

PsyOpus TSS Report

Wave: Post-Intervention | Date: 2/19/2026

Executive Summary

This report aggregates responses from 20 participants across 2 teams. Scores are presented on a scale of 0-100%.

Domain Overview

Domain	Avg Score
Foundational Domain	62.3%
Relational Domain	64.0%
Transformational Domain	66.4%
Response Type Domain	64.5%

Construct Insights

Foundational Domain (62.3%)

Direction, roles, tasks, and operating discipline that anchor day-to-day execution. Concerns the where, who, and how of team performance.

Frustration State (49.2%)

The degree to which the team is aware of a growing gap between where the team performance currently is and where they would like to be.

Frustration is an emotional sign of team fragmentation. High frustration states are a good indicator that the team lacks shared understanding and shared commitment. Frustration is the emotional consequence of a gap between actual and desired states. It is important to remember that frustration is not necessarily a bad thing within a team because it is high energy that is misdirected or wasted but energy none the less. Low arousal moods such as despondency and indifference are much more difficult to change.

Goal Clarity (72.8%)

The degree to which the objectives of the team are well understood by all members with clear goal alignment by all.

Goal directed behaviour is fundamental to the human condition and determines how we focus and recruit our faculties to achieve desired ends. Goal clarity is fundamental for team performance since it contains meaning and direction by which energy of the team is directed. Without goals that are collectively understood and shared a team can quickly move into fragmentation. The emphasis is not so much on whether goals set for the team are in fact correct but are in fact shared and understood.

Process Clarity (66.1%)

The degree to which team members disagree with how decisions are made or dispute over agreed and established protocols of decision making.

How decisions are made can be a significant source of conflict within teams. Process clarity concerns the degree to which the governance and rules of engagement and decision making are determined by the team. There are essentially two aspects: explicit rules concerning formal governance procedures, and implicit rules determined by the culture and values of the team. Where there is a disconnect between explicit and implicit rules, the team has problems with procedural fairness.

Role Clarity (74.0%)

The degree to which each member of the team is clear about their role within the team and the role of other team members to achieve agreed goals.

Roles prescribe the tasks, duties and actions required of each team member to achieve collective goals. It is not sufficient that each team member understands their role within the team but also the roles of others. Role Clarity is achieved when each member clearly knows what their role is within the team and what the role is of others and how these interact to achieve collective goals.

Task Clarity (66.6%)

The degree to which team members disagree or agree with the tasks required to achieve agreed goals within the team.

While roles are nested in goals, tasks are nested in roles. Tasks are the smaller aspects or elements of the role that are required on a day to day basis. Within the TSS the construct of Task Conflict measures both the clarity by which tasks are assigned and understood by team members but also the enthusiasm by which they are embraced. The extent to which each team member embraces both the exciting and the mundane is a good measure of engagement in the team's collective energies.

Team Loafing (50.3%)

The degree to which team members deliberately choose not to pull their weight in contributing to the team.

Team Loafing is not necessarily withdrawal due to incompetence but a deliberate choice not to pull one's weight in the team. It can be a conscious act of withdrawing labour as a sign of protest. For some, loafing is a form of silent symbolic protest in the form of passive-aggressive behaviour. It may also occur due to problems or issues outside the team itself. All forms of loafing can have serious consequences on the dynamics of team cohesion and performance.

Relational Domain (64.0%)

Interpersonal climate, trust, resilience, and collective belief that keep the team cohesive. Concerns the complex psychodynamics between team members and their experiential outcomes.

Interpersonal Conflict (54.4%)

The degree to which there is interpersonal conflict between team members.

Within the TSS, Interpersonal Conflict is a global impression scale and the central measure of relational domains of team performance. Interpersonal conflict can arise from many complex sources within teams. It is not understood as a mediating variable (lead indicator) but an outcome variable (lag indicator), meaning it should be interpreted as a consequence of other drivers within the team like goal and role clarity or participation safety.

Team Efficacy (72.8%)

The degree to which the team believes in its abilities to solve and overcome problems.

Team efficacy is a notion of collective efficacy adapted from Bandura's work on self efficacy. It is concerned not in whether members have a self belief in their capacity to deliver, but whether they believe others within the team have the capacity to deliver. Team efficacy is one of the strongest constructs in the relational domains of team climate and is an indirect measure of team potency. When goals, roles, tasks and processes are clear, often teams feel that they can tackle any problem that comes their way effectively.

Team Mood (61.3%)

The prevailing emotional tone of the team measured across Warr's Affective Circumplex.

Research over the past 20 years has examined the relationship between team mood and performance. A general upbeat mood within the team provides protective factors against stress and fatigue. The TSS team mood scale is based upon Warr's model of affective wellbeing with a bi-polar construct along two continuums: enthusiastic-depressed and anxious-calm. Positive emotions not only make people feel good at the moment, but also feel good about the future, building enduring psychological resources.

Team Resilience (69.0%)

The degree to which the team can remain well motivated and optimistic in spite of setbacks.

Resilience is related to sustainability in the sense that it is defined as the extent to which a team recovers from insult or setbacks. It is not measured in terms of business as usual activities but what happens when the team meets a shock to its internal operations. Those teams who identify themselves as resilient are likely to have short recovery cycles when insult or setbacks are presented. Elements that make a team resilient include positive team mood, diversity of opinion, participation safety, high emotional intelligence and decision influence.

Trust (67.5%)

The degree to which the team trust one another.

Real trust can only occur as a giving act where there is a possibility of betrayal. Trust is something one gives as much as receives and often to gain and build trust, one must give trust in the hope that it will be reciprocated. The TSS measures 5 key aspects of trust: care about the work, care about team members, consistency of follow through, competence in performance, and affect. Trust is the glue that binds all institutions whether they are commercial, familial or social.

Transformational Domain (66.4%)

Safety, influence, innovation, and adaptation that enable breakthrough performance. Measures the environment conducive for breakthrough thinking and its experiential outcomes.

Flow (64.2%)

The degree to which the team is at ease and time seems to fly by because everyone is fully engaged with the task at hand.

Flow is essential absorption in the present moment. According to Csikszentmihalyi, flow is completely focused single-minded attention on the present. Flow states are not a mediating variable but a consequence of effective team mediating variables. Where team members have good foundational and relational elements, the natural consequence is absorption in work and flow. Frustration states are the opposite since the team must be more conscious of mediating variables to achieve flow.

Participation Safety (67.1%)

The degree to which team members feel safe to share their ideas and solutions without fear of castigation or criticism.

Participation safety is the key transformational team construct that drives innovation, breakthrough and peak performance. An environment conducive for truth telling reduces risk, since the team is safe to use the wisdom of the crowd. Most people are very adept at determining whether an environment within a team is safe for truth telling. If people feel unsafe they are unlikely to contribute their truth, reducing accurate risk assessment and increasing group think.

Support for Innovation (67.7%)

The degree to which new ideas are given appropriate consideration and are not summarily dismissed out of hand.

Innovation and breakthrough are mediated by Participation Safety and Team Membership Influence. New ideas are encouraged and received with enthusiasm. What's important is that techniques at least have two elements: safety to participate and the capacity to influence the decision. Innovation needs both passion and responsibility to walk — frustration occurs when people have passion but little responsibility, and burnout when there is responsibility but little passion.

Team Adaptation (67.9%)

The degree to which the team can adapt to new situations, circumstances and information.

Often systems are so complex that teams need to respond or more accurately adapt to changing circumstances as much as controlling or managing them. The difference between leadership and management is the degree to which a team can cope with uncertainty and ambiguity. Teams that can adapt quickly to changing circumstances are likely to be more resilient and responsive to complex systems. What is required is for teams to not only analyse information but to synthesise it holistically.

Team Member Influence (64.1%)

The degree to which team members are given the opportunity to influence the discussion and participate in decision making.

It is not enough for team members to speak their truth. Most people have a strong sense of whether their truth telling influences outcomes within the team. Peak potential lies within the capacity of the team to be open to new ideas and to make them happen. This is where an idea moves from proposition to translation. Openness to experience means that a team who allows for high team membership influence are not afraid to 'fail forward'.

Response Type Domain (64.5%)

Examines the type of responding that respondents make on the Team Synergy Scale, including social desirability, protest voting, and global impressions of team potency.

Faking Bad (48.2%)

The degree to which the team deliberately underestimates its character, ability and performance.

Faking bad is in some sense the opposite of faking good. The TSS contains items which detect overly harsh assessment of the team's capacity or character. High scores may indicate that team members are displeased about the direction and character of the team. This may manifest as protest voting, catastrophising, or a 'negative halo' where a team member sees everything about the team within a negative cognitive bias.

Faking Good (64.5%)

The degree to which the team overrates its ability and performance in a socially desirable way.

Faking good is the common term for social desirability — the desire to overestimate one's values, attitudes and behaviours in order to be viewed favourably by others. The TSS measures faking good behaviour by embedding items that detect highly socially desirable characteristics of team performance which are in reality rare. If respondents consistently rate these items higher than average, it indicates a possibility of over estimating the performance and potential of the team.

Team Potency (69.2%)

A global impression of the team's performance and character, not confined to a specific period of time.

Team Potency combines Halo Performance and Halo Character constructs. These measure an individual's global and overall impression of their team's performance and character which is not confined to a specific period of time. High scores indicate a strong global impression that the team has the characteristics to perform very well. This construct affords opportunities to correct TSS factor scores for response set distortion due to halo rating styles.