a set of learned responses, will be as strong as the learning history that has arisen and accumulated, so the culture is fed by the solutions found by the groups as regards their identity.

Santos (2000) reinforces this tendency by affirming that culture represents the characteristic dilemmas of organizational systems from values that compete with each other and alternate in a coexistence typical of complex phenomena.

The organizational context is collective, with culture being a preponderant factor to delineate the existing relationships between leaders and leaders. These relationships are favored when the members of a group share similar values, converge with the understanding of the needs of the rules for social order, and practice practices that are legitimized in the group (MUZZIO, 2017).

The culture derived from the outstanding characteristics of the members of a group can highlight organizational differences. In this context it can be affirmed that culture is not something universal and previously determined (HOFSTEDE, 2001), therefore it must and must be considered when the concern of collective process construction is observed, observing the dynamics of the work groups and their members.

## VALUE AND IDENTITY IN THE FORMATION OF GROUPS AND LEADERSHIPS: PERSPECTIVES AND SCENARIOS

Several paths lead us to understand what can happen to the course of work, and consequently the interference in the structure and behavior of groups in these almost certain transformations. Redefining group involves redefining leadership models.

Nunes et al (2008) discuss that every individual has a cultural past that defines their habits and their identification within a socialization process. Starting from the premise that an organization is a large and complex social group, it seeks to understand the process of construction of the collective personality, not based on the descriptions and concepts attributed to it, but from the perspective of different experiences and experiences of the people, referring directly to the construction of the identity of the collective work developed.

There are several models in which these authors support this theory and one, specifically, seems to have a direct connection with the proposal of this study: the model of selective affinities. In it, the idea is that groups

should have greater flexibility within organizations, as people seek an individual strategy of action, identifying with the other components of the group in different degrees of hierarchy. Perhaps this approach will lead us to a great reflection of how and what should be the relationships between leaders and leaders, since people, seeking to maintain their individual mobilities, begin to reject the idea that the impositions and restrictions that traditional models manifest can, in a way, slow down your personal goals. The conflict is generated and taken care of, it can be dysfunctional.

Organizational functions, when defining strategies aimed at autonomy, capacity for action and skill development, provide, perhaps without intention, but indirectly, means of affirmation and unequal identity, when the supposed treatment of equality between people prevails, emphasizing that human theories consistently assert that there are behavioral differences between people.

Individuals need self-identification, that is, to have access to the perception of their results, creating their own autonomous rationality. It is the set of individual particularities that leads us to construct the meaning of group work. It can then be said that the construction of collective work necessarily involves the understanding of the need to strengthen individual work. However, how to understand, accept and practice this?

One way is to understand the transformations that exist in the formation of the labor market. Barbosa Filho (2012) affirms that young people in Brazil are taking longer to start work, as it suggests that they are dedicating more time to study, so when they arrive they already do so with a greater range of knowledge, even if theoretical, one of the great challenges of Brazilian education.

Based on the study of Schwartz (1992), the author shows that the values of individuals in different contexts, which refers us to the different organizational profiles, must be analyzed taking into consideration three fundamental aspects: how the priority values of people are affected by their social experiences, how these same values affect their behaviors and their choices and, finally, how social structures can contribute or influence the definition of these values, due to different cultures. Evidence that the knowledge of these aspects helps us to understand the bases that structure the formation of a group, thus allows us to better analyze the different strategies that support the organization of collective work.

Schwartz (1992), in a research carried out with university students, contributes to the understanding of the formation of contemporary groups, establishing some values that young people take into account when they construct the identity of the work. The first is concern for self-improvement and self-fulfillment. In this item the motivational value of achievement is evidenced when success and personal self-realization are portrayed through the demonstration of competencies according to established social norms. The second value is the openness to change and the valorization of self-sufficiency, evidencing, among others, the sense of freedom, creativity and independence to choose one's goals. The third value is security emphasizing harmony, social stability and interpersonal and intrapersonal relationships. Finally, universalism when seeking identity with nature and its systems and, above all, the practice of social justice.

It should be noted that Nunes et al. (2008) affirm that individuals with more knowledge and more politicized tend to commit to organizational changes more effectively, if compared with people deprived of autonomy and critical sense. This assertion drives us to the continuing need to revise management models and the role of leadership is key to this.

## **CREATING GROUP VALUE BY GENERATING COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE IN THE LEADERSHIP PROCESS**

The aim of this study was to approach the variables that a leader must realize in order to perform a good job and to improve his / her skills in order to know how to work in groups. It reinforces the idea that the relationship between leaders and leaders should be understood as a process of social interaction. Based on these guidelines and understanding that value creation for the group tends to be one of these variables; the discussion of how this practice can interfere in the expected results. Value creation and competitive advantage are broad concepts, so it seems to us possible to associate with the concept of human capital.

Therefore, the measurement of human capital as a proposal to create value for the group can lead us to an understanding that this practice will generate a competitive advantage for the organization, if associated or even incorporated into the leadership model. Human capital refers to the competence, attitude and intellectual capacity of employees (Ross, 1998).

Brito & Brito (2012), in exploring the study by Drnevich et al, 2010, have already expressed some concern about the fact that several questions about the study of competitive advantage and what they generate remain unanswered: how can we effectively portray, model and measure it? How do organizational, competitive and environmental dynamics affect it? How does it develop?

The creation of values must be seen in different perspectives, especially by the perception of the company's stakeholders (LEPAK, SMITH, TAYLOR, 2007), since human capital covers the level of knowledge of each employee and is the main factor in the creation of intellectual capital of a company, being this source of innovation and strategic renewal (BONTIS, 1999).

The measurement of human capital as a value strategy, incorporated into the leadership model, generates or can generate competitive advantage. Brandenburger and Stuart (1996) argue that value creation is associated with the opportunity cost ratio, which allows us to incorporate various perspectives of strategic business approaches, and why not, make use of human capital measurement as one of them.

In current literature, it is not difficult to perceive a significant growth of interest in its measurement. Many companies have joined and made available to their investors managerial reports such as integrated report, annual sustainability report, social report and others. Today, the releases of these reports happen on a voluntary basis, since there is no legal requirement for their mandatory delivery. Regardless of the being compulsory, the companies started to show interest in these demonstrations sometimes due to the requirement of the stakeholders and to recognize the benefit to the brand through the intangible assets.

According to Mayo (2003), the way in which companies are evaluated has been undergoing progressive changes since 1990, when a greater value was assigned to the so-called intangible assets, which are knowledge, skills and the brand itself. According to the author, these assets are also called intellectual capital. Human capital, which is part of intellectual capital, is constituted by the people who construct this value.

Human capital is recognized as a pillar of the creation of intellectual capital and its main characteristic is that it can disappear with the exit of the employees of the companies, being thus a constant source of strategic renewal (Bontis, 1999).

In addition, through the valuation of intangible assets, human capital is seen as a new perspective, is no longer considered only as a cost and is now seen as an investment, since it is possible to measure and measure it.

The big question is how to measure intangible assets? Unlike the tangible assets that can be measured by consolidated accounting instruments, it was necessary to develop new means to measure intangible assets.

At first glance, there was a growing volume of research aimed at studying the measurement of these assets and many consultancies created their evaluation systems. Mayo, in his book "The Human Value of the Company", presents several approaches to measuring this type of asset.

The concern with this phenomenon is justified, therefore, determining the value of companies based on human capital is a recurring challenge in an economy that is growing based on knowledge and services.

Brito & Brito (2012) reinforce this idea when they argue that the concept of competitive advantage is not restricted only to the relation between competitor / competition, but that it is directly related to the creation of value.

It is a future challenge for these authors: to investigate which methods may be most effective in measuring human capital.

## **LEADERS AND GROUPS: HOW TO FACE THE NEW CHALLENGES FOR COLLECTIVE WORK**

Based on the Sustainable Development Objectives (ODS), a program created by the United Nations in September 2015, which establishes 17 objectives anchored in three major divisions of sustainable development: economic, social and environmental, Ernst et Samaan (2016)<sup>1</sup> developed a study on the Future of Work, seeking

a more effective direction for the 169 goals established in Agenda 2030, a document constructed, guided and guided by the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. The main problem addressed is how the world of work will be in 2030 and as a reflection, what we are doing in our companies from the perspective of this very near future.

They say that the greatest challenges ahead are: rising demographic imbalances, the search for healthy environments, political uncertainties and growing inequality, and the great promises of technology.

Is it unlikely that the extrapolation of current trends is insufficient to meet the growing demand from leaders, or are we prepared to understand the direction of the changes that are taking place?

Everything is moving so that we have a scenario different from what we find today in organizational contexts. If there is a change in the conception of the work, there will be a need to review the organizational practices, including the dynamics of the groups and the relationship with the leadership process. Researchers are working on scenarios to reduce labor supply and increase the working population at working age, a new group profile is set up and the dynamics applied to them tend to be strengthened in this context. Some goals set out in Agenda 2030 strengthen this idea, as three of them establish the creation of sustainable economic growth and social inclusion, the construction of dynamic, sustainable, innovative and people-centered economies, as well as equal access to jobs, leaders and decision makers at all levels (emphasis added).

In a perspective of greater impact, Brown (2012) radicalizes and proposes three models for effective social change: the Pearl Harbor Model, termed as catastrophic, when a dramatic fact fundamentally changes our way of acting and thinking (it refers to the Japanese attack, unexpected, on 06.12.41, during the Second World War); the Berlin Wall Model when society begins to change in relation to some theme, usually after a long period of slow and gradual changes in thinking and attitudes, and the Sandwich Model when a strong movement of activist sectors presses a certain cause that is also backed by strong political leadership. According to the author, the former presents a greater risk, the second is slower and the third is the more attractive.

Dowbor (2017) reinforces the need to incorporate into the decision-making process of organizations the vision of a possible balanced, economically viable and socially just development (emphasis ours), could find interorganizational barriers, because the leaders reduce their success, and why not say, from their teams, to a single criterion of success, the result purely and simply financially. This, by a natural inheritance, continues being the main instrument of power. It also emphasizes that, in order for us to have in fact a corporate governance, an indispensable premise in the construction of the collective, and the most effective and perhaps the safest route is transparency.

## CONCLUSION

Revisiting the organizational history and theories discussed in this study, it is possible to affirm that the current trend is the disappearance of organizations with more cast structures, to give place to organizations with more flexible models. The great challenge is to learn to deal with some of the emerging blocks of this transition process. The interaction and integration between leaders and, consequently, the construction or reconstruction of the identity of the working groups is one of them.

It was sought to show that the construction of collective work necessarily involves the understanding of the need to strengthen individual work and one of the ways to achieve success is to give autonomy and increase the decision-making power of the leaders with the objective of encouraging the emergence of leaderships the organization.

Impossible to define emphatically what is innovative leadership, but the proposal is that we take a more focused look at the validation of group work, since it tends to create a strong relationship with culture and, therefore, strengthen the leadership process by legitimizing the decisions of their leaders.

But there is a great reflection: and now leaders, how to react (or act) so that their attitudes legitimize their power? And the leaders, how should they behave or react (or act) to such received stimuli? This discussion calls into question the very concept of a group, and of course it is not exhausted here and, judging by the changes and future scenarios, it would not be audacious or reckless to say that they will never be exhausted. It is a continuous and uninterrupted path of discussion.



## REFERENCES

- BARBOSA FILHO, F. de H. Young people in work market. In: BARBOSA, L. (org). Youth and generations in contemporary Brazil. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2012.
- BERGAMINI, C. W. Leadership: administration of feelings. 2ed. São Paulo: Atlas, 2009.
- BONTIS, N. Managing organizational knowledge by diagnosing intellectual capital: framing and advancing the state of the field [J]. International Journal of Technology Management, 1999, v. 18, p. 433-462.
- BRANDERBURGER, A. and Stuart, H. W. Value-based business strategy [J]. Journal of Economics & Management Strategy, 5(1), 5-24. Doi: 10.1111/j.1430-9134.March 1996.0005.x.
- BRITO, R. P and Brito L. A. L. Competitive advantage and its relation to performance: a value-based approach [J]. RAC, Maio/Junho, 2012. v16, n3, art2, pp360-380.
- BROWN, L. R. Plano B 4.0: Mobilization to save civilization. São Paulo: New Content, 2012.
- CAMIELLI, W.A and Epstein R.L. Critical Thinking: The Power of Logic and Argumentation. 3ed. São Paulo: Rideel, 2011.
- DOWBOR, L. The Unproductive capital. The new architecture of power: financial domination, kidnapping of democracy and destruction of the planet. São Paulo: Autonomia Literária, 2017.
- DIAS, R. Organizational culture. São Paulo: Aliança, 2012.
- DURKHEIM, E. The rules of sociological method: São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1978.
- HOFSTEDE, G. Culture consequences: comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2001.
- LEPAK, D. P.; Smith, K.G. and Taylor, M.S. Value creation and value capture: a multi-level perspective. [J]. Academy of Management Review. Janeiro.2007. 32(1), 180-194. Doi:10.5465/amr.2007.23464011.
- MASSMANN, D. Argumentation: in search of a concept. In: Línguas e Instrumentos Linguísticos: Unicamp, Campinas: RG, 2011.
- MAYO, A. The Human Value of the company: valuing people as assets. São Paulo: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2003.
- MOSCOVICI, F. Teams that work. 10ed. Rio de Janeiro: José Olympio, 1994.
- MUZZIO, H. Individual, Leadership and Culture: Evidence of a Management of Creativity [J]. RAC, Curitiba, Fev.2017. v. 21, n. 1, p. 107-124.
- NUNES, D., GUEVARA, A. J. Sustainable leadership: a search for better results from interactions [J]. Journal on Innovation and Sustainability. RISUS ISSN 2179-3565, [S.l.], v. 9, n. 2, p. 47-54, June 2018. ISSN 2179-3565.
- NUNES, L. H; VASCONCELOS, I. F. G. AND JAUSSAUD, J. Executive Expatriation Collection debates in administration. São Paulo: Thomson, 2008.

PERELMAN, C. and OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, L. Treaty of argument. Translation of Maria Ermantina de Almeida Prado Galvão. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2014.

PICHON-RIVIÈRE, E. The group process. 4ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1991.

ROOS, J. Exploring the concept of intellectual capital (IC). Long Range Planning, 1998. v. 31, i.1, p. 150-153.

SANTOS, N. M. B. F. Organizational culture and performance: research, theory and application. Lorena: Stiliano, 2000.

SHEIN, E. H; Organizational culture and leadership. Tradução de Ailton Bomfim Brandão. São Paulo: Atlas, 2009.

SCHWARTZ, S. H. Universals in the content and structure of values: theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, v.25, 1992.