



International Journal of Conflict Management

Task conflict asymmetries: effects on expectations and performance

Karen A. Jehn Frank R. C. De Wit Manuela Barreto Floor Rink

Article information:

To cite this document:

Karen A. Jehn Frank R. C. De Wit Manuela Barreto Floor Rink . (2015), "Task conflict asymmetries: effects on expectations and performance", International Journal of Conflict Management, Vol. 26 Iss 2 pp. 172 - 191

Permanent link to this document:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJCMA-03-2012-0023>

Downloaded on: 10 November 2016, At: 02:01 (PT)

References: this document contains references to 96 other documents.

To copy this document: permissions@emeraldinsight.com

The fulltext of this document has been downloaded 760 times since 2015*

Users who downloaded this article also downloaded:

(2015), "Conflicts in innovation and how to approach the "last mile" of conflict management research – a literature review", International Journal of Conflict Management, Vol. 26 Iss 2 pp. 192-213 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJCMA-09-2012-0062>

(2014), "Why won't task conflict cooperate? Deciphering stubborn results", International Journal of Conflict Management, Vol. 25 Iss 4 pp. 333-358 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJCMA-01-2014-0005>

Access to this document was granted through an Emerald subscription provided by emerald-srm:563821 []

For Authors

If you would like to write for this, or any other Emerald publication, then please use our Emerald for Authors service information about how to choose which publication to write for and submission guidelines are available for all. Please visit www.emeraldinsight.com/authors for more information.

About Emerald www.emeraldinsight.com

Emerald is a global publisher linking research and practice to the benefit of society. The company manages a portfolio of more than 290 journals and over 2,350 books and book series volumes, as well as providing an extensive range of online products and additional customer resources and services.

Emerald is both COUNTER 4 and TRANSFER compliant. The organization is a partner of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and also works with Portico and the LOCKSS initiative for digital archive preservation.

*Related content and download information correct at time of download.

Task conflict asymmetries: effects on expectations and performance

Karen A. Jehn and Frank R.C. De Wit
Melbourne Business School, Melbourne, Australia

Manuela Barreto
University of Exeter, Exeter, UK, and

Floor Rink
University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to examine the effects of asymmetric perceptions of task conflict (i.e. one person experiencing more conflict than the other) on the anticipated relationship with the partner, as well as subjective and objective performance.

Design/methodology/approach – In a 2×2 between-participants experimental design, we manipulated participants' perception of task conflict (perceive task conflict vs does not perceive task conflict) and the perceptual conflict composition of their group (asymmetry vs symmetry). Participants were randomly allocated to each of the four experimental conditions. Eighty-four psychology students at a Dutch university participated (25 men and 59 women; average age = 21).

Findings – Results show that when individuals realize that they have asymmetric task conflict perceptions, they have lower expectations about having a positive relationship with their partner and perform worse compared to when they have symmetric task perceptions (i.e. both experiencing either low or high levels of conflict).

Originality/value – Past research on conflict has not often taken into account that individuals involved in a conflict can experience different amounts of conflict. By conducting an experimental study, in contrast to past research on conflict asymmetry, we can better understand the causal relationship between (a)symmetry of conflict and outcomes. We also provide insight into the mediating chain that examines how conflict asymmetry interferes with work processes and leads to negative work outcomes.

Keywords Conflict asymmetry, Task conflict, Relationship expectations, Subjective and objective performance outcomes

Paper type Research paper

Past research on interpersonal conflict often approaches individuals jointly interacting on a work task as if they perceive and experience the same amount of conflict (Amason, 1996; De Dreu and Weingart, 2003; Jehn, 1995; Jehn and Chatman, 2000; Pelled, 1996; Jehn and Rispens, 2008). Similarly, research on interpersonal relationships and organizational groups in general often examines processes as a function of *shared* team properties or experiences (Klein and Kozlowski, 2000; Mason, 2006), rather than *configural* team properties, or properties that reflect the differences in attitudes and perceptions among individuals working together (Chan, 1998; Klein and Kozlowski,



2000). This approach does not take into account the possibility that the parties involved in a conflict may perceive different levels of conflict. For example, one person in a work interaction may perceive that there is a high level of conflict, while another may perceive that there is actually little or no conflict. We argue that it is critical to take into account these differences in individuals' perceptions of conflict to accurately predict the effects of conflict occurring between work partners.

There is an ongoing debate over whether conflict can ever be beneficial in task settings. A meta-analysis by *De Dreu and Weingart (2003)* indicates that task conflict (as well as relationship conflict) among group members generally tends to be negatively associated with performance. Task conflicts are disagreements focused on the job that the group is attempting to accomplish, while relationship conflicts are non-task-related and of a more personal nature (e.g. gossip, fashion; *Jehn, 1994*). More recent studies and meta-analyses (e.g. *De Wit et al., 2012; Ensley and Hmieleski, 2005; Liang et al., 2007; Matsuo, 2006; Olson et al., 2007*) suggest that although relationship conflict is most often detrimental, task conflict can be beneficial to group performance under specific circumstances. The reason why this might be the case is that task conflict can increase constructive debate and enhance cognitive processing (e.g. *Martinez-Moreno et al., 2009*), both of which can benefit group performance. Unfortunately, however, past research on constructive debate (e.g. *Amason, 1996; Ensley et al., 2002; Jehn, 1995; Olson et al., 2007*) and cognitive processing within groups (e.g. *Carnevale and Probst, 1998; De Dreu and Weingart, 2003*), has also approached these issues without taking into account the possibility that the parties involved may have differing perceptions of the conflict. Therefore, in this study, we provide a new view of task conflict by considering how its effects are likely to depend on whether individuals have symmetric vs asymmetric perceptions of conflict. Specifically, we aim to show that conflict asymmetry negatively influences people's cooperative expectations and social interdependence (*Kelley and Grzelak, 1972; Rink and Ellemers, 2007; Yamagishi, 1986*) of their relationship with their work partner. These negative expectations in turn negatively affect their objective performance, as well as their subjective estimates of their joint performance.

Task conflict asymmetry

Past research on work dyads, or on work partners, has often ignored that different individual perceptions exist (*Klein and Kozlowski, 2000; Mason, 2006*), assuming that people work together on a task as if they have similar emotions (e.g. *George, 1990; Mason, 2006; Totterdell et al., 1998*), attitudes (e.g. *Mason and Griffin, 2003*) and perceptions (e.g. *Cannon-Bowers et al., 1993; Klimoski and Mohammed, 1994*). Although this might often be the case (e.g. due to shared identities and norms), prior research has also acknowledged that interacting individuals can have different perceptions of reality (*Bruner, 1957; Searle, 1995*). For example, social cognitive theory (*Bandura, 2001*) and the social information processing approach (*Salancik and Pfeffer, 1978*) have been employed to explain different experiences of individuals in organizations. Moreover, research on motivation in negotiations and experimental games suggests that individuals often have different perceptions of the same situation (*Liebrand et al., 1986; Sattler and Kerr, 1991; Van Lange and Kuhlman, 1994*). For instance, individuals with different levels of power over resources have different experiences within a task interaction (e.g. *Smith and Trope, 2006*; for a review see *Keltner et al., 2003*). Also, research on diversity and relational demography suggests that individuals in dyadic

relationships perceive conflict differently (e.g. [Bono et al., 2002](#); [Hojjat, 2000](#)). It seems then important to consider not only situations where work partners share perceptions of conflict (as has been done before), but also situations where these perceptions are asymmetrical.

In this research, our focus is on the effects of asymmetric task conflict perceptions on individuals' anticipated relationship with their partner, their subjective estimates regarding their joint performance and their actual task performance. Task conflict asymmetry exists when one partner perceives a substantial level of task conflict, while the other partner perceives that there is really no (or very little) task conflict present ([Jehn and Chatman, 2000](#); [Jehn et al., 2010a, 2010b](#)). In our study, we specifically focus on task conflict, given the aforementioned ongoing debate regarding its importance for the performance of the work partners involved. Indeed, the few studies that have been done to examine conflict asymmetry perceptions suggest that perceptual differences of task conflict decreased performance and creativity of interacting employees in field settings ([Jehn and Chatman, 2000](#); [Jehn et al., 2010a, 2010b](#)).

The current research: conflict asymmetry and task performance

In the study reported here, we examined two collaboration partners working on a decision-making task. As in past studies, in this study, we also focus on the effects of (a)symmetric task conflict perceptions on task performance and use the conflict asymmetry theory as our theoretical framework. However, in this paper, we extend this analysis in following ways:

- First, we carry out an experimental examination of these processes to enable a more solid understanding of the causal relationship between (a)symmetry of conflict perceptions and task performance within work interactions.
- Second, we examine not only how conflict (a)symmetry affects objective performance on a decision task, but also how it affects subjective performance, that is, individuals' estimations of their joint performance.
- And third, we examine the effect of (a)symmetry of conflict perceptions on expected relationship with the work partner, and whether these expectations mediate the negative effects of asymmetry of conflict on objective and on subjective performance.

By extending knowledge in these ways, we aim to provide a more complete picture of the effects of conflict in interdependent work interactions. The success of dyadic or of work interactions cannot be measured by objective performance alone ([Balkundi and Harrison, 2006](#); [Hackman and Wageman, 2005](#)). Objective performance is indicative only of how partners did at that particular moment, but not whether or not they can be expected to do as well in the future. Dyads may perform well simply out of a desire to end the interaction as quickly as possible, in which case good performance is not necessarily to be repeated. Tapping into more subjective variables will provide additional insights not only about the process through which conflict perceptions might have their effects, but also about the continuation of the partnership. In this context, we think that partner's expectations about their relationship and their subjective perception of their joint performance are particularly relevant. Subjective performance estimates are important predictors of the resources that people are willing to invest in a future collaboration ([Balkundi and Harrison, 2006](#); [Hackman and Wageman, 2005](#)), and are

often based on people's initial expectations of those who they work with and their cooperative expectations in socially interdependent situations (Kelley and Grzelak, 1972; Yamagishi, 1986). Indeed, expectations tend to colour our own behaviour, the way we view others (Rosenthal, 1994; Burgoon *et al.*, 1995), and also tend to influence our motivation to remain in a working relationship (Rink and Ellemers, 2007). In the sections below, we discuss the relationship between conflict asymmetry perceptions and task performance, as well as the role that one's subjective experience of the collaboration has in this relationship, in more detail.

Research on shared mental models provides some evidence that consistency across individuals in views and interpretations of group processes increases performance (e.g. Marks *et al.*, 2002; Mathieu *et al.*, 2000). The logic provided is that for interdependent members working together to perform well, all involved must have a common understanding of the goals, the processes required to reach those goals and the information that members have (Hinsz *et al.*, 1997; Mohammed *et al.*, 2000; Smith-Jentsch *et al.*, 2001). We argue that if individuals working together have a common perception of the social processes in the dyad (i.e. conflict symmetry) it will be easier for them to work more effectively on their task (Hinsz *et al.*, 1997; Marks *et al.*, 2002; Mathieu *et al.*, 2000). If they do not agree that a conflict exists, they are unlikely to share the cognitions necessary to allow them effective discussions regarding their joint efforts toward completion of the task. Work partners must exchange and process information to reach an optimal solution (Carnevale and Probst, 1998; Leenders *et al.*, 2003). Therefore, we propose that if collaboration partners have different views of the conflict situation this will impair their joint performance:

H1. Asymmetric conflict perceptions will be associated with poorer task performance compared to symmetric conflict perceptions.

Mediating process: anticipated relationship with the partner

We propose that there are several reasons *why* asymmetric conflict perceptions may be detrimental in work interactions. Research on collective cognition (Gibson and Earley, 2007), negotiated belief structures (Walsh *et al.*, 1988), efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 2001) and shared mental models (Klimoski and Mohammed, 1994) suggests that groups benefit from consensus among their members. When the cognitive structures of work partners reflect a common understanding of the attributes, skills, responsibilities and needs of their colleagues (Mohammed *et al.*, 2000), or when work partners agree on the concerns they have about the upcoming interaction (Mason and Griffin, 2003), they can more easily help one another, coordinate work strategies and communicate critical information (Mathieu *et al.*, 2000). Perceived sharedness among members, therefore, has positive effects on a range of aspects involved in work processes (Bar-Tal, 1990; Cannon-Bowers *et al.*, 1993; Mason, 2006; Salas *et al.*, 1992), while asymmetric perceptions may not.

Although several processes may underlie these effects, to provide a controlled analysis of this process in this research, we focus on one particular potential mediating process, controlling for the occurrence of the remaining through the use of an experimental approach. Specifically, we examine whether the negative effect of asymmetric perceptions on objective and subjective performance is mediated by one's expectations about the relationship with the partner. Precisely because sharedness (symmetry of perceptions) is so important in work interactions, we argue that when

collaboration partners realize that they do *not* share conflict perceptions this is likely to be a problem for the relationship between work partners and their expectations (Kelley and Grzelak, 1972; Rink and Ellemers, 2007). People have a fundamental need to feel secure about their perceptions of the world (e.g. Festinger, 1954; Hogg, 2000; Weary and Edwards, 1996; Van den Bos and Lind, 2002). Uncertainty about one's own or other's attitudes, beliefs and, in this case, task conflict perceptions, is generally experienced as aversive, and associated with feelings of stress and anxiety (e.g. Hogg, 2000; Van den Bos *et al.*, 2007; Van den Bos and Lind, 2002). As individuals in work situations generally expect those with whom they have to collaborate with to hold similar views of the task at hand (e.g. naive realism; Robinson *et al.*, 1995), unexpected differences in perceptions are likely to cause confusion and discomfort *vis-à-vis* the work partner (Milton and Westphal, 2005; Polzer *et al.*, 2002). Therefore, we propose that asymmetry of conflict perceptions will lead work partners to anticipate a poorer relationship with their work partner than when conflict perceptions are symmetric. That is, we expect more positive expectations when both collaboration partners perceive task conflict or when both partners do not perceive task conflict, than when one partner perceives more conflict than the other:

- H2.* Asymmetric conflict perceptions within a workgroup will be associated with less positive expectations about the relationship with the partner than symmetric conflict perceptions.

We also propose that partner's expectations about their relationship with their interaction partner will in turn influence how they estimate the effectiveness of the collaboration (their subjective performance), as well as their actual joint performance. Work interactions in which expectations about the upcoming collaboration partner are positive, tend to have more confidence in their potential to perform well, as well as actually perform better (Kelley and Grzelak, 1972; Rink and Ellemers, 2007). Indeed, in this sense, initial expectations about the interaction function in a self-fulfilling way – shaping partner's confidence that they will be successful, and their ability to do so. This is why we propose that the effect of (a)symmetric perceptions of conflict on objective and subjective joint performance will be mediated by participant's anticipated relationship with their partner. This final hypothesis therefore is:

- H3.* The effects of asymmetric conflict perceptions on performance will be mediated by the expected relationship with the partner.

Method

Participants and design

In a 2×2 between-participants experimental design, we manipulated participants' perception of task conflict (perceive task conflict vs does not perceive task conflict) and the perceptual conflict composition of their dyad (asymmetry vs symmetry). We chose to use the experimental method to control for other effects of our dependent variables, to examine causality and to use a constant task. All of which have not been done in past research on conflict asymmetry, as the majority has been cross-sectional field studies (c.f. Jehn *et al.*, 2010a, 2010b).

Participants were randomly allocated to each of the four experimental conditions. Eighty-four psychology students at a Dutch university participated (25 men and 59

women; average age = 21) and received €3.50 (about US\$5 at the time) for their participation.

Procedure

All participants sat in separate cubicles in front of a computer, through which they received all instructions. Participants read that they were to perform a task together with a fellow student and that the dyad's computers were connected so they could exchange information with each other. Participants did not know each other nor the "partner". This partner, in reality, however, did not exist and all communications with the work partner were experimentally simulated and preprogrammed. To reduce potential problems of familiarity between the participants, participants remained unaware to whom exactly they were connected. In total, participants took about 30 to 40 minutes to complete the experiment.

Conflict asymmetry manipulation. At the start of the experiment, participants read that based on individuals' ways of perceiving conflicts between work partners, it is possible to classify people in one of two categories: people who *do not* have the tendency to perceive task conflict in work situations, and people who *do* have the tendency to perceive task conflict in work situations. Allegedly, to determine whether or not they were the type of person that tends to perceive task conflict within work interactions, participants were asked to answer 12 questions. We used a procedure adapted from Salancik (1974) and De Dreu and Van Kleef (2004) in which leading questions were asked, so that participants in the "no conflict perception" condition would answer in ways that led them to infer that they did not expect conflict, whereas participants in the "conflict perception" condition would infer that they indeed expected conflict which allowed us to put them into the asymmetry or symmetry condition by mismatching or matching (respectively) the conflict perceptions of their work partner (see Appendix for the complete list of items). In all conditions, statements were as neutral as possible, so that a tendency to perceive conflict was not seen as more or as less desirable than a tendency not to perceive conflict. Participants gave their responses to all questions on seven-point Likert scales with "not at all" (1) and "very much" (7) as endpoints.

After participants and their (alleged) work partner answered these questions, they received feedback about their answers. Depending on the condition, participants learned to which of the two categories they and their partner belonged – whether they had a tendency to perceive conflict or not, and whether or not their partner had the same tendency as themselves. In the *symmetry* condition, participants were told that they and their partner had similar tendencies to perceive conflict in work situations (or to not perceive conflict). Alternatively, in the *asymmetry* condition, they were told that they and their partner had dissimilar tendencies to perceive conflict in work situations (i.e. when they had a tendency to perceive conflict in work situations their partner did not, and vice-versa). Again, the feedback they received about their and their partner's perception of conflict was preprogrammed and depended solely on the condition to which they were randomly assigned. A pilot study conducted pretested these conditions and the asymmetry of conflict perceptions[1]. Participants were then asked to fill in a questionnaire measuring their expectations of their, and their work partner's, perceptions of task conflict, and the asymmetry of conflict perceptions (manipulation checks), as well as expectations regarding the upcoming dyad work.

Task. In the next phase of the experiment, the participants were asked to perform a dyad task – the NASA dilemma (see [Cammalleri et al., 1973](#)). This dilemma, in which participants are presented with a moon landing scenario and a number of available objects, requires participants to rank objects in order of usefulness to survive on the moon. It is possible to identify the most correct solution for this problem, making it possible to compute a performance score. Participants first provided an individual solution for this dilemma (Round 1, pre-debate), independently of their work partner ([Cammalleri et al., 1973](#)). After this, participants were asked to perform the task another time (Round 2, post-debate). This time, they were told that their score and their partner's score would be averaged, and the best performing dyad would be awarded €50 in addition to the experimental reward that all participants would receive. Also, participants were told before doing the task a second time that they and their work partner would have the opportunity to discuss the relevance of several of the objects featured in the task.

Debate. Before doing the task a second time, participants were given the opportunity to exchange messages about the objects which featured in the task, in a debate session with the bogus workpartner. To ensure an actual debate, participants had to discuss at least three items. After the third item, participants were asked whether they wanted to discuss another object or not. The “debate” continued until the participant chose not to debate the next object, or until eight (out of 14) objects were discussed (to place a limit on the duration of the study). During the discussion of the first object, participants were asked to type a message to the bogus work partner. Hereafter, they received a pre-programmed message about the same object. This message provided an opinion about the usefulness of that object on the moon. For each object, both work partners were allowed to send one message. To make it credible that participants were interacting with a real partner, waiting times were randomized and spelling errors were included in the messages the participant received. After this exchange of messages, participants indicated their individual solution to the dilemma and were reminded that their answers would be combined with their partner's for their overall joint score. After this, the experiment was ended and participants were debriefed.

Measures

Manipulation check. The manipulation checks were items adapted from the Intragroup Conflict Scale ([Jehn, 1995](#)). Due to limited subject time, and in line with past research (e.g. [De Wit et al., 2012](#); [Jehn, 1994](#)), we decided to use only two items to measure task conflict instead of the more standard four items. Two questions assessed whether participants expected to experience task conflict (for example, “I expect that I will have different viewpoints from my partner on the issues to discuss” $r = 0.88, p < 0.001$). Two items assessed whether participants expected *their work partner* to perceive task conflict (e.g. “I expect that my partner will think we have different ideas on the issues to handle”, $r = 0.89, p < 0.001$), which allowed us to then put them into symmetry or asymmetry work situations. Participants gave their responses to all questions on seven-point Likert scales. To rule out the possibility that the (a)symmetry manipulation would simply trigger conflict in general, irrespective of conflict type, we also examined whether relationship conflict was affected. Again, two items assessed participants own experience of relationship conflict (e.g. “It was clear that we did not match on a more personal level” $r = 0.64, p < 0.001$). Given that the questions used to manipulate

participants tendencies to perceive (or not perceive) conflict during collaborative tasks primarily focused on task conflict (see De Dreu and Van Kleef, 2004), we did not expect to see differences for perceptions of relationship conflict.

Finally, two additional questions were added that assessed task conflict (a)symmetry directly; “I expect we will perceive the same amount of diverging viewpoints on the issues to discuss” and “I expect one of us will and one of us will not perceive diverging viewpoints on the issues to discuss” (reverse coded, $r = 0.90, p < 0.001$).

Dependent and mediating variables. All perception items were presented as statements, and participants were asked to indicate on a seven-point Likert-type scale the extent to which they agreed with each statement (from 1 “totally disagree” to 7 “totally agree”).

Our main dependent variable, performance, was measured at different points in time. Participants carried out the task in two rounds: in Round 1, they provided their individual answers, then they debated, and in Round 2, they provided their final answers. *Subjective task performance* was measured after Round 1 (right before the debate) with two items: “I expect my partner and I to have performed well on the task” and “I think my partner and I worked in an effective manner” ($\alpha = 0.81$). This subjective performance estimate was measured at this stage so as to remain uncontaminated by the actual interaction, or any type of feedback it might imply. *Objective task performance* was measured both in Round 1 (pre-debate) and in Round 2 (post-debate) of the task. In addition to the total number of correctly ranked items, the participant’s total rank order of objects was compared with the correct order, as suggested by Cammalleri *et al.* (1973). This comparison enabled us to compute an error score for each item (i.e. the difference between the correct rank and the participant’s rank). All of the individual error scores were summed to obtain a total error score for the complete task. Furthermore, the number of correctly ranked items of the first round (pre-debate) was subtracted from the number of correctly ranked items of the second round (post-debate) to produce a difference score, reflecting the improvement made between the two tasks. Similarly, the total error score of the first trial was subtracted from the total error score on the second trial, also reflecting the improvement between the two tasks.

Importantly, we examined the proposed mediator right after the conflict (a)symmetry manipulation, before the measurement of performance. Participants’ anticipated relationship with their task partner was measured with three items (e.g. “I expect I will be happy working with my work partner”, “I expect I will be satisfied with my work partner” and “I expect I would like to work again with my work partner”, $\alpha = 0.93$) adapted from Jehn (1995) and consistent with expectation research (e.g. Rink and Ellemers, 2007).

Results

Unless otherwise indicated, all variables were analyzed with a 2 (perceived task conflict vs no perceived task conflict) \times 2 (symmetry vs asymmetry of perception) between-participants (M)ANOVA. The first condition was to allow us to examine whether high–high asymmetry (both perceive high levels of task conflict) versus low–low asymmetry (both perceive low levels of conflict) was expected. The second condition of asymmetry allowed us to test our hypotheses. Table I shows the correlations and descriptive statistics for the variables that were included in the analyses.

Manipulation checks

The results of the manipulation checks indicate that our manipulations worked as intended. Participants in the “tendency to perceive conflict” condition (which allowed us to put participants into the symmetry or asymmetry condition) expected to perceive more task conflict ($M = 5.71, SD = 0.85$) than participants in the “tendency not to perceive conflict” condition ($M = 2.88, SD = 1.34, F(1,83) = 130.63, p < 0.001$). Participants linked with work partners who allegedly had low tendencies to perceive conflict, indeed expected their partner to perceive less task conflict ($M = 2.67, SD = 1.27$) than participants linked with a work partner with alleged high tendencies to perceive conflict ($M = 5.92, SD = 0.97, F(1,83) = 18.7, p < 0.001$). This would be a symmetry condition. Importantly, when examining perceived levels of relationship conflict, however, *no* difference emerged between participants in the “tendency to perceive task conflict” condition, $M = 5.22, SD = 1.01$, and participants in the “tendency not to perceive conflict” condition, $M = 5.15, SD = 1.00, F(1,83) < 1, p = ns$. This finding demonstrates that the conflict (a)symmetry manipulation did not target relationship conflict – participants primarily made assumptions about the presence or absence of task conflict, as intended.

In line with our (a)symmetry manipulation, participants in the *symmetric* condition expected that they and their work partner would not perceive different levels of conflict ($M = 2.67, SD = 1.32$), whereas those in the *asymmetry* condition expected that they and their work partner would perceive different levels of conflict ($M = 5.40, SD = 1.36, F(1,83) = 86.32, p < 0.001$).

Dependent variables

Task performance. *H1* suggested a negative relationship between asymmetric conflict perceptions and performance (i.e. subjective performance, as well as objective performance). As can be seen in *Table II*, this prediction received support from our data. First, the main effect of (a)symmetry on the subjective performance estimates was significant and in the predicted direction, $F(1,83) = 5.171, p = 0.03$, indicating that participants in the symmetry condition estimated they (and their partner) would perform well to a greater extent than participants in the asymmetry condition.

Second, although the number of errors made by participants in Round 2 in the asymmetrical and symmetrical conditions was not significantly different (Round 1,

Variables	1	2	3	4	5
1. Perception of task conflict (perceiving vs not perceiving task conflict) ^a	–				
2. Perceptual conflict composition of their group (asymmetry vs symmetry)	0.00	–			
3. Expected satisfaction with task partner	–0.26*	0.02	–		
4. Objective task performance	–0.23*	–0.03	0.44**	–	
5. Subjective task performance	0.26*	–0.09	–0.17	–0.10	–
Mean	0.50	0.50	4.79	5.17	–0.33
SD	0.50	0.50	1.09	1.00	6.58

Note: ^aUsed to control for level of conflict and to create symmetry and asymmetry conditions; * $p < 0.01$; ** $p < 0.001$

Table I.
Means, standard deviations and correlation matrix ($N = 84$)

$F(1,83) = 0.95, p = 0.33$; Round 2: $F(1,83) = 0.41, p = 0.53$), participants in the asymmetrical and symmetrical conditions did have significantly different error-improvement scores $F(1,83) = 5.64, p < 0.05$. That is, participants in the symmetrical conditions were able to improve their performance ($M = 2.00, SD = 6.70$), so compared to Round 1, they made fewer errors in Round 2. By contrast, participants in the asymmetry conditions saw their objective performance worsen ($M = -1.33, SD = 6.10$): as compared to Round 1, they made *more* errors in Round 2.

Anticipated relationship with the partner. H2 proposed that asymmetrical conflict perceptions would lead to an immediate decrease in expected satisfaction with the partner. This analysis revealed a reliable main effect of (a)symmetry, $F(1,83) = 6.14, p < 0.05$, indicating that participants in the symmetry conditions ($M = 5.07, SD = 0.95$) expected to be more satisfied with their partner than participants in the asymmetry condition ($M = 4.50, SD = 1.16$). As expected, this was independent of the main effect of the level of conflict expected (high or low). Hence, people expected the relationship with their partner to be less optimal when they expected different conflict perceptions (asymmetry) than when they expected converging conflict perceptions (symmetry). This beneficial effect of symmetry was revealed irrespective of the absolute amount of conflict that was expected within the dyad, that is, both when no one expected conflict and when both dyad members expected conflict.

Mediation analyses. The predicted mediation was found for the subjective performance estimates. First, regression analyses showed that the relationship between the (a)symmetry manipulation and people's performance estimates was significant, $B = -0.49, p = 0.03$ (see Figure 1), just like the relationship between the (a)symmetry manipulation and their expected relationship with the work partner, $B = -0.55, p = 0.02$ and the relationship between the expected relationship with the work partner and people's performance estimates, $B = 0.42, p < 0.001$. Second, a regression analyses on people's performance estimates showed that the effect of the (a)symmetry manipulation was not significant anymore, $B = -0.28, p = 0.17$, when individuals' expected relationship with the work partner was included in the analyses (and which itself still had a significant effect on the performance estimates, $B = 0.38, p < 0.001$). Finally, to test the mediation relationship suggested in H3 through formal significance tests of the indirect relationship between the predictor (i.e. conflict asymmetry perceptions) and the outcome variables (i.e. objective and subjective performance), as transmitted by the mediating variable (i.e. expected relationship with work partner), we used the mediation bootstrap procedures following Preacher and Hayes (2004, 2008). This procedure does

Performance results	Symmetrical conditions	Asymmetrical conditions
Subjective performance	4.91* (1.08)	5.40* (0.87)
Number of errors Round 1	40.90 (8.88)	38.90 (8.74)
Number of errors Round 2	38.90 (8.57)	40.23 (9.45)
Error improvement ^a	2.00* (6.70)	-1.33* (6.10)

Notes: Standard deviations are given within parentheses; ^a error improvement: the number of errors in Round 2 (post-debate) minus the number of errors in Round 1 (pre-debate); positive scores imply that, compared to the first round, participants improved and made fewer errors during round 2; * means in this row are significantly different: $p < 0.05$

Table II. Performance results: error scores and error-improvement scores

not make assumptions about the shape of the sampling distribution of the indirect relation, thus producing relatively robust results (Edwards and Lambert, 2007), and are recommended in small to moderate samples such as in this study (Shrout and Bolger, 2002). For these analyses, we applied the PROCESS.


SPSS Macro by Hayes, using model 4 (www.afhayes.com/spss-sas-and-mplus-macros-and-code.html). The results showed that the bias-corrected bootstrapped estimates of the indirect effect with 95 per cent confidence (nboots = 5,000) were between, lower level confidence interval (LL CI) = -0.43 and upper level confidence interval (UL CI) = -0.02. Given that this indirect effects differs from 0 at the $p < 0.05$ level (Preacher and Hayes, 2004), *H3* was supported in that participants' expected relationship with their partner fully explained the negative link between task conflict asymmetry and the subjective performance estimates. No mediation was found for objective performance.

Discussion

The study reported here was designed to examine the consequences of asymmetric (vs symmetric) conflict perceptions on task performance, and the mediating effect of relationship expectations. Asymmetric task conflict perceptions exist when the parties involved in what appears to be the same conflict situation perceive the situation differently. We went beyond past research by providing an experimental examination of this process, illuminating the causal relationship between the core variables.

The results found on objective performance, the subjective performance estimates and on initial expectations about the relationship with the partner provide a more complete picture of the effects of asymmetric task conflict on work interactions than past research has done (e.g. Jehn and Chatman, 2000; Jehn and Rispens, 2008). We predicted and found that participants in the symmetrical condition were able to improve their objective task performance, while participants in the asymmetrical condition had a decline in performance indicated by increased errors. We additionally showed that already after the first round, and without receiving any type of performance feedback, participants subjectively estimated their joint performance more negatively in the asymmetric conflict situation than in the symmetric situation. Mediation analyzes showed that this negative estimation can be explained by the expectations participants had about their partner, which in turn depended on (a)symmetry of conflict perceptions. That is, when conflict perceptions were asymmetric individuals developed lower expectations of their relationship with their work partner, and these in turn resulted in

Figure 1. Diagram of the relationships between task conflict (a)symmetry perceptions and anticipated partner satisfaction, subjective performance and objective performance



poorer subjective estimates of their joint performance. As such, the initial expectations developed on the basis of conflict (a)symmetry functioned as self-fulfilling prophecies by subsequently influencing individual's perceptions of the dyadic performance.

That we only found this mediation for subjective performance, and not for objective performance, is unexpected, but possible to explain. A possible explanation lies at the measurement level, given that both expectations about the relationship and subjective performance are subjectively made estimates, while performance was assessed on a rather objective indicator. This divergence also makes sense at a conceptual level. Indeed, the partner's subjective estimation of their joint work is likely to be a judgment that partly reflects the extent to which they trust the other to behave in a predictable way – such as when conflict perceptions are symmetric, but not when partners disagree about their conflict perceptions (i.e. when they are asymmetric). Subjective performance might thus even be more directly related to the expected relationship with the work partner, than actual performance. In fact, actual performance can additionally depend on a range of less controllable factors, such as both partners' level of expertise, while subjective performance more directly reflects how well individuals think they did in comparison to how they think they could have done in different circumstances – such as when they have more positive expectations about their partner. Objective and subjective performance indicators can thus be relatively independent, as they can depend on slightly different factors.

We contribute to the existing literature on intragroup conflict (e.g. De Dreu and Weingart, 2003; De Wit *et al.*, 2012; Jehn and Bendersky, 2003) by showing that the way a conflict is perceived (i.e. symmetric or asymmetric) is an important factor in determining attitudes and joint outcomes. That is, we suggest a new insight to inform the ongoing debate of whether or not task-related conflict can be beneficial by examining the asymmetric perceptions of work partners and the effect of this above and beyond the basic conflict level during the interaction. This research is a first experimental step to provide insight to research on conflict asymmetry in workgroups, in addition to dyadic work relationships. In this study, we found that symmetric perceptions of conflict (both partners perceiving high levels, or both partners perceiving low levels) were both better for the work interaction (i.e. expected relationship with the partner and objective and subjective performance) than were asymmetric perceptions of conflict (one member perceiving a low level of conflict and the other a high level, and vice versa). From this, we infer that it is not necessarily the average amount of conflict that matters during work interactions, but whether or not individuals agree about the level of the conflict within the dyad (or group). More generally, we believe that our work also contributes to research on work interactions and perceptions by taking into account interpersonal or intragroup differences in how people perceive and respond to what from the outside appears to be the same situation.

Limitations and future directions

This study has a number of limitations. First, we conducted this study in a laboratory setting to control for all other factors except symmetric and asymmetric conflict perceptions, and to test the causal effect of these (a)symmetrical perceptions on attitudes and behaviors. The laboratory setting also allows us to examine these effects on performance on the very same task, not easily accomplished in the field. However, testing these processes in the laboratory limits the external validity of our findings, so

future research should attempt to replicate these findings in a field setting. In addition, longitudinal research in the field would allow researchers to further examine the causality of the mediating relationships. In addition, while the experimental manipulation measures were self-report on task conflict asymmetry, other measures could be used in research to examine this such as observation. However, given that asymmetry is a perception, this seems an appropriate first step.

In addition, we operationalized symmetry/asymmetry as a dichotomous variable. Future research, however, should examine the continuous nature of asymmetry to symmetry of task conflict perceptions (as well as relationship and process conflict asymmetry). This will allow a different set of analyses of a continuous variable to test the proposed relationships with expectations and performance. An important antecedent of conflict asymmetry, or how individuals perceive the level of conflict within the group, may require an examination of personality characteristics of the parties involved. Prior research suggests that individual dispositional variables (extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness to experience) influence employees' perceptions at work (Barrick and Mount, 1991; Buss, 1991; Digman, 1990). For instance, it may be that individuals with a higher level of agreeableness are less likely to perceive conflict, while those with a high level of neuroticism may be more likely to perceive that their task ideas are being attacked. This could be an interesting direction for future research.

This research raises several additional interesting questions for future research. Given that people tend to attribute expectancy violations, and negative expectancies about the work interaction, to the target of this expectancy (i.e. the partner; Burgoon *et al.*, 1995), one question would be whether participants also impute the experience of conflict (a)symmetry to the partner rather than to the self. If this is the case, it may become difficult for two parties who experience conflict asymmetry to resolve this issue, as they both expect the *other* to change the situation. If so, it might be even more difficult to reduce asymmetric conflict perceptions, than to reduce symmetric perceptions of high levels of conflict. Moreover, considering conflict resolution programs, it might seem important to establish whether it is fruitful to first focus on lowering the perceptions of those who perceive high levels of conflict, or whether it is best to first concentrate on making "the blind bright", so that those who do not perceive conflict learn to recognize its existence.

Another avenue for future research is to examine the effects of relationship and process conflict asymmetries and how these are similar or different from the effects of asymmetries in task conflict perceptions in work interactions. In this study, we focused specifically on task conflict, given the ongoing debate regarding task conflict and performance outcomes. In a similar vein, another area for future research is the concept of asymmetry of *type* of conflict, that is, a situation where one member perceives the conflict as a task-related conflict, but the other member involved in the work interaction perceives the conflict as a relationship conflict. This can have extreme consequences for the interaction where one member is focusing on the task, while the other is focusing on the relationship and also feeling dismissed because their partner is apparently ignoring their relationship concerns and only focusing on task goals. Finally, while we examined a profile of consequences of asymmetrical conflict perceptions (expected relationship with the partner, subjective and objective performance), future research would also benefit from examining other group or work outcomes such as likelihood of continuing the collaboration, motivation to work, withdrawal from the group and even absenteeism from work.

Conclusion and implications

In sum, this research contributes to the understanding of work interactions and the different perceptions that employees may have when working together, and how this affects their expectations and performance. Specifically, work partners involved in the same situation can perceive a conflict differently, thus interfering with their expectations about each other and with their performance on a joint task. Managers, as well as employees, should be aware that what appears to be the same conflict situation can be perceived and experienced in quite different ways by those involved, and that this has important consequences. This suggests that a first step in managing work conflicts is for managers and team leaders to facilitate a shared understanding of the situation and to provide a forum for perspective taking (Galinsky *et al.*, 2005; Galinsky and Mussweiler, 2001; Jehn *et al.*, 2006), so that each party involved understands the other and can react with that in mind. In this way, individuals can agree that they disagree and move forward in their discussions toward more effective task conflict management and outcomes.

Note

1. We pilot tested our procedure to manipulate perceived task conflict by submitting a separate sample of participants ($N = 44$) to the same instruction, as in this study (without the dependent measures). This test showed that participants who were told that they had a tendency to perceive task conflict indeed expected to perceive more task conflict during the upcoming interaction ($M = 2.91$, $SD = 1.45$) than did participants who were told that they did not have a tendency to perceive task conflict ($M = 5.61$, $SD = 1.24$), $F(1,44) = 44.01$, $p < 0.001$. Similarly, participants in the “partner has a tendency to perceive task conflict” conditions expected their work partner to perceive more task conflict ($M = 6.13$, $SD = 0.76$) than participants in the “partner does not have a tendency to perceive task conflict” conditions ($M = 2.83$, $SD = 1.52$), $F(1, 44) = 77.24$, $p < .001$. Finally, participants in the asymmetry conditions ($M = 5.18$, $SD = 1.81$) expected more task conflict asymmetry than participants in the no asymmetry conditions ($M = 3.41$, $SD = 0.87$), $F(1,44) = 17.16$, $p < 0.001$.

References

- Amason, A. (1996), “Distinguishing the effects of functional and dysfunctional conflict on strategic decision making: resolving a paradox for the top management teams”, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 39 No. 1, pp. 123-148.
- Balkundi, P. and Harrison, D.A. (2006), “Ties, leaders, and time in teams: strong inference about network structure’s effects on team viability and performance”, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 49 No. 1, pp. 49-68.
- Bandura, A. (2001), “Social cognitive theory: an agentic perspective”, *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 52, pp. 1-26.
- Barrick, M.R. and Mount (1991), “The big five personality dimensions and job performance: a meta analysis”, *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 44 No. 1, pp. 1-26.
- Bar-Tal, D. (1990), *Group Beliefs*, Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.
- Bono, J.E., Boles, T.L., Judge, T.A. and Lauver, K.J. (2002), “The role of personality in task and relationship conflict”, *Journal of Personality*, Vol. 70 No. 3, pp. 311-334.
- Bruner, J.S. (1957), “On perceptual readiness”, *Psychological Review*, Vol. 64 No. 2, pp. 123-152.
- Burgoon, J.K., LePoire, B.A. and Rosenthal, R. (1995), “Effects of pre-interaction expectancies and target communication on perceiver reciprocity and compensation in dyadic interaction”, *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 31 No. 4, pp. 287-321.

- Buss, D.M. (1991), "Evolutionary personality psychology", *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 45, pp. 459-491.
- Cammalleri, J.A., Hendrick, H.W., Pittman, W.C., Blout, H.D. and Prather, D.C. (1973), "Effects of different leadership styles on group accuracy", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 57 No. 1, pp. 32-37.
- Cannon-Bowers, J.A., Salas, E. and Converse, S. (1993), "Shared mental models in expert team decision making", in Castellan, N.J. Jr (Ed.), *Individual and Group Decision Making: Current Issues*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hilldale, NJ, pp. 221-246.
- Carnevale, P.J. and Probst, T.M. (1998), "Social values and social conflict in creative problem solving and categorization", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 74 No. 5, pp. 1300-1309.
- Chan, D. (1998), "Functional relations among constructs in the same content domain at different levels of analysis: a typology of composition models", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 83 No. 2, pp. 234-246.
- De Dreu, C.K.W. and Van Kleef, G.A. (2004), "The influence of power on the information search, impression formation, and demands in negotiation", *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 40 No. 3, pp. 303-319.
- De Dreu, C.K.W. and Weingart, L.R. (2003), "Task versus relationship conflict, team performance, and team member satisfaction: a meta-analysis", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 88 No. 4, pp. 741-749.
- De Wit, F.R.C., Greer, L.L. and Jehn, K.A. (2012), "The paradox of intragroup conflict: a meta-analysis", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 97 No. 2, pp. 360-390.
- Digman, J.M. (1990), "Personality structure: emergence of a five-factor model", *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 41, pp. 418-440.
- Edwards, J.R. and Lambert, L.S. (2007), "Methods for integrating moderation and mediation: a general analytical framework using moderated path analysis", *Psychological Methods*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 1-22.
- Ensley, M.D. and Hmieleski, K.A. (2005), "A comparative study of new venture top management team composition, dynamics and performance between university-based and independent start-ups", *Research Policy*, Vol. 34 No. 7, pp. 1091-1105.
- Ensley, M.D., Pearson, A.W. and Amason, A.C. (2002), "Understanding the dynamics of new venture top management teams: cohesion, conflict and new venture performance", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 17 No. 4, pp. 365-386.
- Festinger, L. (1954), "A theory of social comparison processes", *Human Relations*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 117-140.
- Galinsky, A.D. and Mussweiler, T. (2001), "First offers as anchors: the role of perspective-taking and negotiator focus", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 81 No. 4, pp. 657-669.
- Galinsky, A.D., Ku, G. and Wang, C.S. (2005), "Perspective-taking and self-other overlap: fostering social bonds and facilitating social coordination", *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp. 109-124.
- George, J.M. (1990), "Personality affect and behavior in groups", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 75 No. 2, pp. 107-116.
- Gibson, C.B. and Earley, P.C. (2007), "Collective cognition in action: accumulation, interaction, examination, and accommodation in the development and operation of group efficacy beliefs in the workplace", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 32 No. 2, pp. 438-458.

- Hackman, J.R. and Wageman, R. (2005), "A theory of team coaching", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 30 No. 2, pp. 267-287.
- Hinsz, V.B., Tindale, R.S. and Vollrath, D.A. (1997), "The emerging conceptualization of groups as information processors", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 121 No. 1, pp. 43-64.
- Hogg, M.A. (2000), "Subjective uncertainty reduction through selfcategorization: a motivational theory of social identity processes", in Stroebe, W. and Hewstone, M. (Eds), *European Review of Social Psychology*, Vol. 11, Wiley, Chichester, pp. 223-255.
- Hojjat, M. (2000), "Sex differences and perceptions of conflict in romantic relationship", *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, Vol. 17, pp. 598-617.
- Jehn, K.A. (1994), "Enhancing effectiveness: an investigation of advantages and disadvantages of valuebased intragroup conflict", *International Journal of Conflict Management*, Vol. 5 No. 3, pp. 223-238.
- Jehn, K.A. (1995), "A multimethod examination of the benefits and detriments of intragroup conflict", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 40 No. 2, pp. 256-282.
- Jehn, K.A. and Bendersky, C. (2003), "Intragroup conflict in organizations: a contingency perspective on the conflict-outcome relationship", *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 25, pp. 187-242.
- Jehn, K.A. and Chatman, J.A. (2000), "The influence of proportional and perceptual conflict composition on team performance", *The International Journal of Conflict Management*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 56-73.
- Jehn, K.A. and Rispens, S. (2008), "Conflict in workgroups", in Barling, J. and Cooper, C.L. (Eds), *Handbook of Organizational Behavior*, SAGE Publications, Los Angeles, CA, pp. 262-276.
- Jehn, K.A., Rispens, S. and Thatcher, S. (2010), "The effects of conflict asymmetry on workgroup and individual outcomes", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 53 No. 3, pp. 596-616.
- Jehn, K.A., Rupert, J. and Nauta, A. (2006), "The effects of conflict asymmetry on mediation outcomes - Satisfaction, work motivation and absenteeism", *International Journal of Conflict Management*, Vol. 17, pp. 96-109.
- Jehn, K.A., Rupert, J., Nauta, A. and van den Bossche, S. (2010), "Crooked conflicts: the effects of conflict asymmetry in mediation", *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, Vol. 3, pp. 338-357.
- Kelley, H. and Grzelak, J. (1972), "Conflict between individual and common interest in an *n*-person relationship", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 21 No. 2, pp. 190-197.
- Keltner, D., Gruenfeld, D.H. and Anderson, C. (2003), "Power, approach, and inhibition", *Psychological Review*, Vol. 110 No. 2, pp. 265-284.
- Klein, K. and Kozlowski, S. (2000), *Multilevel Theory, Research and Methods in Organizations*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Klimoski, R. and Mohammed, S. (1994), "Team mental model: construct or metaphor?", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 20 No. 2, pp. 403-437.
- Leenders, R.T., van Engelen, J. and Kratzer, J. (2003), "Virtuality, information exchange, and new product team creativity: a social network perspective", *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management*, Vol. 20, pp. 69-92.
- Liang, T.P., Liu, C.C., Lin, T.M. and Lin, B. (2007), "Effect of team diversity on software project performance", *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, Vol. 107 No. 5, pp. 636-653.
- Liebrand, W.B.G., Jansen, R.W.T.L., Rijken, V.M. and Suhre, C.J.M. (1986), "Might over morality: social values and the perceptions of other players in experimental games", *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 22 No. 3, pp. 203-215.

- Marks, M.A., Sabella, M.J., Burke, C.S. and Zaccaro, S.J. (2002), "The impact of cross-training on team effectiveness", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 87 No. 1, pp. 3-13.
- Martinez-Moreno, E., Gonzalez-Navarro, P., Zornoza, A. and Ripoll, P. (2009), "Relationship, task and process conflicts on team performance: the moderating role of communication media", *International Journal of Conflict Management*, Vol. 20 No. 3, pp. 251-268.
- Mason, C.M. (2006), "Exploring the processes underlying within-group homogeneity", *Small Group Research*, Vol. 37 No. 3, pp. 233-270.
- Mason, C.M. and Griffin, M.A. (2003), "Identifying group task satisfaction at work", *Small Group Research*, Vol. 34 No. 4, pp. 413-442.
- Mathieu, J.E., Heffner, T.S., Goodwin, G.F., Salas, E. and Cannon-Bowers, J.A. (2000), "The influence of shared mental models on team processes and performance", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 85 No. 2, pp. 273-283.
- Matsuo, M. (2006), "Customer orientation, conflict, and innovativeness in Japanese sales departments", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 59 No. 2, pp. 242-250.
- Milton, L.R. and Westphal, J.D. (2005), "Identity confirmation networks and cooperation in groups", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 48 No. 2, pp. 191-212.
- Mohammed, S., Klimoski, R. and Rentsch, J.R. (2000), "The measurement of team models: we have no shared schema", *Organizational Research Methods*, Vol. 3 No. 2, pp. 123-125.
- Olson, B.J., Parayitam, S. and Bao, Y. (2007), "Strategic decision making: the effects of cognitive diversity, conflict, and trust on decision outcomes", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 33 No. 2, pp. 196-222.
- Pelled, L.H. (1996), "Relational demography and perceptions of group conflict and performance: a field investigation", *International Journal of Conflict Management*, Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 230-246.
- Polzer, J.T., Milton, L.P. and Swann, W.B. Jr (2002), "Capitalizing on diversity: Interpersonal congruence in small work groups", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 47, pp. 296-324.
- Preacher, K.J. and Hayes, A.F. (2004), "SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models", *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, Vol. 36 No. 4, pp. 717-731.
- Preacher, K.J. and Hayes, A.F. (2008), "Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models", *Behavior Research Methods*, Vol. 40 No. 3, pp. 879-891.
- Rink, F. and Ellemers, N. (2007), "The role of expectancies in accepting task-related diversity: do disappointment and lack of commitment stem from actual differences or violated expectations?", *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, Vol. 33 No. 6, pp. 842-854.
- Robinson, R.J., Keltner, D., Ward, A. and Ross, L. (1995), "Actual versus assumed differences in construal: 'Naïve Realism' in intergroup perception and conflict", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 68 No. 3, pp. 404-417.
- Rosenthal, R. (1994), "Interpersonal expectancy effects: a 30-year perspective", *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, Vol. 3 No. 6, pp. 176-179.
- Salancik, G.R. (1974), "Inference of one's attitude from behavior recalled under linguistically manipulated cognitive sets", *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 10 No. 5, pp. 415-427.
- Salancik, G.R. and Pfeffer, J. (1978), "A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 23 No. 2, pp. 224-253.

- Salas, E., Dickinson, T.L., Converse, S.A. and Tannenbaum, S.I. (1992), "Toward an understanding of team performance and training", in Swezey, R.W. and Salas, E. (Eds), *Teams: Their Training and Performance*, Ablex, Norwood, NJ, pp. 3-29.
- Sattler, D.N. and Kerr, N. (1991), "Might versus morality explored: motivational and cognitive bases of social motives", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 60 No. 5, pp. 756-765.
- Searle, J.R. (1995), *The Construction of Social Reality*, The Free Press, New York, NY.
- Shrout, P.E. and Bolger, N. (2002), "Mediation in experimental and nonexperimental studies: new procedures and recommendations", *Psychological Methods*, Vol. 7 No. 4, pp. 422-445.
- Smith, P.J. and Trope, Y. (2006), "You focus on the forest when you're in charge of the trees: power priming and abstract information processing", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 90 No. 4, pp. 578-596.
- Smith-Jentsch, K.A., Campbell, G.E., Milanovich, D.M. and Reynolds, A.M. (2001), "Measuring teamwork mental models to support training needs assessment, development, and evaluation: two empirical studies", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 22 No. 2, pp. 179-194.
- Totterdell, P., Kellett, S., Teuchmann, K. and Briner, B.B. (1998), "Evidence of mood linkage inwork", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 74 No. 6, pp. 1504-1515.
- Van den Bos, K., Euwema, M.C., Poortvliet, M. and Maas, M. (2007), "Uncertainty management and social issues: uncertainty as an important determinant of reactions to socially deviating people", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 37 No. 8, pp. 1726-1756.
- Van den Bos, K. and Lind, E.A. (2002), "Uncertainty management by means of fairness judgments", in Zanna, M.P. (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 34, Academic Press, San Diego, CA, pp. 1-60.
- Van Lange, P.A.M. and Kuhlman, D.M. (1994), "Social value orientations and impressions of partner's honesty and intelligence: a test of the might versus morality effect", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 67 No. 1, pp. 126-141.
- Walsh, J.P., Henderson, C.M. and Deighton, J. (1988), "Negotiated belief structures and decision performance: an empirical investigation", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 42 No. 2, pp. 194-216.
- Weary, G. and Edwards, J.A. (1996), "Causal-uncertainty beliefs and related goal structures", in Sorrentino, R.M. and Higgins, E.T. (Eds), *Handbook of Motivation and Cognition: The Interpersonal Context*, Vol. 3, Guilford, New York, NY, pp. 148-181.
- Yamagishi, T. (1986), "The provision of a sanctioning system as a public good", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 51 No. 1, pp. 110-116.

Further reading

- Baron, R.M. and Kenny, D.A. (1986), "The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 51 No. 6, pp. 1173-1182.
- Bazerman, M.H., Curhan, J.R., Moore, D.A. and Valley, K.L. (2000), "Negotiation", *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 51 No. 1, pp. 279-314.
- Bazerman, M.H. and Neale, M. (1983), "Heuristics in negotiation: limitations to dispute resolution effectiveness", in Bazerman, M.H. and Lewicki, R. (Eds), *Negotiations in Organizations*, Sage, Beverly Hills, CA, pp. 51-67.
- Burke, P.J. and Stets, J.E. (1999), "Trust and commitment through self-verification", *Social Psychology Quarterly*, Vol. 62 No. 4, pp. 347-360.

- Choi, H.S. and Thompson, L. (2005), "Old wine in a new bottle: impact of membership change on group creativity", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 98 No. 2, pp. 121-132.
- De Dreu, C.K.W., Koole, S.L. and Steinel, W. (2000), "Unfixing the fixed pie: a motivated information-processing approach to integrative negotiation", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 79 No. 6, pp. 975-987.
- Ellemers, N., Kortekaas, P. and Ouwerkerk, J.W. (1999), "Self-categorisation, commitment to the group and group self-esteem as related but distinct aspects of social identity", *European Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 29 Nos 2/3, pp. 371-389.
- Fishbein, M. and Ajzen, I. (1975), *Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.
- Ford, C. and Sullivan, D.M. (2004), "A time for everything: how the timing of novel contributions influences project team outcomes", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 25 No. 2, pp. 279-292.
- Galinsky, A.D., Gruenfeld, D.H. and Magee, J.C. (2003), "From power to action", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 85 No. 3, pp. 453-466.
- Guinote, A., Judd, C.M. and Brauer, M. (2002), "Effects of power on perceived and objective group variability: evidence that more powerful groups are more variable", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 82 No. 5, pp. 708-721.
- Kluwer, E.S. and Mikula, G. (2002), "Gender related inequalities in the division of family work in close relationships: a social psychological perspective", *European Review of Social Psychology*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 185-216.
- Lim, B.J. and Klein, K.J. (2006), "Team mental models and team performance: a field study of the effects of team mental model similarity and accuracy", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 27 No. 4, pp. 403-418.
- Schelling, T.C. (1960), *The Strategy of Conflict*, Harvard University Press, Boston, MA.
- Swann, W.B. (1990), "To be adored or to be known? The interplay of self-enhancement and self-verification", in Higgins, E.T. and Sorrentino, R.M. (Eds), *Handbook of Motivation and Cognition*, Guilford, New York, NY, pp. 408-450.
- Swann, W.B., De La Ronde, C. and Hixon, J.G. (1994), "Authenticity and positivity strivings in marriage and courtship", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 66 No. 5, pp. 857-869.
- Swann, W.B., Polzer, J.T., Seyle, D.C. and Ko, S.J. (2004), "Finding value in diversity: verification of personal and social self-views in diverse groups", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp. 9-27.
- Thompson, L. (1990), "Negotiation behavior and outcomes: empirical evidence and theoretical issues", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 108 No. 3, pp. 515-532.
- Thompson, L. and Hastie, R. (1990), "Social perception in negotiation", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 47 No. 1, pp. 98-123.
- Van Knippenberg, D., Haslam, S.A. and Platow, M.J. (2007), "Unity through diversity: value-in-diversity beliefs as moderator of the relationship between work group diversity and group identification", *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research and Practice*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 207-222.
- Weary, G., Vaughn, L.A. Stewart, B.D. and Edwards, J.A. (2006), "Adjusting for the correspondence bias: effects of causal uncertainty, cognitive busyness, and causal strength of situational information", *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 42 No. 1, pp. 87-94.

Tendency to perceive conflict	Tendency not to perceive conflict
1. In work situations, I think it is important for people to have their own opinion	1. I think it is important for people to be cooperative in work situations
2. When I am working on something with somebody else, I think it is important to get the most out of myself	2. When I am working on something with somebody else, I think it is important to find some common ground
3. When I work together with others, I think it is important for people to understand me	3. When I work together with others, I think it is important that people agree with each other
4. During collaborations with others, it is easy for me to tell others I am unhappy with something	4. During collaborations with others, I find it difficult to tell people I am unhappy with something
5. When realizing certain goals, I stand up for myself	5. When realizing certain goals, I do not always stand up for myself
6. In work situations, I am task-oriented	6. In work situations, I am socially oriented
7. When performing a task, I think it is important to openly give your opinion	7. I think modesty is important during the performance of a task
8. Most of the time, I try to be open for a good discussion during a collaboration	8. Most of the time, I try not to get involved in discussions during a collaboration
9. During a collaboration, I enjoy convincing other people	9. During a collaboration, I enjoy working together with others
10. When necessary to perform a task, I will not try to escape from facing a conflict	10. Generally, I experience only little conflict in work situations
11. I am bothered by differences of opinion that are not articulated during the completion of a task	11. During the completion of a task, I sometimes think it is wise to stop a discussion
12. People with whom I collaborated describe me as a strong person with an independent opinion	12. People with whom I collaborated describe me as an easy-going person

Table A1.
Questions used to
manipulate
participants
tendencies to
perceive – or not
perceive – conflict
during collaborative
tasks

Corresponding author

Karen A. Jehn can be contacted at: k.jehn@mbs.edu

For instructions on how to order reprints of this article, please visit our website:

www.emeraldgrouppublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm

Or contact us for further details: permissions@emeraldinsight.com

This article has been cited by:

1. Smaranda Boros, Lore van Gorp, Brecht Cardoen, Robert Boute. 2016. Breaking Silos: A Field Experiment on Relational Conflict Management in Cross-Functional Teams. *Group Decision and Negotiation* . [[CrossRef](#)]