For Team & Operations Leaders

Whitepaper · Teams Edition · January 2026

~11 min read

Cross-Functional Teams, Trust, and the Need for a Behavioral Methodology

Despite the popularity of cross-functional teams, the evidence shows they are consistently difficult to lead and frequently underperform. This Teams Edition argues the fragility is not only a design problem but a trust deficit — and that TrustFlow™ supplies the missing behavioral infrastructure.

By Jeff Morris, "The High Trust Guy"

DreamSmart Behavioral Solutions

January 2026 · Version 1.0

Powered by Behavioral SuperPowers® • Activated by TrustFlow™ • Led by Coach Jeff ("The High Trust Guy") | DreamSmart Behavioral Solutions · The Teams Edition

SUMMARY

Cross-functional teams are widely used but systematically fragile. Roughly three-quarters are reported as failing on basic criteria — schedule, budget, specifications, customer value, strategic alignment — and a decade-plus of peer-reviewed research confirms the pattern across sectors and countries. Structural fixes help but do not resolve the recurrent breakdowns in coordination, accountability, and learning. This paper argues the deeper issue is a **trust deficit**, and positions the TrustFlow™ methodology as a structured system of observable, coachable micro-behaviors — the 12 Cs,

organized in four quadrants — that converts trust from a generalized climate into behavioral infrastructure for cross-functional systems.

Keywords: cross-functional teams, team trust, TrustFlow, 12 Cs, behavioral methodology, team performance, knowledge hiding, psychological safety

Key takeaways

- ✓ Cross-functional structures are widely deployed but systematically fragile — role ambiguity, conflicting priorities, accountability gaps, knowledge hiding, and coordination drag recur across public-sector, manufacturing, innovation, and capital-projects settings.
- ✓ Meta-analytic evidence (112 studies, 7,763 teams) puts intrateam trust's relationship with performance at an above-average ρ ≈ .30 — and trust matters even more in virtual and high-uncertainty work.
- ✓ Structural and process redesign cannot create the micro-level interactions — how people listen, commit, follow through, and repair breaches — that sustain trust under pressure. That is the gap TrustFlow™ fills.
- ✓ TrustFlow™ treats trust as a four-quadrant, 12-C dashboard of micro-behaviors, each grounded in established leadership, trust, and team-effectiveness scholarship and defined by observable behaviors, contextual triggers, and measurable indicators.
- ✓ The framework is a testable behavioral intervention: inputs (12 Cs and TrustSparks), mediators (psychological safety, reflexivity, monitoring, effort, knowledge sharing), and outcomes (delivery, quality, stakeholder value, strategic alignment, validated trust indices).

Cross-functional teams, trust, and the need for a behavioral methodology

Despite the popularity of cross-functional teams, empirical evidence shows they are consistently difficult to lead and frequently underperform. Tabrizi's field study of 95 cross-functional teams across 25 large corporations, published in *Harvard Business Review*, reported that nearly 75% failed on at least three of five basic criteria: staying on schedule, staying on budget, meeting specifications, delivering customer value, and maintaining strategic alignment (De Smet et al., 2024). Although this is professional rather than peer-reviewed academic work, it has been widely cited as a practical indicator of how often cross-functional teams break down in real organizations.

Recent peer-reviewed research across time, sectors, and countries paints a similar picture. A systematic review of matrix organizations and cross-functional teams in the public sector concluded that, although such teams are widely deployed, they frequently suffer from role ambiguity, conflicting priorities, and accountability gaps, and the evidence for clear performance benefits is mixed (Pakarinen & Virtanen, 2017). Studies of cross-functional innovation teams show that their positive impact on project performance is contingent on context — for example, benefits appear primarily in more functionally organized firms with high organizational connectedness and can be absent or weaker in project-based firms (Blindenbach-Driessen, 2015). Large-sample work in manufacturing firms finds that cross-functional collaboration does not automatically translate into better new product performance; under high competitive intensity, the time and conflict costs can offset the benefits unless knowledge integration mechanisms are deliberately designed (Hsu, 2014).

More recent studies deepen this pattern across contexts and cultures. A 2022 structural equation study of cross-functional teams found that within-team competition and knowledge hiding significantly reduce team efficiency, underscoring that assembling diverse expertise can backfire when social dynamics

are poorly managed (Ton et al., 2022). An empirical study of cross-functional collaboration in the early phases of capital projects identified multiple barriers — misaligned incentives, unclear roles, information asymmetries, and conflicting priorities — that systematically undermine cross-functional collaboration (Yin et al., 2023). Work on team structure in cross-functional innovation teams similarly concludes that collaboration across functional boundaries is "inherently challenging" and that some commonly recommended structures (highly integrated subgroups with dense cross-functional communication) can worsen innovation outcomes compared to more differentiated structures (Larson et al., 2023).

Taken together, evidence spanning more than a decade, multiple industries (public sector, manufacturing, capital projects, innovation teams), and diverse national settings (e.g., Europe, North America, East Asia) converges on a consistent conclusion: cross-functional structures are widely used but systematically fragile. Structural fixes and process redesign help, but they do not fully resolve the recurrent breakdowns in coordination, accountability, and learning.

From structural fragility to a trust deficit

A growing body of work suggests that this fragility is not only a design problem but also a trust problem. Meta-analytic evidence across 112 independent studies (7,763 teams) shows that intrateam trust is positively related to team performance with an above-average effect size ($\rho \approx .30$), and this relationship holds even after controlling for other predictors such as prior performance and trust in leadership (De Jong et al., 2016). A more recent meta-analysis focused on business teams similarly reports a strong, positive relationship between team trust and team performance, with effects strongest in decision-making and self-directed teams — exactly the kinds of teams that characterize complex cross-functional work (Morrissette & Kisamore, 2020).

Additional work demonstrates that trust is especially critical under the very conditions that typify cross-functional and hybrid collaboration. A meta-analysis of 52 studies (1,850 teams) found that team trust is more strongly related to performance in virtual teams than in face-to-face teams, where coordination costs and perceived risk tend to be higher (Breuer et al., 2016). Process-oriented studies also show that trust enhances performance via team monitoring, effort, and reflexivity — the same capabilities cross-functional teams need to manage interdependencies, negotiate trade-offs, and adapt to changing requirements (De Jong et al., 2016).

Viewed through this lens, Tabrizi's "75% dysfunctional" finding is not an anomaly but a symptom of a deeper pattern: cross-functional teams are placed in high-interdependence, high-ambiguity, high-risk environments, yet organizations rarely provide a behavioral trust methodology robust enough to support them. Structural and process changes are necessary, but they do not by themselves create the micro-level interactions — how people listen, commit, follow through, and repair breaches — that sustain trust under pressure.

Positioning TrustFlow™ as a behavioral trust methodology

The TrustFlow™ methodology addresses a persistent gap in the trust and cross-functional performance literature by treating trust not as a generalized relational climate, but as a structured system of observable, coachable, and measurable micro-behaviors organized within a four-quadrant, 12 Cs dashboard. Consistent with research demonstrating that trust is performance-relevant across contexts (De Jong et al., 2016) and that behavioral execution patterns frequently explain cross-functional outcomes beyond structural design (Ton et al., 2022), TrustFlow™ operationalizes trust as behavioral infrastructure. Each of the 12 Cs is grounded in established leadership, trust, and team-effectiveness scholarship and defined by observable micro-behaviors, contextual triggers, and measurable indicators.

The 12 Cs of TrustFlow™ — the dashboard that structures this paper.

Quadrant	The Cs	Role in cross-functional systems
I. Foundations of TrustFlow™	Character · Courage · Commitment	Establishes psychological safety and moral credibility — prerequisites for cross-functional effectiveness.
II. Essentials of TrustFlow™	Connection · Communication · Caring	Strengthens interpretive clarity and relational cohesion within complex systems.
III. The Work of TrustFlow™	Clarify · Collaboration · Coaching	Translates relational safety into disciplined execution behaviors.
IV. Results of TrustFlow™	Consistency · Competence · Closeout	Ensures that trust produces measurable execution outcomes.

Quadrant I — Foundations of TrustFlow™

The Foundations quadrant establishes psychological safety and moral credibility, prerequisites for cross-functional effectiveness.

Character. Defined as alignment between espoused values and observable actions, especially under pressure. Character connects directly to integrity-based trust and reliability constructs in organizational trust theory; behavioral consistency of values under stress reduces relational uncertainty and defensive behavior, and ethical leadership has been repeatedly linked to credibility and trust formation (Chaiyasat et al., 2025).

Courage. Operationalized as the behavioral willingness to surface dissent, risks, and trade-offs early. Courage mitigates knowledge hiding and hidden conflict in cross-functional environments (Ton et al., 2022) and supports psychological-safety mechanisms linked to team reflexivity (De Jong et al., 2016; Abunab et al., 2026).

Commitment. Keeping your word and following through; showing up reliably and going the extra mile to honor shared outcomes. Behavioral commitment increases accountability and aligns with research linking trust to performance outcomes (Rai & Koodamara, 2025).

Quadrant II — Essentials of TrustFlow™

The Essentials quadrant strengthens interpretive clarity and relational cohesion within complex systems.

Connection. Intentional relational investment that builds affect-based trust and reduces fragmentation in distributed or cross-functional teams (Costa & Rodrigues, 2025; De Jong et al., 2016).

Communication. Operationalized as clarity, transparency, and right-sized information exchange. Research demonstrates that communication quality — not merely frequency — predicts engagement and trust development and moderates team effectiveness (Hu et al., 2025; Morrissette & Kisamore, 2020).

Caring. Leading with empathy and respect; demonstrating genuine concern for people while reinforcing humility, integrity, and trust. Empathic, compassionate leadership reduces defensiveness and supports engagement and performance (Westover, 2024).

Quadrant III — The Work of TrustFlow™

The Work quadrant translates relational safety into disciplined execution behaviors.

Clarify. Explicit articulation of roles, decision rights, and expectations. Role ambiguity has been consistently linked to performance breakdowns in matrix structures (Pakarinen & Virtanen, 2017); clarity behaviors reduce coordination loss and trust misalignment, and role clarity supports resilience during change (Bernuzzi et al., 2023).

Collaboration. Structured synthesis of cross-functional input rather than mere interaction volume. Research indicates that collaboration effectiveness depends

on coordinated behavioral norms rather than structural proximity alone (Morrissette & Kisamore, 2020; Ton et al., 2022; International Coach Federation Thought Leadership Institute, 2023).

Coaching. Operationalizes feedback loops and reflexivity behaviors that enable adaptive correction. Empirical evidence shows that developmental feedback processes enhance leader credibility and team commitment (Alves & Nunes Figueiredo, 2024).

Quadrant IV — Results of TrustFlow™

The Results quadrant ensures that trust produces measurable execution outcomes.

Consistency (performance reliability). Creating predictable cadences and standards; following through, especially when it is hard. Trust-repair and maintenance literature highlights the importance of predictable follow-through for sustained relational confidence (Van Strydonck et al., 2025).

Competence. Demonstrable capability and skill credibility. Ability-based trust remains a central pillar in trust theory and significantly predicts team confidence and performance consistency (Fitsilis, 2024).

Closeout. Formal completion of commitments and structured capture of learning. Failure to close commitments contributes to rework, project inefficiency, and trust erosion in complex environments (Yin et al., 2023; Westover, 2025). Behavioral closeout practices convert trust from sentiment to deliverable accountability.

TrustSparks™ and micro-behavioral activation

Across all four quadrants, TrustFlow™ integrates **TrustSparks™** — small, intentional behavioral activations deployed at high-friction moments (e.g., scoping meetings, escalation decisions, interdepartmental conflict). These micro-activations create

immediate psychological-safety signals and reinforce credibility in line with contemporary trust-dynamics research.

Empirical framing: TrustFlow™ as a testable intervention

TrustFlow™ may be conceptualized as a structured behavioral intervention:

- **Inputs:** frequency and quality of 12 Cs micro-behaviors and TrustSpark activations.
- **Mediators:** psychological safety, reflexivity, monitoring, collective effort, and knowledge sharing (De Jong et al., 2016; Breuer et al., 2016).
- **Outcomes:** on-time and on-budget delivery, quality adherence, stakeholder value creation, strategic alignment, and validated trust/climate indices (De Smet et al., 2024).

By structuring trust through four quadrants and twelve operational dimensions, TrustFlow™ extends existing trust scholarship by converting foundational constructs (ability, benevolence, integrity; affect- and cognition-based trust; trust repair; trust dynamics) into measurable, coachable behavioral infrastructure for cross-functional systems. Trust becomes not only a relational perception but also an observable architecture.

The core hypothesis

By systematically increasing behavioral trust — via TrustFlow™'s TrustSparks and 12 Cs dashboard — leaders can raise intrateam and cross-functional trust to levels that meta-analytic evidence already links to higher team performance, thereby reducing the probability that cross-functional teams fall into the "dysfunctional 75%."

How to cite this whitepaper

Morris, J. (2026). *Cross-functional teams, trust, and the need for a behavioral methodology* (TrustFlow™ Teams Edition, Whitepaper, Version 1.0). DreamSmart Behavioral Solutions. https://dreamsmartbehavioralsolutions.com/resources/whitepapers/trustflow-cross-functional-teams

References

Abunab, H. Y., Mrayyan, M. T., & Alfayoumi, I. H. (2026). Courageous leadership of nursing academics and the impact on students' psychological safety. *Teaching and Learning in Nursing, 21*(1), 12–18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.teln.2025.08.013

Alves, J., & Nunes Figueiredo, P. C. (2024). The influence of coaching competences on the commitment and development of leaders in organizations. In *Advances in leadership coaching and development* (pp. 58–77). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-5242-7.ch004

Bernuzzi, C., Sommovigo, V., Maffoni, M., Setti, I., & Argentero, P. (2023). A mixed-method study on the bright side of organizational change: Role clarity and supervisor support as resources for employees' resilience. *Journal of Change Management, 23*(2), 143–176. https://doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2023.2172057

Blindenbach-Driessen, F. (2015). The (in)effectiveness of cross-functional innovation teams: The moderating role of organizational context. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management, 62*(1), 29–38. https://doi.org/10.1109/TEM.2014.2361623

Breuer, C., Hüffmeier, J., & Hertel, G. (2016). Does trust matter more in virtual teams? A meta-analysis of trust and team effectiveness considering virtuality and documentation as moderators. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 101*(8), 1151–1177. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000113

Chaiyasat, C., Petchsawang, P., Simha, A., & Williamson, P. (2025). An integrative literature review of ethical leadership studies and future research agenda: Insights from empirical

research between 2020–2024. *Public Integrity.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2025.2525727

Costa, B., & Rodrigues, R. I. (2025). The invisible bond: Exploring the sequential mediation of interpersonal connections and engagement in the relationship between the onboarding process and talent retention. *Administrative Sciences, 15*(7), Article 281. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci15070281

De Jong, B. A., Dirks, K. T., & Gillespie, N. (2016). Trust and team performance: A meta-analysis of main effects, moderators, and covariates. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 101*(8), 1134–1150. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000110

De Smet, A., D'Auria, G., Meijknecht, L., & Albaharna, M. (2024, October 31). *Go, teams: When teams get healthier, the whole organization benefits.* McKinsey & Company. mckinsey.com

Fitsilis, P. (2024). Navigating the skills revolution: The essential role of competence frameworks. https://doi.org/10.32388/V28REV

Hsu, T. T. (2014). Cross-functional collaboration, competitive intensity, knowledge integration mechanisms, and new product performance: A mediated moderation model. *Industrial Marketing Management.* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2013.08.012

Hu, J., Choi, M., & Kim, H. E. (2025). Motivating change-oriented behavior through coaching leadership: The role of psychological entitlement and knowledge management. *Frontiers in Psychology, 16,* Article 1626507. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1626507

International Coach Federation Thought Leadership Institute. (2023, April 19). *How coaching approaches help managers cultivate collaborative teams.* Global Digital Library.

Larson, L. E., Harris-Watson, A. M., Carter, D. R., Asencio, R., DeChurch, L. A., Kanfer, R., & Zaccaro, S. J. (2023). A multilevel review of interruptions in teams: Mechanisms, outcomes, and future directions. *Academy of Management Discoveries.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.5465/amd.2020.0238

Morrissette, A. M., & Kisamore, J. L. (2020). Trust and performance in business teams: A meta-analysis. *Team Performance Management: An International Journal, 26*(5–6), 287–300. https://doi.org/10.1108/TPM-02-2020-0012

Pakarinen, M., & Virtanen, P. J. (2017). Matrix organizations and cross-functional teams in the public sector: A systematic review. *International Journal of Public Sector Management, 30*(3), 210–226. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPSM-04-2016-0065

Rai, S. S., & Koodamara, N. K. (2025). How does trust in a leader influence organizational commitment? A test of a moderated mediation model. *Acta Psychologica, 257,* Article 105092. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2025.105092

Ton, A. D., Szabó-Szentgróti, G., & Hammerl, L. (2022). Competition within cross-functional teams: A structural equation model on knowledge hiding. *Social Sciences, 11*(1), 30. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci11010030

Van Strydonck, I., Decramer, A., Peccei, R., & Audenaert, M. (2025). Process and content in performance management: How consistency and supervisor developmental feedback decrease emotional exhaustion via high-quality LMX. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 45*(2), 365–398. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X231220938

Westover, J. H. (2024). Building the compassionate culture: How empathetic leadership breeds engagement and performance. *Human Capital Leadership Review, 12*(3). https://doi.org/10.70175/hclreview.2020.12.3.10

Westover, J. H. (2025). Assessing accountability in a world-class culture. *Human Capital Leadership Review, 16*(4). https://doi.org/10.70175/hclreview.2020.16.4.6

Yin, Z., Caldas, C., de Oliveira, D., Kermanshachi, S., & Pamidimukkala, A. (2023). Cross-functional collaboration in the early phases of capital projects: Barriers and contributing factors. *Project Leadership and Society, 4,* 100092. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plas.2023.100092

Related research

WHITEPAPER · ACADEMIC EDITION

The TrustFlow™ Methodology — Academic Edition

WHITEPAPER · FOR THE C-SUITE

TrustFlow™ as a Competitive Advantage in Corporate America

CASE STUDY

From mid-range to A-Team: a Fortune 500 leadership team fixes accountability

SOLUTION

Executive team building