

The Impact of Conflict and Conflict Management Style on Deadbeats and Deserters in Virtual Teams

Kimberly Furumo, University of Hawaii at Hilo

Abstract

Individuals face additional challenges when interacting in virtual teams. The lack of media richness and the asynchronous nature of technologically transmitted messages make communication more difficult. Conflicts may be more likely to arise in virtual teams.. In this study, team members who were identified as deadbeats by other team members and those who deserted the team were studied. Deadbeats and deserters reported experiencing more conflict and less trust, group cohesion, and satisfaction when working in virtual teams. Analysis of two conflict management approaches showed that deserters were significantly more likely to use an avoidance conflict management style than active team members. Active team members were more likely to use an integrative approach to conflict management. Results of the study suggest that conflict, and the way in which individuals deal with it, may impact the likelihood of social loafing and desertion in virtual teams.

1. Introduction

Virtual teams can be defined as geographically or organizationally dispersed groups of individuals that communicate via information communications technology in a synchronous or asynchronous modes [23]. Teams communicating asynchronously in an electronic environment face special challenges which threaten the performance of the virtual team. The flow of communication may be interrupted and confusion about the message can not be clarified immediately. The lack of media richness (i.e., limited exposure to body language, gestures, and voice tone) also increases the likelihood of the communication being misunderstood.

These challenges increase the likelihood of conflict and poorly managed conflict can be detrimental to the performance of the team [2,8,17]. Extant research of traditional teams shows that the output of teams is often superior to that of an individual because of the synergy that comes from individuals sharing ideas and

functional expertise. However, in virtual teams there is the chance that the technology will negatively impact performance. In its worst form, members may become disillusioned and leave the team.

In this research, virtual team members who become either deadbeats or team deserters were studied to determine whether they varied from active members in terms of how they perceived group cohesion, trust, conflict, and satisfaction with the team. The conflict management styles used by team members were also studied to determine whether the manner in which an individual handles conflict impacts their likelihood of reducing effort or abandoning the team altogether.

2. Literature Review

Social Impact Theory [15] has been used to explain why individuals may not exert full effort when working in teams. Social Impact Theory views individuals as sources and targets of social impact. When working in groups, individuals perceive themselves and others in terms of social impact and decide based on this assessment, how much they will participate in the group. The greater the sources and targets of social impact within a group, the less the motivation of individual members to contribute to the group effort. Kidwell and Bennett [14] suggested that in large groups, individuals may be less motivated to perform because they perceive their contributions as being marginal or they perceive the rewards as being incongruous with inputs [32]. Karau and Willams [13] found that free-riding increased with group size.

Chidambaram and Tung [4] suggest that Social Impact Theory explains social loafing in terms of two theoretical dimensions. The first, the "dilution effect" addresses whether an individual feels submerged in a group. The second, the "immediacy gap" suggests that as individuals feel more isolated from the group they will participate less. They suggest that the dilution effect and the immediacy gap come

together to influence individual contributions in a group. The dilution effect refers to the motivational reasons for interaction while the immediacy gap occurs when increased distance between members leads individuals to feel isolated from the group. This would suggest that individuals may limit effort in groups for two different reasons. Individuals who perceive that they can get away with doing less because their individual efforts cannot be identified may be motivated by different reasons to social loaf than those who feel isolated in a group and give up because they feel ineffective.

Previous studies have viewed social loafers as individuals who reduce their effort in groups when they believe that they can without suffering negative repercussions. In this context, social loafers have been viewed as lazy or at best smart for not applying effort that will not be directly attached to their efforts. Studies of social loafing have not considered that some individuals may stop participating in a group out of frustration because they perceive that they can have not impact on the team outcome. In this study, we propose that social loafers can be categorized as those who are “lazy/smart” or those who are “frustrated

Individuals, who social loaf because they believe their individual efforts cannot be identified, continue to work with a team but limit their effort. We refer to these individuals as deadbeats. Individuals who abandon the team, perhaps out of frustration or conflict, are referred to as deserters.

Conflict in teams has been defined as the disagreement among team members that results from incompatible goals and interests [26]. Conflict may be more prevalent and difficult to manage in virtual teams [9]. Non-collocated team members, who meet via information and communications technology (ICT), face obstacles because of communication difficulties. The lack of media richness in ICT communications can lead to miscommunications and team members may have more difficulty establishing trusting relationships.

Trust has been defined as “the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party” [16]. A lack of trust exists when one party does not have faith in the competencies of another or questions the motivation of the other to take the promised

action as seriously [28]. So, trust can be seen as a relationship between two or more individuals in which one perceives that the others are involved, are competent, will complete their fair share of the work, and will make an honest effort to meet commitments.

Trust is important in teams because it lowers transaction costs [31]. Individuals, who do not trust fellow team members, are more likely to monitor or double check each other’s work to insure the quality of the team’s output. This self-protective activity increases the amount of time and resources needed to complete a project. In virtual teams, trust becomes an important component in preventing psychological distance [27] and it increases confidence in relationships by promoting open information exchange [9]. Trust is often referred to as the glue that holds the virtual team together. Not surprisingly, trust has been identified as a determinant of effectiveness in virtual teams [10, 29]. Individuals who trust each other are likely to be more satisfied with the team experience since they perceive that their best interests are being served, while only having to complete their fair share of the team’s task. Individuals who trust each other may be more likely to bring problems forth in an effort to resolve them effectively.

When individuals do not perceive that their best interests are being met, conflict arises. Studies have identified two distinct dimensions of conflict, one related to task and the other related to interpersonal relationships between team members [12,21,22,30]. Task conflict involving differences of viewpoint related to the task can enhance the effectiveness of a team if it is handled appropriately, while relationship or personalized conflict which is characterized by feelings of anger, frustration, and distrust hinders effective group functioning [1,12]. Teams that hope to be productive must address issues of relationship conflict. Groups with unresolved relationship conflict have lower cohesion [18] and meta-analytic studies have shown that group cohesion impacts performance [19]. Relationship conflict has also been linked with decreased performance and decreased intent to remain in a group [6,11,12].

Studies of interpersonal conflict management have utilized a theoretical framework comprised of two underlying motives – concern for self and concern for others [7]. Within this theoretical framework, five major conflict management patterns have been identified. Two styles, *integrating* (high concern

for self and others) and *compromising* (moderated concern for self and others), are known as cooperative conflict management styles [24]. Other styles include, *dominating* (high concern for self and low concern for others), *obliging* (low concern for self and high concern for others), and *integrating* (high concern for self and high concern for others). The integrative and avoidance conflict management styles are thought to be polar opposites since one involves high regard for all parties concerned and one regards low concern for all involved. The integrative conflict management approach, involves solving problems through the collaboration of team efforts. The avoiding conflict management approach involves ignoring problems.

Previous studies have not focused on the impact of conflict management on individual social loafing behavior in teams. In virtual teams, relationship conflict may be increased because of the difficulties of ICT communications and trust development. In this exploratory study, we analyze how trust, group cohesion, conflict, and satisfaction differ for active team members, deadbeats, and deserters.

To do this, we propose two sets of hypotheses. In the first, we compare active team members with the group of all social loafers (deadbeats and deserters included).

Hypothesis 1: Active Members will experience higher levels of trust and group cohesion than Deadbeats and Deserters

Hypothesis 2: Active Members will experience less task and relationship conflict than Deadbeats and Deserters

Hypothesis 3: Active Members will have higher outcome and process satisfaction than Deadbeats and Deserters

In the second set of hypotheses, deadbeats and deserters are compared to identify subtle differences that may exist between the two groups. In particular, it is proposed that the social loafer group can be categorized, based on motivations of behavior, into a group of deadbeats and a group of deserters.

Hypothesis 4: Deserters will experience less trust, group cohesion, and satisfaction than Deadbeats

Hypothesis 5: Deserters will report more task and relationship conflict than Deadbeats

If we assume that deadbeats and deserters perceive group dynamics (trust, conflict, cohesion) less favorably than active team members, is this due to the fact that they handle conflict less favorably? Since deserters have made a decision to leave the team, one possible explanation for their behavior is that they deal with conflict by intentionally withdrawing. On the other hand, active team members, who are neither deadbeats nor deserters, may handle conflict in a more positive way by integrating multiple team member viewpoints. If this is the case, we would expect active members to be more likely to use an integrative conflict management approach and deserters to use an avoidance conflict management approach.

Hypothesis 6: Active Members will be more likely to use an integrating conflict management style than Deadbeats and Deserters

Hypothesis 7: Deadbeats and Deserters will be more likely to use an avoiding conflict management style than Active Members

Hypothesis 8: Deserters will be more likely to use an avoiding conflict management style than deadbeats

3. Methodology

3.1 Design

The hypotheses were tested using a quasi-experimental design in which participants were randomly assigned to virtual teams to complete a week-long task. Participants in the study were upper level college students enrolled in a management course at a mid-sized university in the Midwestern United States and the task involved determining how to allocate \$1 million in surplus funds. At the conclusion of the experiment, individual participants completed a survey designed to measure their perceived levels of trust, group cohesion, satisfaction, task and relationship conflict experienced in the team, and their conflict management styles.

Participants were asked to estimate the amount of time each team member spent on the project and identify whether any of the team

members acted as deadbeats or deserters. Deadbeats were defined as members who contributed 10% or less to the completion of the project. Deserters were defined as those who left the team and completed the project on their own. Individuals were classified as deadbeats only if all other members of the team identified them as such. This insured that team members were not identified as deadbeats simply because one other team member was disgruntled.

3.2 Tools and Manipulation Checks

Students used WebCT, an instructional software package, to complete the team project. WebCT allows users to participate in email and discussion board facilities with assigned members of a team without divulging individual identities. Prior to the start of the experiment all participating students were trained on the WebCT software package. Students completed three assignments requiring them to use the various features of the software. All students who did not score a 100% on each assignment were required to re-do the assignment until they got perfect scores. This method provided assurance that each participant was familiar with the features of the WebCT software and that variations among participants in trust, group cohesion satisfaction, and perceived conflict were not the result of unfamiliarity with the technology.

In reality, many virtual team members have some face-to-face contact. However in this study, individuals never met face-to-face and were instructed not to reveal any personal information about themselves during the duration of the project. Participants were given a randomly generated email sign-on so other participants could not identify who their fellow team members were. On the day the project was assigned students were given a personalized printout, providing them with the WebCT email addresses of their team members and written instructions about how to complete the project. They were informed that they would receive a failing grade if they attempted to meet in person or communicate any personal information about themselves to the other team members. WebCT collects a stream of all communications that take place on-line and students were informed that the instructor would review the communication stream to insure that they did not violate the confidentiality guidelines. Review of the communication stream uncovered inappropriate

communication in two teams and individuals in these teams were eliminated from the study. To further reduce unmeasured variability, students were eliminated from the study if they had had a previous virtual team experience or if one or more of the team members dropped the class before the completion of the experiment.

Subjects were labeled as active team members, deadbeats, or deserters based on their participation in the team. Participants were labeled as deadbeats if all the other team members identified them as individuals who contributed 10% or less toward the completion of the project or as deserters if they did not work with the team. Interestingly, the deserters in the study each began the project with the team but at some point deserted the team and turned in their own version of the project.

3.3 Data Collection and Analysis

To assess perceived trust levels, a scale developed by Jarvenpaa, Knoll, and Leidner [9] was used. Their scale is based on previous instruments developed by Mayer, Davis, and Schoorman [16] and Pearce, Sommer, Morris, and Frideger [20] to measure the level of trust in dyads. Jarvenpaa et al. [9] modified these instruments to reflect the team rather than a dyad by testing the two instruments at two different time points and across cultures. Both measures of trust were correlated but the instrument developed by Pearce and colleagues had higher reliability ($\alpha = .92$) and thus it was used as the basis of their modified survey. After testing, Jarvenpaa et al. [9] reduced the 8-item scale to a 6-item instrument with a five-point Likert-type response scale anchored on one end with strongly agree and the other with strongly disagree. They reported Cronbach's alpha for the scale at .92.

To determine the individual's perceived level of group cohesion, a scale developed by Chin, Salisbury, Pearson, and Stollack [5] was used. They adapted an earlier scale [3] to the small group setting. It identified two dimensions of small group cohesion – belongingness (Cronbach's $\alpha = .95$) and morale (Cronbach's $\alpha = .87$). The scale is composed of six items utilizing 7-point Likert-type scales anchored with strongly agree and strongly disagree.

Task and relationship conflict were measured with Pearson, Ensley, and Amason's [21] conflict scale. Their scale, based on the intragroup conflict scale developed by Jehn [11], measures task and relationship conflict with

reported Cronbach's alphas of $\alpha=.79$ and $\alpha=.85$ respectively. The scale is composed of six items utilizing 5-point Likert-type response categories anchored with none and a great deal.

To measure individual satisfaction with the output and process of the team, a scale developed by Reinig [25] was used. He developed and tested an instrument to measure satisfaction with group process and outcomes in the virtual and face-to-face team environments. His instrument consisted of five questions pertaining to satisfaction with the process and five pertaining to satisfaction with the decision. He reported Cronbach's alpha for the instrument at .79.

Integrating and avoidance conflict management styles were measured using a portion of the ROCI-II scale developed by Rahim [24]. The scale identifies the extent to which an individual uses a particular conflict management style when dealing with conflict. The scale utilizes a 5-point Likert-type response scale anchored on one end with strongly agree and the other with strongly disagree. Rahim reported reliability of his integrating conflict management style scale at $\alpha=.77$ and the reliability for the avoiding conflict management style scale at $\alpha=.75$. Items for all survey scales are included in Appendix A.

To test the hypotheses, ANOVA tests with planned contrasts were performed. The independent variable, type of student, had three conditions: active team member, deadbeat, or deserter. The dependent variables measured in this study were trust, group cohesion, task and relationship conflict, process and outcome satisfaction, and conflict management style.

3.4 Sample

Of the original 192 subjects randomly assigned to teams, 16 were eliminated from the study because of one of the following reasons: either they or one of their team members dropped the class prior to the completion of the project, they or one of their team members had a previous virtual team experience, or they or one of their team members attempted to divulge their identify in the virtual team environment. The remaining sample consisted of 176 students ranging in age from 19 to 50 with a mean age of 22 years. Of the 176 students, 105 (60%) were male and 71 (40%) were female. Details are available in Table 1.

Table 1: Sample Statistics

Team Member Type	n	Percent of Total	Age	Gender
Active Member	160	90.9%	22.1	94 male 66 female
Deadbeat	13	7.4%	22.2	8 male 5 female
Deserter	3	1.7%	20.3	3 male 0 female
Totals	176	100.0%	22.0	105 male 71 female

3.5 Instrument Validation

Before utilizing the scale data, principal components factor analyses were completed to insure that items appropriately tested the intended constructs. Analysis of the trust construct showed that all six items had acceptable loadings ranging from .712 to .865. All items were retained and the reliability analysis of the scale yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .87. A composite measure of trust was identified for each participant by averaging scores on the six items in the survey. Since the instrument utilized a 5-point Likert-type response scale, average scores could range from 1 for no trust to 5 for complete trust.

Analysis of the group cohesion construct showed that the six items had acceptable loadings ranging from .703 to .982. All items were retained and the reliability analysis of the scale yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .92. A composite measure of group cohesion was identified for each participant by averaging the scores of the six items in the survey. Since the instrument utilized a 7-point Likert-type response scale, average scores could range from 1 for no group cohesion to 7 for the highest group cohesion.

Analysis of the task and relationship conflict construct yielded two distinct dimensions. Items related to task conflict had factor loadings ranging from .781 to .886 while the loadings for the relationship conflict items ranged from .674 to .941. The reliability tests showed a Cronbach's alpha of .86 for task conflict and .95 for relationship conflict. Composite measures for each dimension of conflict were calculated by averaging the scores of individual items. Since the instrument utilized a 5-point Likert-type response scale, average scores could range from 1 for no conflict to 5 for the maximum amount of conflict.

Analysis of the satisfaction construct yielded two distinct dimensions: outcome

satisfaction and process satisfaction. The loadings for the first dimension ranged from .747 to .869 while the loadings for the second dimension ranged from .773 to .878. Two items related to outcome satisfaction were removed because of high cross-loadings. The overall reliability analysis yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .89. Composite measures for both dimensions of satisfaction were obtained by averaging the scores for each of the remaining items. Scores ranged from 1 for no satisfaction with process or outcome to 5 for total satisfaction.

Analysis of the conflict management construct yielded distinct dimensions with loadings ranging from .605 to .808. The overall reliability analysis yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .773. Composite measures for the integrative and avoidance conflict management styles were obtained by averaging item scores. Scores for each of the conflict management styles ranged from 1 indicating a very low amount of the conflict management style and 5 indicating an extremely high amount of the conflict measurement style.

4. Results

Hypotheses 1-3 predicted that active team members would report higher levels of trust, group cohesion, process and outcome satisfaction and lower levels of task and relationship conflict than deadbeats or deserters. Results of initial ANOVA tests (Table 2) and summary means (Table 3) show that there were significant differences among the groups on all the variables except task conflict.

Table 2: ANOVA Results comparing Active Members, Deadbeats, and Deserters

Variable	F	Sig
Trust	8.876	.000
Group Cohesion	6.606	.002
Process Satisfaction	5.006	.008
Outcome Satisfaction	7.310	.001
Task Conflict	.962	.384
Relation Conflict	8.337	.000

Active team members reported higher trust and group cohesion (3.71 and 4.67 respectively) than deadbeats (3.44 and 3.88) and deserters (1.94 and 1.64). They also reported more satisfaction with both the process and the outcome of the team (3.87 and 3.96) than the deadbeats (3.52 and 3.23) and the deserters (2.47 and 2.67). Task conflict did not vary

significantly among the groups but relationship conflict did (1.43 for active members, 1.75 for deadbeats and 3.08 for deserters).

Table 3: Group Means for Trust, Cohesion, Conflict, and Satisfaction

Variable	Mean (Standard Deviation)		
	Active	Dead-beat	Deserter
Trust	3.71 (.74)	3.44 (.75)	1.94 (.77)
Group Cohesion	4.67 (1.24)	3.88 (1.18)	2.5 (1.64)
Process Satisfaction	3.87 (.82)	3.52 (.89)	2.47 (1.50)
Outcome Satisfaction	3.96 (.87)	3.23 (.74)	2.67 (.67)
Task Conflict	1.83 (.76)	1.94 (.92)	2.42 (.52)
Relationship Conflict	1.43 (.70)	1.75 (1.08)	3.08 (.95)

To determine which groups (active members, deadbeats, and deserters) significantly varied, two planned contrasts were performed. Table 4 provides a summary of the contrast coefficients. In the first contrast, active members were compared to the group of deadbeat and deserters combined. In the second contrast, the deadbeat group was compared with the deserter group.

Table 4: Contrast Coefficients

Contrasts	Type of Team Member		
	Active	Dead-beats	Deserters
1 (Active vs. Deadbeats & Deserters)	-2	+1	+1
2 (Deadbeats vs. Deserters)	0	+1	-1

Results of the contrasts, displayed in Table 5, show that the active members reported significantly higher levels of trust, group cohesion, process and outcome satisfaction and less relationship conflict than the group of deadbeats and deserters. However, there was not a statistical difference between the groups for task conflict. Therefore, hypotheses 1 and 3 were fully supported while hypothesis 2 was only partially supported.

Results of the second contrast, also shown in Table 5, revealed that the deadbeats group reported significantly higher levels of trust

and lower levels of relationship conflict than the deserter group but differences were not significant for the other variables. Therefore, hypotheses 4 and 5 are only partially supported.

Table 5: Results of Contrast Tests

	Contrast	T	Sig.
Trust	1	-4.142	.000
	2	3.125	.002
Group Cohesion	1	-3.592	.000
	2	1.739	.084
Process Satisfaction	1	-3.164	.002
	2	1.963	.051
Outcome Satisfaction	1	-3.549	.000
	2	1.023	.308
Task Conflict	1	1.377	.170
	2	-.966	.335
Relationship Conflict	1	4.057	.000
	2	-2.831	.005

To test hypotheses 6 and 7, an ANOVA analysis comparing the active and deadbeat/deserter groups was performed. Tables 6 and 7 provide a summary of the results. The active members reported significantly higher levels of the integrating conflict management style than the deadbeat /deserter group ($F_{1,175} = 4.375$; $p=.038$); however. The deadbeat/deserter group did not report significantly higher levels of the avoidance conflict management style ($F_{1,175} = 2.222$; $p=.138$). Therefore, Hypothesis 6 is supported but hypothesis 7 is not. Further evaluation of the differences between deadbeats and deserters showed that there were significant differences between the levels of conflict avoidance between the groups. Deserters had much higher levels of the avoidance conflict management style than deadbeats. Results are displayed in Table 8. These results confirm hypothesis 8.

Table 6: Conflict Management Style Group Means

Conflict Management Style	Type of Team Member	
	Active	Deadbeat/Deserter
Integrating	4.10 (.44)	3.85 (.62)
Avoiding	2.60 (.79)	2.91(.60)

Table 7: ANOVA Comparison of Active vs. Deadbeat/Deserter Groups on Conflict Management Style

Conflict Management Style	F	Sig
Integrating	4.375	.038
Avoiding	2.222	.138

Table 8: ANOVA Comparison of Deadbeat vs. Deserter Groups on Avoidance Conflict Management Style

Conflict Management Style	Dead-beats Mean	Desert-ers Mean	F	Sig
Avoiding	2.75 (.54)	3.58 (.38)	6.250	.025

5. Discussion and Conclusions

Results of this study suggest that active team members are more trusting, experience better group cohesion, and are more satisfied with the virtual team experience. They also reported less relationship conflict in teams. While both the deadbeats and the deserters reported lower levels of trust, cohesion, and satisfaction than the active members, deserters were the least trusting and were least satisfied with the virtual team experience. Surprisingly, they did not report significantly higher levels of task conflict but identified increased levels of relationship conflict.

These findings may suggest that when conflict escalates in teams, some members will withdraw from the team experience. Deadbeats did so to a lesser extent than deserters. There is also evidence to suggest members who experience high levels of relationship conflict may desert the group.

Analysis of the conflict management styles showed that deserters were more likely to use an avoiding conflict management style than deadbeats. This may suggest that members who perceive that there is a lot of relationship conflict in a team may use an avoidance conflict management style and desert the team. On the other hand, active team members are more likely to use an integrating conflict management style which may indicate that they are better at resolving conflicts and therefore experience greater trust and satisfaction.

This exploratory study suggests that deadbeats and deserters are different from active group members. There is some evidence that deadbeats and deserters utilize a conflict management style that is less likely to resolve conflicts and may lead to frustration and withdrawal from the team.

6. References

- [1] A.C. Amason, "Distinguishing the Effects of Functional and Dysfunctional Conflict on Strategic Decision Making: Resolving a Paradox", *The International Journal of Conflict Management*, 13, 1996, pp. 110-126.
- [2] H. Barki and J. Hartwick, "Interpersonal Conflict and its Management in Information System Development", *MIS Quarterly*, 25, 2001, pp. 195-228.
- [3] K.A. Bollen and R.H. Hoyle, "Perceived Cohesion: A Conceptual and Empirical Examination", *Social Forces*, 69, 1990, pp. 479-504.
- [4] L. Chidambaram, L. Tung, "Is Out of Sight, Out of Mind? An Empirical Study of Social Loafing in Technology-Supported Groups", *Information Systems Research*, 16(2), 2005, pp. 149-168.
- [5] W.W. Chin, W.D. Salisbury, A.W. Pearson, and M.J. Stollak, "Perceived Cohesion in Small Groups: Adapting and Testing the Perceived Cohesion Scale in a Small-Group Setting", *Small Group Research*, 30, 1999, pp. 751-766.
- [6] C. De Dreu and A. Van Vianen, "Managing Relationship Conflict and the Effectiveness of Organizational Teams", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 22, 2001, pp.309-328.
- [7] H. Desivilya and D. Eizen, "Conflict Management in Work Teams: The Role of Social Self-Efficacy and Group Identification", *The International Journal of Conflict Management*, 16(2), 2005, pp. 183-208.
- [8] E. de Pillis and K. Furumo, "Technical Opinion: Counting the Cost of Virtual Teams", *Communications of the ACM*, forthcoming November 2007.
- [9] P. Hinds and D. Bailey, "Out of Sight, Out of Synch: Understanding Conflict in Distributed Teams", *Organizational Science*, 14, 2003, pp. 615-632.
- [9] S. L. Jarvenpaa, K. Knoll, and D. E. Leidner, "Is Anybody Out There? Antecedents of Trust in Global Virtual Teams", *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 14, 1998, pp. 29-64.
- [10] S.L. Jarvenpaa and D.E. Leidner, "Communication and Trust in Global Virtual Teams", *Organization Science*, 10, 1999, pp. 791-815.
- [11] K.A. Jehn, "Enhancing effectiveness: An Investigation of Advantages and Disadvantages of Value Based Intragroup Conflict", *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 5, 1994, pp. 223-238.
- [12] K.A. Jehn, "A Multidimethod Examination of the Benefits and Detriments of Intragroup Conflict", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, 1995, pp. 256-282.
- [13] S. Karau, S. and K. Williams, "Social-Loafing: A Meta-Analytic Review and Theoretical Integration", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65(4), 1993, pp. 681-706.
- [14] R. Kidwell, and N. Bennett, "Employee Propensity to Withhold Effort: A Conceptual Model to Intersect Three Avenues of Research", *Academy of Management Review*, 18, 1993, pp. 429-456.
- [15] B. Latane, "The Psychology of Social Impact", *American Psychologist*, 36, 1981, pp. 343-356.
- [16] R. C. Mayer, J. H. Davis, and F. D. Schoorman, "An Integrative Model of Organizational Trust", *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 1995, pp. 709-734.
- [17] J. McGrath, "Time, Interaction, and performance (TIP): A Theory of Groups", *Small Group Research*, 22, 1991, pp. 147-174.
- [18] R.C. Pace, "Personalized and Depersonalized Conflict in Small Group Discussions: An Examination of differentiation", *Small Group Research*, 21, 1990, pp. 79-96.
- [19] D. Paskevich, M. Patterson, H. Prapavessis, K. Spink, and P. Terry, "Do Individual Perceptions of Group Cohesion reflect Shared Beliefs? An Empirical Analysis", *Small Group Research*, 2004, pp. 467-491.
- [20] J. L. Pearce, S. M. Sommer, A. Morris, and M. Frideger, "A Configurational Approach to Interpersonal Relations: Profiles of Work Place Social Relations and Task Interdependence.", *Graduate School of Management Irvine, CA: University of California*, 1992.
- [21] A.W. Pearson, M.D. Ensley, and A.C. Amason, "An Assessment and Refinement of Jehn's Intragroup Conflict Scale", *The International Journal of Conflict Management*, 13, 2002, pp. 110-126.
- [22] R.L. Pinkley, "Dimensions of Conflict Frame: Disputant Interpretations of Conflict", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 1990, pp. 117-126.

[23] A. Powell, G. Piccoli, and B. Ives, "Virtual Teams: A Review of Current Literature and Direction for Future Research", DATA BASE for Advances in Information Systems, 35, 2004, pp. 6 - 36.

[24] M.A. Rahim, "A Measure of Styles of Handling Interpersonal Conflict", Academy of Management Journal, 26, 1983, pp. 368-376.

[25] B.A. Reinig, "Toward an Understanding of Satisfaction with the Process and Outcomes of Teamwork", Journal of Management Information Systems, 19, 2003, pp. 65-83.

[26] S.P. Robbins, Managing Organizational Conflict, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1974.

[27] C.C. Snow, S.A. Snell, and S.C. Davison, "Use Transnational Teams to Globalize Your Company", Organizational Dynamics, 24, 1996, pp. 50-67.

[28] T. van der Smagt, "Enhancing Virtual Teams: Social Relations vs. Communication Technology", Industrial Management & Data Systems, 100, 2000.

[29] P. Walden and E. Turban, "Working Anywhere, Anytime and with Anyone", Human Systems Management, 19, 2000, pp. 213-222.

[30] V. Wall and L.N. Nolan, "Perceptions of Inequity, Satisfaction, and Conflict in Task Oriented Groups", Human Relations, 39, 1986, pp. 1033-1052.

[31] M.B. Watson-Manheim and F. Belanger, "Support for Communication-Based Work Processes in Virtual Work", e-Service Journal, 2002, pp. 61-82.

[32] K.D. Williams and S.J. Karau, "Social Loafing and Social Compensation: The Effects of Expectations of Co-Worker Performance", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61, 1991, pp. 570-581.

Appendix A: Survey Items

Trust (Source: Jarvenpaa, Knoll, and Leidner, 1998)

1. Overall, the people in my group are very trustworthy
2. We are usually considerate of one another's feelings in this work group
3. The people in my group are friendly
4. There is no "team spirit" in my group
5. There is a noticeable lack of confidence among those with whom I work
6. We have confidence in one another in this group

Cohesion (Source: Chin, Salisbury, Pearson, and Stollack, 1999)

1. I feel that I belong to this group

2. I am happy to be part of this group.
3. I see myself as part of this group.
4. This group is one of the best anywhere.
5. I feel that I am a member of this group.
6. I am content to be part of this group.

Conflict (Source: Pearson, Ensley, and Amason, 2002)

Task Conflict:

1. How much disagreement was there among the members of your group over their opinions?
2. How many disagreements over different ideas were there?
3. How many differences about the content of decisions did the group have to work through?
4. How many differences of opinion were there within the group?

Relationship Conflict:

1. How much emotional conflict was there among the members of your group?
2. How much anger was there among the members of the group?
3. How much personal friction was there in the group during decisions?
4. How much were personality clashes between members of the group evident?
5. How much tension was there in the group during decisions?

Satisfaction (Source: Reinig, 2003)

With Outcome:

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the quality of your group's solution?
2. To what extent does the final solution reflect your inputs?
3. To what extent do you feel committed to the group solution?
4. To what extent are you confident that the group solution is correct?
To what extent do you feel personally responsible for the correctness of the group solution?

With Process:

5. How would you describe your group's problem solving process?
6. How would you describe your group's problem solving process?
(coordinated)
7. How would you describe your group's problem solving process?

8. How would you describe your group's problem solving process?
(understandable)
9. How would you describe your group's problem solving process?

*Items 1 and 5 were removed because of high cross loadings.

Conflict Management Style (Source: Rahim, 1983)

Integrating Style:

1. I collaborated with team members to come up with a final product that was acceptable to all of us.
2. I tried to bring all concerns out in the open so that issues could be resolved in the best possible way.
3. I tried to work with my team members to find solutions to a problem that satisfied our expectations.
4. I exchanged accurate information with my teammates to solve a problem together.
5. I tried to investigate an issue with my team members to find a solution acceptable to us.

Avoiding Style:

1. I attempted to avoid being put on the spot and kept any concerns of conflict to myself.
2. I usually avoided open discussion of any differences of opinion I had with team members.
3. I tried to stay away from disagreement with my team members.
4. I avoided an encounter with a team member.
5. I tried to avoid unpleasant exchanges with my team members.