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Inherent conflict?

• Independence and shared responsibility often lead to conflict

• Conflict, *of some form*, will undoubtedly be experienced within a team
  – Tuckman’s (1965) model
  – Steiner’s (1972) *Law* of team performance
Types of conflict

- Relationship conflict -- RC
  - Interpersonal tensions
  - Personal issues that manifest as personality clashes
  - Correlation with performance, $\rho = -.14$
Types of conflict

- Process conflict -- PC
  - Disagreements about how team’s work should be accomplished
  - Conflicts around responsibility and which team member does what
  - Correlation with performance, $\rho = -.27$
Types of conflict

• Task conflict -- TC
  – Disagreements about the nature of the work to be done

  – Conflicts from differences of opinion about goals

  – Correlation with performance, $\rho = -.06$
Separation vs. complexity

• Separation
  – Role of different types of conflict examined independent of other conflict types

• Complexity
  – Acknowledge role of different forms of conflict simultaneously
Separation vs. complexity

• Not all conflict should be bad

  — Task conflict should be beneficial to team performance!

• But only when relationship and process conflict are low
Complexity perspective

• ‘*But doesn’t this just suggest a three-way interaction?’*

  – Yes

  – But much previous research failed to support these interactions
Complexity perspective

• Typical approaches to interactions
  – Low power
  – Linearity

• Person-centered approaches, like latent profile analysis (LPA), implicitly model interactions
  – Team-centered in our case
Complexity perspective

- LPA has allowed us to find a distinct subset of teams that have
  - High TC, low RC, and low PC
    - i.e., the ideal profile

- Has lead to discovery of distinct types of teams
The conflict profiles

- Across four independent samples
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The conflict profiles


The conflict profiles

- Relation with team performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Task conflict dominant</th>
<th>Runner up</th>
<th>Could be worse</th>
<th>Dysfunctional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>TC</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could be worse</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Could be worse is the most dysfunctional profile.
The conflict profiles

- Evidence of construct validity
  - Psychological safety
    - TCD > Runner-up > Could be worse = Dysfunctional
  - Innovation
    - TCD > Runner-up = Could be worse = Dysfunctional
The conflict profiles

• Evidence of construct validity
  
  – Burnout
    • TCD > Runner-up > Could be worse = Dysfunctional

  – Perceptions of learning
    • TCD > Runner-up = Could be worse > Dysfunctional

  – Peer ratings of performance
    • TCD > Runner-up > Could be worse > Dysfunctional
Implications and Summary

• Robust set of four profiles
  – Task Conflict-Dominant (i.e., the ideal)
  – The Runner-up (i.e., RC/PC-Minor)
  – Could be worse (i.e., Mid-range Conflict)
  – Dysfunctional

• Evidence of construct validity
  – At the team- and individual-levels
Implications and Summary

- Main limitations
  - Cross-sectional
  - Student teams
A *shameless* sales pitch:

- If you have access to field teams, we’d be delighted to collaborate

- We’ve got the
  - Expertise
  - Training program (*SUIT* intervention)
  - Assessment platform (itpmetrics.com)
  - Data analysis
Thank you for your time!
mclarnon@oakland.edu