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Abstract

No research exists examining the possible effects person-group (PG) fit can have on the amount of conflict individuals perceive when working with a particular group. This study was the first to examine the relationship between a multidimensional conceptualization of PG fit (i.e., values-based, personality-based, and abilities-based) and perceived intragroup conflict types (relationship, task, and process conflict) under the moderator of perceived group conflict, and an exploratory moderator of task interdependence. It was hypothesized that all three multidimensional PG fit constructs would strongly and negatively correlate with all three perceived intragroup conflict types, especially when perceived group performance was higher. Surveys were collected online through MTurk from a sample of 86 participants. Using centered versions of all predictor variables, analyses were conducted using multiple linear regression and hierarchical linear regression. Perceived performance did not significantly moderate the relationship between any type of PG fit and any form of conflict. The same results were found using the exploratory moderator of task interdependence. Contributions and limitations are discussed.
Chapter I

Review of the Literature

Person-group (PG) fit, also known as person-team fit, is one of the most underresearched person-environment (PE) fit constructs (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005). Recently, studies have begun to examine multiple constructs of fit simultaneously, such as person-job fit, person-organization fit, and PG fit (Jansen & Kristof-Brown, 2006; Kristof-Brown, Jansen, & Colbert, 2002). Even more recently, the multidimensionality of fit constructs (i.e., values, personality, and abilities-based fit) are being examined together, including a recent multidimensional study on PG fit (Seong & Kristof-Brown, 2012). This is due to an increasing interest in how each subtype of fit can stand as an individual, exclusive construct (Jansen & Kristof-Brown, 2006; Judge & Ferris, 1992; Kristof, 1996; O’Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991).

PG fit has positively correlated with multiple Industrial/Organizational (I/O) variables, such as job satisfaction, team commitment, and group cohesion, exemplifying the importance of establishing fit among group and team members (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005). However, no research to this author’s knowledge has examined whether PG fit can predict the amount of conflict one perceives in the workplace. Ravlin and Ritchie (2006) performed a study in which they examined perceived and actual fit to one’s organization through value congruence. One of the studied dependent variables was perceptions of conflict, which provided significant results based on both actual and perceived fit. This study and its implications will be
discussed in more detail in the rationale and hypotheses section of this paper. The current study attempts to expand the fit literature to perceived PG fit and conflict types. Thus, the focus of this research is exploring the potential influence of multidimensional PG fit on perceived conflict in the workplace.

Conflict in the workplace can contribute to multiple unwanted outcomes, especially if some individuals perceive conflicts occurring differently than others (Chatman & Jehn, 2000). Primarily, negative effects have been found on group outcomes for relationship and task conflict (De Dreu & Weingart, 2003). Process conflict has been found to negatively affect group outcomes as well (Amason, 1996; Jehn, 1995). However, recent research indicates that conflict can be positive in some instances and also less detrimental to groups than previous findings have suggested (De Wit, Greer, & Jehn, 2012).

It is important to investigate how individuals, especially those responsible for team and group formation, can prevent conflicts from occurring. Research presented in this study supports the idea that fit with one’s workgroup can lessen the amount of conflict perceived. Therefore, the relationship between how well individuals fit their workgroup (i.e., PG fit) and the amount of conflict perceived by these individuals will be examined. Due to the growing interest in multidimensionality of individual fit constructs and the lack of research on the relationship between PG fit and perceived conflict, there is one main question of the present research: Does PG fit, defined on a multidimensional level (encompassing values-based group fit, abilities-based group fit, and personality-based group fit in one’s overall evaluation of fit to a group) affect the amount of
intragroup conflict (i.e., relationship conflict, task conflict, and process conflict) perceived by individuals in workgroups?

In order to examine this question, this paper will begin with an overview of PG fit, starting with a discussion on PE fit. Multidimensionality of PG fit will then be discussed, and values, personality, and abilities fit will be introduced. Conflict and different types of perceived conflict will then be examined. Evidence for a link between PG fit and perceived conflict in the workplace will be considered, through the presentation of perceived group performance. Lastly, task interdependence will be discussed as an exploratory moderator of the present relationship. The overall purpose of this paper is to examine if PG fit can influence perceived conflict in organizations.

**Person-Environment Fit**

Before discussing the construct of PG fit, it is important to clarify the meaning of PE fit. Traditionally, “fit” has centered around the idea that outcomes are a result of how an individual interacts with the environment, such that a good fit leads to positive outcomes (Edwards, 1991; Kristof, 1996). PE fit originated with the work of Holland (1973) and his theory of vocational choice and behavior. Holland’s theory suggests that a congruence between individuals and the workplace is important for satisfaction, reinforcement, and remaining in one’s work environment, and therefore reflects one of the earliest theoretical and empirical treatments of what would become the broad PE fit literature. Research supports that fit, “...has been found to be positively related to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, intentions to remain, job involvement, career success, health and adaptation, organizational effectiveness, and to lower stress and
turnover” (Saks & Ashforth, 1997, p. 397). Thus, fit has positive effects in many I/O areas.

PE fit can be considered from either an objective or a subjective perspective, with the present study focusing on the latter. Subjective fit is one’s perceived fit. Subjective fit is self-reported by an individual, and fit is obtained when self-reported ratings (e.g., values, personality, and abilities) match those of an individual, group, job, or other fit construct (see below). Objective fit is one’s actual fit, or how well the characteristics that an individual obtains matches those needed as reported by external sources (Kristof, 1996). Although assessing such fit is clearly important, understanding the relationship between objective fit and conflict is left for future research to explore.

PE fit is defined as the compatibility between an individual and the work environment: specifically, when an individual’s characteristics match well with their work environment (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005). PE fit is an all-encompassing construct composed of many different subtypes of fit including person-job (PJ) fit, person-organization (PO) fit, person-vocation (PV) fit, PG fit, and person-person fit, among others. Lauver and Kristof-Brown (2001) describe PE fit as an “umbrella concept” which subsumes different subtypes of fit. Therefore, PE fit is comprehensive, such that an individual’s compatibility with multiple work environment areas is utilized to decide one’s fit (Kristof-Brown et al., 2002).

**Person-Group Fit**

PG fit is a single-dimension fit perception of PE fit because it focuses on one area of the work environment: how well an individual fits with a particular workgroup (Jansen & Kristof-Brown, 2006). For the purposes of this study, “workgroup” and “team” are
often used interchangeably, but every attempt will be made to retain the language of the original authors. Because the literature often treats person-group and person-team fit as being the same construct (e.g., Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005), this seems a reasonable semantic and logical decision to make.

An individual fits their immediate workgroup when interpersonal congruence is established between the individual and the work environment (Judge & Ferris, 1992; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, and Johnson, 2005; Werbel & Gilliland, 1999). Jansen and Kristof-Brown (2006) define PG fit as focusing on “the skill and interpersonal compatibility between individuals within a work setting” (p. 194). Interpersonal compatibility, or PG fit, is examined by looking at both supplementary fit (does the individual have common values or beliefs with the team?) and complementary fit (does the individual provide unique advantages to the team?) among team members (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987; Werbel & Johnson, 2001). Thus, complementary fit is commonly related to abilities-based fit, and values and traits (e.g., personality) can be defined as being supplementary (Seong & Kristof-Brown, 2012). Having supplementary and complementary fit with group members on characteristics such as values, personality, and abilities, enables a group to be more effective (Werbel & Johnson, 2001). Thus, it is important that individuals fit their workgroups on both supplementary and complementary levels.

PG fit is related to multiple positive outcomes in the workplace. For example, a meta-analysis by Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, and Johnson (2005) examined different fit constructs, including PG fit, and found several significant relationships for PG fit and the criteria of interest. PG fit significantly and positively correlated with coworker
satisfaction and supervisor satisfaction. Additionally, PG fit had moderate true score correlations with job satisfaction ($r = .31$), organizational commitment ($r = .19$), and intent to quit ($r = -.22$). Group cohesion had a positive and strong significant correlation ($r = .47$) with PG fit as well. Thus, results from this study indicate that PG fit has several beneficial relationships with areas important to the success of organizations and employees.

**The Multidimensionality of Fit**

As previously explained, PE fit is an all-encompassing construct. However, the individual fit constructs encompassing PE fit (e.g., PO, PJ, PG) have commonly been studied separately in past research, and rarely in combination (e.g., Kristof, 1991; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001; O’Reilly et al., 1991). This is because fit researchers have traditionally been interested in understanding how each type of fit can uniquely predict certain outcomes for individuals in the workplace (e.g., job performance, job satisfaction, commitment), rather than examining how multiple types of fit interact in predicting certain outcomes.

Over the past decade or so, fit researchers have become interested in studying PE fit as a multidimensional construct, such that individual fit constructs are studied simultaneously in a study. For example, Kristof-Brown et al. (2002) examined individuals’ PJ, PG, and PO fit perceptions in one study to explore how individuals combine information from these three fit perceptions in examining how individuals evaluate their work environment. The authors found each type of fit had unique importance for how individuals perceived fit in their study. This finding suggests that it is
important to evaluate fit on a multidimensional level to get a more accurate representation of how individuals perceive their overall fit (Kristof-Brown et al., 2002).

Additionally, Jansen and Kristof-Brown (2006) developed a multidimensional theory of PE fit addressing how individual fit types (PO, PJ, PV) combine on a multidimensional level, affecting a variety of outcomes for individuals. The authors advocate studying the multidimensionality of an individual’s fit because a more complete representation of an employee’s perceptions can be examined when more than one type of fit is taken into consideration. These authors explain that there is an interdependence between fit types, such that “...various dimensions of fit are interrelated, and when combined, partially comprise an individual’s total work experience” (Jansen & Kristof-Brown, 2006, p. 194). Hence, the studies by Kristof-Brown et al. (2002) and Jansen and Kristof-Brown show the importance of examining multidimensionality in fit constructs.

The multidimensionality of person-group fit. Although evidence exists for the importance of studying fit on a multidimensional level, little research has examined the multidimensionality of individual fit constructs. Seong and Kristof-Brown (2012) note that PG fit has traditionally been assessed by directly examining perceived fit with a group or team, or with a single conceptualization of fit, such as personality-based group fit. This is problematic because PG fit then becomes over-simplified relative to current theories of the construct. Thus, it is important to expand multidimensional fit research by examining the multiple conceptualizations (i.e., multidimensionality) of individual fit constructs, such as PG fit. Seong and Kristof-Brown offered a multidimensional assessment of PG characteristics, breaking the construct down into values-based PG fit, personality-based PG fit, and abilities-based PG fit. In examination against other models,
the authors found that a superordinate, multidimensional assessment of PG fit was the best fitting conceptualization of PG fit. PG fit as a multidimensional, superordinate construct implies individuals use an overarching conceptualization of PG fit to determine similarity on different areas of PG fit, such as values, personality, and abilities. The breakdown of fit dimensionality as presented in the following paragraphs draws heavily upon the direction and findings of Seong and Kristof-Brown’s research. It is presented to allow the reader to understand the theoretical framework that exits at the present time, but because the framework is based largely on a single study, that is not to be viewed as comprehensive.

*Values-based fit.* Values-based fit focuses on the idea that a congruence of values between group members positively affects an individual’s attitudes because the individual can identify and define one’s self with similar others in the group. Thus, values-based fit relates to the social identity theory (Hogg & Abrams, 1988; Tajfel & Turner, 1985), or the idea that individuals will look to similar others to validate their beliefs and values. Values-based fit also relates to Byrne’s (1971) similarity-attraction paradigm, which maintains that similarity between individuals increases interpersonal liking and attraction among group members. Perceptions of value congruence between employees and one’s organization has been reported to relate positively to commitment, intentions to stay, and satisfaction (Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001; Ravlin & Ritchie, 2006). Additionally, Adkins, Ravlin, and Meglino (1996) found that value congruence has a positive relationship with certain workgroup outcomes including satisfaction, attendance, and performance, in the presence of moderators such as task interdependence and tenure. Specifically, this study found that when job interdependence was high between
coworkers, a positive relationship was found between value congruence and a performance rating by a supervisor. Tenure was found to moderate the relationship between facet satisfactions and attendance, meaning that a positive relationship was observed between value congruence and outcomes that are beneficial to lower tenured employees.

**Personality-based fit.** Personality-based fit focuses on how well one’s personality matches the personality of group members (Seong & Kristof-Brown, 2012). Holland (1966, 1973) was the first to theorize the importance of a match between individuals falling under specific occupational trait categories (realistic, investigative, artistic, social, enterprising, and conventional) and the environment in which they work. Holland’s theory of vocational choice supports personality-based fit because each of these six categories represents a unique personality type. Holland’s theory supports that the congruence between one’s personality and work environment predicts one’s vocational satisfaction, achievement, and stability (e.g., being satisfied with one’s job is dependent upon how similar one’s personality is with the work environment; Holland, 1973).

In a team or group context, PE fit literature suggests that individual characteristics of group members, like personality, interact with the characteristics of other group members, affecting how individuals work with their team and how tasks are accomplished (Kristof-Brown, Barrick, & Stevens, 2005). Kristof-Brown, Barrick, & Stevens (2005) explain that many personality traits have been studied for the purpose of examining effects on team-level outcomes, but little research has yielded consistent results. However, findings have indicated the importance of personality traits for team outcomes, such as agreeableness, conscientiousness, and emotional stability in team
performance (Mount, Barrick, & Stewart, 1998). Other research has found that capacity of team members to work together is higher when extraversion and emotional stability of the team are higher (Barrick, Stewart, Neubert, & Mount, 1998). Overall, these findings suggest that personality-based fit can affect how a team functions.

**Abilities-based fit.** Abilities-based fit focuses on whether an individual has the capabilities to meet the needs and demands of their environment (French, Caplan, & Harrison, 1982; Kristof, 1996). An example in the workplace is an individual having the proper knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) to correctly complete tasks and solve problems. Task performance and fit relationships are typically low, and Seong and Kristof-Brown (2012) found no relationship between abilities-based fit and knowledge sharing. However, it seems likely that abilities-based fit, based on the definition above, of group members affects how conflict is perceived. Abilities-based fit can relate to perceived group performance. Having low abilities-based fit within a group increases the likelihood that group tasks will not be completed correctly or in a timely manner, decreasing perceived group performance level. This, in turn, can cause conflict between group members to arise and ultimately, encourage perceptions of conflict between group members to emerge.

**Conflict**

Conflict has commonly been defined as occurring when individuals perceive tension because of real or perceived discord between team members (e.g., De Dreu, Harinck, & Van Vianen, 1999; Wall & Callister, 1995). Conflict has many potential negative consequences for team members, including a reported decrease in satisfaction and interference with performance (De Dreu & Weingart, 2003). This may decrease task
completion because of unwanted, uncomfortable distractions, caused by the tension conflict creates. When individuals in groups perceive conflict to be occurring differently than one another, negative outcomes can result. More specifically, past research has indicated that individuals having differing views of relationship and process conflict demonstrated low satisfaction, low commitment, and low perceived cohesiveness (Jehn & Chatman, 2000). Moreover, managing conflict properly in the workplace is essential to effectively functioning organizations. Each individual type of intragroup conflict (relationship, task, and process conflict) will be discussed more in depth below.

Team conflict research has traditionally focused on relationship and task conflict (Amason, 1996; Guetzkow & Gyr, 1954; Jehn, 1994, 1997; Kabanoff, 1991). A third type of conflict, process conflict, was defined and developed after relationship and task conflict and is gaining interest to researchers (Jehn, Northcraft, & Neale, 1999). All three conflict types were measured in this study to examine perceived conflict of individuals in groups. Understanding the meaning of each and the negative outcomes that can result when these conflicts are perceived will be examined next.

**Relationship conflict.** Relationship conflict occurs when issues not related to work being done cause tension. These issues can be personal or social (Jehn & Chatman, 2000). De Wit et al. (2012) found relationship conflict to relate to disagreements with team members about norms, values, interpersonal issues, and can involve differences in personality. Consistent with De Wit et al., past research has primarily indicated negative outcomes for relationship conflict, including low satisfaction, intent to remain in a group, and task completion (e.g., Amason, 1996; Jehn, 1995). Relationship conflict can induce symptoms of anxiety and fear, thus reducing overall satisfaction with one’s workgroup.
Additionally, relationship conflict can trigger an individual to perceive an ego threat (Baumeister, 1998), because the majority of relationship conflicts are due to a perceived disagreement about one’s self-concept (De Wit et al., 2012).

**Task conflict.** Task conflict involves disagreements involving the work being done by a group (Jehn & Chatman, 2000). Task conflicts can arise from policies and procedures, distribution of resources, and interpretation of facts (De Dreu & Weingart, 2003). Ravlin and Ritchie (2006) found that the attitudinal outcome of perceived task role conflict was significantly negatively related to perceived and actual organizational fit. As previously mentioned, mixed research exists as to whether task conflict can be beneficial.

For example, Jehn (1995) examined whether conflict can be beneficial among 105 different workgroups and found task conflict was only detrimental to group performance if groups were performing routine tasks (i.e., familiar tasks performed in a consistent manner). When tasks to be completed were non-routine, involving higher thought processes and more difficulty, disagreements regarding the task were not detrimental, and sometimes beneficial. This is most likely because high task conflict encourages the use of open discussion and critical problem solving (Jehn, 1995). However, many findings do suggest task conflict is harmful to certain group outcomes (e.g., overall group stress level and group performance) and could possibly negatively affect creativity, group effectiveness, and decision making (De Wit et al. 2012; De Dreu, 2008). Due to inconsistencies in past research, it is important that more research is performed on task conflict and outcomes.

**Process conflict.** Process conflict centers around strategies for task completion and how duties and resources are delegated (Jehn & Chatman, 2000). Process conflict
examples include disagreements with group members about who will be responsible for what tasks and how the tasks will be completed (Jehn & Bendersky, 2003). Typically, research has shown negative outcomes when process conflict is present (e.g., Greer & Jehn, 2007; Jehn et al., 2008). Negative outcomes with process conflict can occur through delegation of task assignment in groups. For example, if an individual receives a task they feel is too simple, they may feel their group perceives them as less competent than they actually are, and thus, feel insulted because of the personal connotation of the delegated task (Jehn & Bendersky, 2003). Therefore, process conflicts have been found to negatively affect group viability (e.g., satisfaction and commitment) and emergent group states (i.e., trust and group cohesion; Jehn et al., 1999; Thatcher, Jehn, & Zanutto, 2003; Vodosek, 2007).

A Review of Task, Relationship, and Process Conflict Findings

De Dreu and Weingart (2003) performed a meta-analysis on relationship and task conflict over 30 studies. The authors examined views of conflict by studying associations between task and relationship conflict, team performance, and team member satisfaction. The findings from this study were in opposition to previous research, stating that task conflict can yield positive results for individuals (e.g., Amason, 1996; Jehn, 1995; Tjosvold, 2008; Van de Vliert & De Dreu, 1994). As indicated previously, authors in support of task conflict being beneficial suggest task conflict can encourage team members to engage in higher-level group decision making and critical thinking. However, results from De Dreu and Weingart’s study are inconsistent with these views. Results indicated that task conflict and relationship conflict have an equal and significantly negative relationship with team performance (task, \( r = -0.23 \); relationship, \( r = \))
-22). Additionally, both relationship and task conflict had the weakest relationships with task performance in studies examining lower thought processing teams in comparison to higher-processing teams. These findings further suggest that task conflict does not encourage higher-level group decision making. As a result, De Dreu and Weingart concluded that conflict interferes negatively with complex, non-routine tasks (higher-level processing) than everyday, routine tasks (c.f., Jehn, 1995). The findings from this meta-analysis reiterate that mixed results are present concerning task conflict being beneficial, due to the negative relationships found between conflict, team performance, and satisfaction.

A recent meta-analysis by De Wit et al. (2012) found conflicting results to De Dreu and Weingart’s (2003) meta-analysis concerning task conflict. This meta-analysis, examining 116 studies, was much larger than De Dreu and Weingart’s meta-analysis (30 studies). De Wit et al. were interested in studying intragroup conflict, which centers on the processes taking place when an individual perceives differences or incompatibilities with other team members. This study also included process conflict. The authors examined past studies on intragroup conflict by examining relationship, task, and process conflict on proximal (e.g., group sustainability and emergent states) and distal (i.e., performance) group outcomes. Results indicated that task conflict showed neither more negative nor more positive group outcomes, contradicting the findings of De Dreu and Weingart that task conflict is primarily bad for group outcomes. The authors found task conflict had less of a negative effect on proximal outcomes than relationship and process conflict did. In line with previous research, relationship and process conflict in this study tended to be more consistently negative with group performance.
The results of the two above meta-analyses suggest that more research is needed to determine how individuals perceive conflict (specifically task conflict) and what outcomes these produce. Nonetheless, a majority of the past research on perceived conflict indicates perceiving conflict in workgroups can have problematic outcomes for group effectiveness. Thus, it is important to consider what actions can be taken to enhance group compatibility, so that perceived conflict can be reduced. Forming workgroups based on congruence (i.e., PG fit) can possibly eliminate the amount of perceived conflict by individuals in teams, and hence, merits attention. Evidence for a relationship between PG fit and perceived conflict will be discussed in the following section.

**Person-Group Fit and Perceived Conflict**

Some research has indicated that heterogeneity of workgroups lowers overall fit between work environments and workers (Bowen, Ledford, & Nathan, 1991; Cable & Parsons, 2001; Hopkins, Hopkins, & Mallette, 2001). This causes concerns for how the culture and performance of an organization can be affected when low PG fit is present within work teams. How similar one is to their workgroup may influence how well they perform in that group, and this relationship requires attention.

Past studies exist linking fit to performance level. More specifically, how well an individual performs on a job may depend on fit (Kristof, 1996; Williams & O’Reilly, 1998). Werbel and Johnson (2001) argue that the proper use of PG fit in selection procedures can increase cohesiveness and effectiveness of workgroups. Additionally, research exists linking performance and positive work attitudes to PG fit (e.g., Atkins &
Caldwell, 2004; Judge & Cable, 1997). From these findings, it is likely that perceived PG fit can influence perceived group performance level.

Surprisingly, research is limited regarding how perceived group performance can affect perceived conflict in groups. Most research examines how or why conflict or perceived conflict can affect performance (e.g., Alper, Tjosvold, & Law, 2006; Carnevale & Probst, 1998; Cox, 2003; De Dreu & Weingart, 2003; De Wit et al. 2012). The present study intends to reverse this research trend and investigate how perceived group performance level (high vs low) interacts with interpersonal conflict. Specifically, this research examined the moderating effect of self-reported group performance level on perceived PG fit and perceived conflict.

**Perceived group performance.** Perceived group performance can be understood as an individual’s perceived level of their group’s overall performance. Past studies have assessed perceived performance, making perceived group performance a meaningful variable to study (e.g., DeNisi, Randolph, & Blencoe, 1983; Sansone, 1986). In summary, this study is interested in learning how a group member’s perception of their group’s performance affects the conflict the individual group member experiences.

**Task Interdependence**

Based on a recommendation from Seong and Kristof-Brown (2012), task interdependence was included as an exploratory moderator, to determine if it might serve a similar moderating role as that hypothesized for perceived group performance. Seong and Kristof-Brown suggested exploring whether certain environmental constraints, such as task interdependence, can moderate PG fit and its dimensions. This study is interested in seeing if depending on one another to complete tasks affects the relationship between
multidimensional PG fit and conflict perceptions. However, it should be reiterated this is an exploratory element of the current study.
Chapter II

Rationale and Hypotheses

Although existing constructs can be used to draw links between PG fit and perceived conflict, there is little research simultaneously examining the two constructs. The closest study is the work of Ravlin and Ritchie (2006), who focused on the interrelationship of perceived and actual values fit and attitudinal outcomes of perceived and actual fit on an organizational level. Conflict perceptions were one of the studied outcomes, but very little is discussed about what the authors found in this respect. The type of conflict studied was given and the authors reported perceived and actual fit significantly related to conflict perceptions, along with their interaction. Thus, the rationale as to why these hypotheses are examined is to expand on the ideas of Ravlin and Ritchie and Seong and Kristof-Brown’s (2012) study. Previous literature indicates that conflict is a problem in groups (De Dreu & Weingart, 2003; De Wit et al., 2012) and more research is needed to examine what can be done to prevent conflict from occurring. Positive outcomes result in the workplace when PG fit is present (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, and Johnson, 2005), but no studies have explicitly examined perceived intragroup conflict types as outcomes of PG fit. It is possible that PG fit can reduce perceived conflict in the workplace, and this study is the first to hypothesize and examine such a relationship.
Research supports that values congruence has a positive effect on performance (Adkins et al., 1996). It is theorized that perceived group performance will moderate the values-based PG-conflict relationship. Values-based PG fit was operationalized through the summation of items from Seong and Kristof-Brown's (2012) PG multidimensional fit measure. Conflict types were operationalized through the total score of Jehn's (1995) intragroup conflict scale and items from Shah and Jehn's (1993) conflict measure. Perceived group performance was operationalized through a one-item question asking individuals to rate their perceptions of group performance. The experimental moderator of task interdependence was operationalized through the total score of received and initiated task interdependence items from Van der Vegt, Emans, and Van de Vliert (1998) study. All measures and the operationalization of the study variables are described in more detail in the Method section of this document.

H1a: The effect of participants' values-based PG fit on relationship conflict will be moderated by perceived group performance, such that as perceived group performance increases, the relationship between PG fit and relationship conflict will become increasingly negative.

H1b: The effect of participants' values-based PG fit on task conflict will be moderated by perceived group performance, such that as perceived group performance increases, the relationship between PG fit and task conflict will become increasingly negative.

H1c: The effect of participants' values-based PG fit on process conflict will be moderated by perceived group performance, such that as perceived group
performance increases, the relationship between PG fit and process conflict will become increasingly negative.

Personality-based fit research lacks consistency, but evidence does suggest personality characteristics are important to group outcomes. Past research has found teams work better together when certain personality characteristics are high in groups (Barrick et al., 1998). For example, conscientiousness has been shown to be a valid predictor for all criterion and occupational groups for performance (Cascio & Aguinis, 2011). Therefore, research is needed on how perceived group performance, or how well one perceives their group to be performing, can moderate the relationship between personality fit and perceived conflict, leading to the second hypothesis.

H2a: The effect of participants' personality-based PG fit on relationship conflict will be moderated by perceived group performance, such that as perceived group performance increases, the relationship between PG fit and relationship conflict will become increasingly negative.

H2b: The effect of participants' personality-based PG fit on task conflict will be moderated by perceived group performance, such that as perceived group performance increases, the relationship between PG fit and task conflict will become increasingly negative.

H2c: The effect of participants' personality-based PG fit on process conflict will be moderated by perceived group performance, such that as perceived group performance increases, the relationship between PG fit and process conflict will become increasingly negative.
Abilities-based fit is dependent on whether an individual can meet the demands of their work environment (French, Caplan, & Harrison, 1982; Kristof, 1996). As stated previously, it is likely that one’s abilities will affect how one performs in a group, and thus, how others perceive one’s performance. Lower abilities-based fit alludes to lower performance, and possibly more perceived conflict within the workgroup. This interpretation leads to the third and final hypothesis.

H3a: The effect of participants’ abilities-based PG fit on relationship conflict will be moderated by perceived group performance, such that as perceived group performance increases, the relationship between PG fit and relationship conflict will become increasingly negative.

H3b: The effect of participants’ abilities-based PG fit on task conflict will be moderated by perceived group performance, such that as perceived group performance increases, the relationship between PG fit and task conflict will become increasingly negative.

H3c: The effect of participants’ abilities-based PG fit on process conflict will be moderated by perceived group performance, such that as perceived group performance increases, the relationship between PG fit and process conflict will become increasingly negative.

Overall, all hypotheses are in support of PG fit reducing the amount of overall conflict one perceives with their immediate workgroup when perceived group performance is high.
Chapter III

Method

Participants

Participants eligible for this study included any individuals who were working, or had worked, with a team or workgroup for a period of at least three months. Ninety-three individuals participated in this study. Participants were excluded if they did not meet the requirements of the study or were taking the survey under false pretenses (e.g., have not worked with their workgroup for a period of three months or more). Parameters for this study are discussed further in the limitations section. All participants ($N = 86$) were over the age of 18 (79% Caucasian; 68.6% male; 57% American). The mean age was 30 (SD = 10.53) and 46.5% of individuals reported having a bachelor’s degree. The plurality (31.4%) of individuals reported working with their workgroups for a period of three to six months, and the average tenure was around four and a half years (SD = 0.47). The most frequent occupational category was information technology/computer science, with education falling closely behind. Participants were recruited through MTurk, an online site through Amazon.com allowing individuals to participate in human intelligence tasks (HITs), such as survey completion, provided by requesters (the creators of the HITs). The study was advertised on MTurk and individuals received a small compensation of 50 cents for completing a brief survey, anticipated to take no longer than 20 minutes. The median study on MTurk requires only a few minutes and pays five to 10 cents (Downs,
Holbrook, Sheng, & Cranor, 2010). Due to the short duration and lack of difficulty required by the present survey, 50 cents for survey completion appeared fair and within the normal range for this particular survey.

**Measures**

**Multidimensional PG fit.** PG fit was measured consistent with the approach used by Seong and Kristof-Brown (2012). All items were assessed on a 7-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*), with higher scores indicating stronger fit. Seong and Kristof-Brown tested different models of PG fit (i.e., multidimensional vs. non-multidimensional models) and found the best fitting model was one supporting a multidimensional, superordinate construct of PG fit. This suggests that distinctions between perceptions of each individual subtype of PG fit (i.e., values-based fit, personality-based fit, and abilities-based fit) are driven by a superordinate construct of fit. Thus, the authors indicated that the best fitting model tested was one in which individuals first formed an overall perception of compatibility with one’s team or group (superordinate) and then used this perception to assess their own fit on underlying dimensions (values, personality, and abilities).

No other studies to this author’s knowledge have attempted to measure the multidimensionality of PG fit this way, except for Seong and Kristof-Brown (2012). Thus, no established measures or assessments exist and authors must create their own according to area of interest. Seong and Kristof-Brown examined the multidimensionality of PG fit in comparison to other models of PG fit and were interested in outcome variables such as commitment to team and knowledge sharing. Therefore, all items assessing PG fit were adapted from Seong and Kristof-Brown, but other items and
methods of analyses were not used due to the areas of interest in this study. The specific scales and how they were adapted are described next.

**Values-based fit.** Values-based fit was assessed as Seong and Kristof-Brown (2012) did, with three items from Cable and DeRue’s (2002) study. Cable and DeRue designed a fit scale to measure how an individual’s views fit those of their organization (i.e., measuring value congruence and PO fit). These same items were used in Seong and Kristof-Brown’s (2012) methods, except value congruence was assessed with group members instead of the organization by replacing “organization” with “team members” in the three questions. An example of an adapted item is “My personal values match/matched my team members’ values and culture” (Seong & Kristof-Brown, 2012). Seong and Kristof-Brown reported the coefficient alpha reliability of their values-based fit items ($\alpha = .94$), and Cable and DeRue also reported the reliability of their scale ($\alpha = .91$ in a single-firm sample; $\alpha = .92$ in a multiple-firm sample). The coefficient reliability of the values-based PG fit scale in the current study was $\alpha = .87$.

**Personality-based fit.** Personality-based fit was also measured consistent with Seong and Kristof-Brown’s (2012) methodology. Seong and Kristof-Brown used items from Cable and DeRue (2002) and Cable and Judge’s (1996) measures, constituting a total of three items. Seong and Kristof-Brown (2012) adapted these measures to fit the measurement of PG fit. An example item is “My personality provides/provided a good fit with my team’s personality.” Coefficient alpha for personality-based fit was $\alpha = .95$ (Seong & Kristof-Brown, 2012). The coefficient alpha reliability of the personality-based PG fit scale in the current study was $\alpha = .88$. 
Abilities-based fit. Abilities-based fit was measured in accordance with Seong and Kristof-Brown (2012), by using three adapted items of Cable and DeRue's (2002) scale. "My job" was adapted to "team task" in order to assess fit to the team's task. An example item from this scale is, "My abilities and education provide/provided a good match with the demands that my team's tasks place/placed on me." Coefficient alpha for abilities-based fit was $\alpha = .88$ (Seong & Kristof-Brown, 2012). Cable and DeRue reported the reliability of their demands-abilities fit scale ($\alpha = .89$ in a single firm sample, and $\alpha = .92$ in a multiple firm sample). The coefficient alpha reliability of the abilities-based PG fit scale in the current study was $\alpha = .81$. References for all of the copyrighted scales are included in Appendix A, but the scales themselves are not reproduced for copyright reasons.

Intragroup conflict scale. The Intragroup Conflict Scale (ICS) established by Jehn (1995) was utilized to measure perceived relationship and task conflict of group members. This scale has been used by a number of authors interested in looking at relationship and task conflict (e.g., Amason, 1996; Amason & Sapienza, 1997; Simons & Peterson, 2000). Through a series of studies, Pearson, Ensley, and Amason (2002) refined the ICS to an improved 6-item scale, instead of the original 9-item scale. Three of these items measure relationship conflict and three items measure task conflict. An example of a relationship item is "How much anger is/was there among the members of the group?" An example of a task conflict item is, "How many disagreements over different ideas are/were there?" Participants were asked to respond to questions over a prior three month period of working with a group. The scale is scored with a 5-point scale ($1 = \textit{none}$ to $5 = \textit{a great deal}$). Individual answers were summed to create a scale score, with a higher score
meaning higher perceived conflict. The coefficient alpha reliability of the relationship conflict scale was $\alpha = .87$, and the coefficient alpha reliability of the task conflict scale was $\alpha = .84$.

**Process conflict.** Process conflict was assessed using three items from Shah and Jehn (1993), following the process conflict measurement methods of Jehn et al. (1999). An example item includes, “How frequently do/did members of your workgroup disagree about the way to complete a group task?” Participants rated each item on a 1 (*none*) to 5 (*a lot*) scale. The coefficient alpha for process conflict using these same questions was reported in a study by Jehn et al. (1999) as $\alpha = .78$. The coefficient alpha reliability of the process conflict scale in the current study was $\alpha = .88$.

**Perceived group performance.** Individuals’ perceived group performance was measured by asking participants to subjectively rate their group’s overall performance. Participants answered the question, “Overall, how well do/did you feel your group performed?” on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*very poorly*) to 7 (*very well*). Past studies have also adopted this method of measuring perceived performance (e.g., DeNisi, Randolph, & Blencoe, 1983; Sansone, 1986). In this section of the survey, participants answered how long they have or had worked in the group, and were given the opportunity to write out any other information they wanted to share regarding their experiences working with this particular workgroup. The items in this section are in Appendix B.

**Task interdependence.** Taggar and Haines’ (2006) task interdependence scales were used to measure task interdependence. These authors measured initiated interdependence (i.e., team members depend on the individual) and received interdependence (i.e., the individual depends on team members) by using items from Van
der Vegt, Emans, and Van de Vliert (1998). An example item of initiated task interdependence is, "To what extent do/did your colleagues depend on you for materials, means, and other things they need?" An example item of received task interdependence is, "To what extent do/did you depend on your colleagues for information and advice?"

All items were rated on a scale ranging from 1 (completely independent) to 7 (completely dependent). Reliability for the initiated and received interdependence questions was $\alpha = .82$ for initiated task interdependence and $\alpha = .79$ for received task interdependence. The coefficient alpha reliability of the initiated task interdependence scale in the current study was $\alpha = .77$; the reliability of the received task interdependence scale in the current study was $\alpha = .71$.

**Demographics.** Demographic information that was collected included age, sex, race, nationality, education, profession, and number of years working for an organization amongst other common demographic questions. The items in this section are presented in Appendix C.

**Procedure**

Approval for this study was sought by submitting a request through Xavier University’s Institutional Review Board in the Exempt category, based on the study consisting of anonymous survey responses (see Appendix D for the IRB approval letter). Data were collected online through Amazon’s MTurk.com web interface for recruitment, using surveygizmo.com for actual study responses. Participants signed up through MTurk for this study, which contained a link for them to complete the survey on surveygizmo.com. MTurk users receive a unique MTurk worker ID when they sign up for the site, which was used to track them for compensation purposes. Participants in the
study were asked to enter their MTurk worker ID as part of the Demographics page on the survey itself, so that their participation was accurately reported. Protection of participants was ensured through anonymity in data collection; all worker ID numbers were discarded after it had been verified (via MTurk.com) that proper payment had been made to the participants who completed the study, and before any analyses were conducted.

Participants were told that they were completing the survey to get a better understanding of workgroup functionality, and it was required that electronic consent forms (see Appendix E) were read and accepted in order to participate in the study. No experimental manipulations or interventions were applicable to this study. However, certain quality check items were included (e.g., "Please choose "strongly agree" as the answer to this item") so that participants taking the survey improperly were eliminated (see Appendix F). Participants were debriefed (see Appendix G) about the meaning of the study immediately after completing their surveys.
Chapter IV

Results

Mean centered versions of all predictor variables were used in the analyses, and were created prior to computing the interaction term. None of the hypothesized moderation emerged, including those for the experimental moderators of received and initiated task interdependence. However, significant correlations were found between a number of variables (see Table 1 for the full correlation matrix, descriptive statistics, and internal consistency reliabilities for the continuous variables used in the study), and many predictors were significant even in the presence of the moderator variable. In summary, values, personality, and abilities based PG fit were all significantly and positively correlated with perceived performance, and all three types of PG fit were significantly and negatively correlated with relationship, task, and process conflict. Values, personality, and abilities-based PG fit were all significantly correlated with one another as well. This finding suggests that the multidimensional PG fit scale measures a single fit factor; this will be discussed more when the study’s limitations are considered. The high intercorrelations of the conflict measures will be discussed in that context as well. More detail about each analysis, including regression summary tables, is provided next.

Perceived performance did not significantly moderate the relationship between values-based PG fit and any form of conflict (i.e., relationship, task, or process conflict). As can be seen in Table 2, both perceived performance ($\beta = -.31, p = .04$) and values-
based PG fit ($\beta = -.24, p = .01$) were significantly predictive of reported relationship conflict, but the interaction term was not ($\beta = .01, \text{ns}$). Tables 3 and 4 demonstrate similar for hypotheses 1b and 1c. Table 3 demonstrates that perceived performance ($\beta = -.30, p = .02$) and values-based PG fit ($\beta = -.24, p = .04$) significantly predicted reported task conflict, but the interaction term was not significantly predictive ($\beta = -.13, \text{ns}$). Table 4 indicates that perceived performance ($\beta = -.32, p = .01$) significantly predicted reported process conflict, but values-based PG fit ($\beta = -.19, \text{ns}$) and the interaction term did not ($\beta = -.09, \text{ns}$).
Table 1

Descriptive Statistics, InterCorrelations, and Reliabilities of Scales Utilized

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>30.41</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>- (&lt;-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>(&lt;-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Team Longevity</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>(&lt;-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>- .05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Values PG Fit</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Personality PG Fit</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.0**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>(.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Abilities PG Fit</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>(.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Total PG Fit</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td>.8**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Perceived</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.8**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Initiated TI</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Received TI</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Relationship Conflict</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Task Conflict</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Process Conflict</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 86. Numbers in parentheses are coefficient a reliabilities.
PG = person-group; TI = task interdependence.
* p < .05. ** p < .01.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Total PG Fit</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Perceived Performance</td>
<td>.6** (.77)</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.3** (.71)</td>
<td>.2** (.77)</td>
<td>.3** (.71)</td>
<td>.3** (.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Initiative T1</td>
<td>.2** (.77)</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2** (.71)</td>
<td>.2** (.77)</td>
<td>.2** (.71)</td>
<td>.2** (.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Received T1</td>
<td>.2** (.77)</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2** (.71)</td>
<td>.2** (.77)</td>
<td>.2** (.71)</td>
<td>.2** (.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Relationship Conflict</td>
<td>-.4** (.84)</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1** (.84)</td>
<td>.1** (.84)</td>
<td>.1** (.84)</td>
<td>.1** (.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Task Conflict</td>
<td>-.4** (.84)</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1** (.84)</td>
<td>.1** (.84)</td>
<td>.1** (.84)</td>
<td>.1** (.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Process Conflict</td>
<td>-.4** (.84)</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1** (.84)</td>
<td>.1** (.84)</td>
<td>.1** (.84)</td>
<td>.1** (.84)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Hierarchical Regression Testing Perceived Performance as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Values-Based PG Fit and Relationship Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Performance</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>13.13**</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values PG Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values PG Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perc. Perf. x Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. PG = Person-group; Perc. Perf. = perceived performance
Criterion = Relationship Conflict.

* p < .05. ** p < .01.
Table 3

Hierarchical Regression Testing Perceived Performance as a moderator of the Relationship Between Values-Based PG Fit and Task Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9.77**</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Values PG Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>-.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Values PG Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perc. Perf. x Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. PG = Person-group; Perc. Perf. = perceived performance

Criterion = Task Conflict

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. 
Table 4

Hierarchical Regression Testing Perceived Performance as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Values-Based PG Fit and Process Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12.26**</td>
<td>-.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values PG Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values PG Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perc. Perf. x Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. PG = Person-group; Perc. Perf. = perceived performance
Criterion = Process Conflict

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. 
Perceived performance also did not significantly moderate the relationship between personality-based PG fit and any form of conflict. Table 5 indicates that both perceived performance ($\beta = -.27, p = .04$) and personality-based PG fit ($\beta = -.28, p = .03$) were significantly predictive of reported relationship conflict, but the product of the predictors was not ($\beta = -.09$, ns).

Table 6 shows that perceived performance ($\beta = -.34, p = .01$) significantly predicted reported task conflict, but personality-based PG fit ($\beta = -.17$, ns) and the interaction term was not significantly predictive ($\beta = -.18$, ns). Table 7 indicates that perceived performance ($\beta = -.35, p = .01$) significantly predicted reported process conflict, but personality-based PG fit ($\beta = -.21$, ns) and the interaction term did not ($\beta = -.10$, ns).

Lastly, perceived performance did not significantly moderate the relationship between abilities-based PG fit and any form of conflict. Table 8 indicates that both perceived performance ($\beta = -.32, p = .01$) and abilities-based PG fit ($\beta = -.26, p = .05$) were significantly predictive of reported relationship conflict, but the interaction term was not ($\beta = -.15$, ns). Table 9 shows that perceived performance ($\beta = -.31, p = .01$) and abilities-based PG fit ($\beta = -.26, p = .05$) were significantly predictive of reported task conflict, but the interaction term was not ($\beta = -.20$, ns). Table 10 indicates that perceived performance ($\beta = -.33, p = .01$) and abilities-based PG fit ($\beta = -.29, p = .03$) were significantly predictive of reported process conflict, but the interaction term was not ($\beta = -.13$, ns).

As mentioned previously, neither received or initiated task interdependence significantly moderated the relationship between any type of fit or conflict. The only
significant correlation observed for task interdependence was between values-based PG fit and both initiated and received task interdependence.
Table 5

Hierarchical Regression Testing Perceived Performance as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Personality-Based PG Fit and Relationship Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Performance</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>11.20**</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality PG Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Performance</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality PG Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perc. Perf. x Personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. PG = Person-group; Perc. Perf. = perceived performance
Criterion = Relationship Conflict

* p < .05. ** p < .01.
Table 6

*Hierarchical Regression Testing Perceived Performance as a Moderator of the*

*Relationship Between Personality-Based PG Fit and Task Conflict*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Performance</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>8.06**</td>
<td>-.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality PG Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Performance</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>-.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality PG Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perc. Perf. x Personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. PG = Person-group; Perc. Perf. = perceived performance*

Criterion = Task Conflict

* p < .05. ** p < .01.
Table 7

Hierarchical Regression Testing Perceived Performance as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Personality-Based PG Fit and Process Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>11.95**</td>
<td>-.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality PG Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality PG Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perc. Perf. x Personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. PG = Person-group; Perc. Perf. = perceived performance
Criterion = Process Conflict

* p < .05. ** p < .01.
Hierarchical Regression Testing Perceived Performance as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Abilities-Based PG Fit and Relationship Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>( \Delta R^2 )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>10.25**</td>
<td>-.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abilities PG Fit</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>-.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abilities PG Fit</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perc. Perf. x Abilities</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. PG = Person-group; Perc. Perf. = perceived performance
Criterion = Relationship Conflict

* p < .05. ** p < .01.
Table 9

*Hierarchical Regression Testing Perceived Performance as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Abilities-Based PG Fit and Task Conflict*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>( \Delta R^2 )</th>
<th>( df )</th>
<th>( F )</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>8.67**</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abilities PG Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abilities PG Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perc. Perf. x Abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. PG = Person-group; Perc. Perf. = perceived performance*

Criterion = Task Conflict

* \( p < .05 \). ** \( p < .01 \).
**Table 10**

*Hierarchical Regression Testing Perceived Performance as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Abilities-Based PG Fit and Process Conflict*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Performance</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12.91**</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abilities PG Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Performance</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abilities PG Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perc. Perf. x Abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. PG = Person-group; Perc. Perf. = perceived performance*

Criterion = Process Conflict

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. 
Chapter V

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether multidimensional PG fit affects conflict perceptions when working in a workgroup. As the results indicate, no hypotheses were supported in this study. Based on the data, it is clear that for many of the regressions, the univariate effects of the predictors were significant, but the predictors did not statistically interact (see Tables 2 – 10). The correlation matrix (Table 1) shows the relationships between multidimensional PG fit performance predictors and the intragroup conflict variables. As the correlations show, the relationships between the predictors (values, personality, and abilities PG fit), and Criteria (relationship, task, and process conflict) are consistently negative and significant. These relationships are all in the $r = -0.30$ to $r = -0.45$ range, indicating medium to large effect sizes (Cohen, 1992). These relationships are meaningful to future research, and will be discussed shortly.

Beyond the strength of the univariate predictors, it is also possible the lack of significance may be due to the particular moderator scales chosen. The chosen method to measure perceived performance was to simply ask individuals how well they felt their group was performing (DeNisi et al., 1983; Sansone, 1986). A different scale might have allowed for the identification of a significant moderation effect. However, the question must be asked if a different scale truly would have measured the “perceived performance” variable more accurately. The method of measuring perceived performance
was simply asking participants how well they felt their group performed. This is a face
valid assessment of the target construct that captures the core of the research question,
but it is theoretically possible a different measure might lead to different results. This will
be discussed more in the limitations section.

Contributions

As mentioned previously, significant correlations between many of the variables
were found. Values-based PG fit was significantly and positively correlated with
perceived performance, initiated task interdependence, and received task
interdependence. Values-based PG fit was also significantly and negatively correlated
with relationship conflict, task conflict, and process conflict. These relationships indicate
that groups who are high on values-based PG fit (i.e., sharing common values and
beliefs) perform better, offer and receive knowledge from workgroup members, and
experience less intergroup conflict. These relationships line up with past research. For
example, value congruence has shown positive outcomes, such as satisfaction and
performance, for workgroups (Adkins, Ravlin, & Meglino, 1996). More specifically, past
research supports the significant correlation found in the present study between values-
based PG fit and perceived performance.

Personality-based PG fit was significantly and positively correlated with
perceived performance, and significantly and negatively related to relationship conflict,
task conflict, and process conflict. Past research has examined particular personality traits
as they related to team outcomes, such as conscientiousness, emotional stability, and
extraversion (Mount, Barrick, & Stewart, 1998). A future research direction could be to
study individual personality traits (e.g., conscientiousness, emotional stability, extraversion) in measuring multidimensional PG fit and conflict perceptions.

Abilities-based PG fit was significantly positively correlated with perceived performance, and significantly negatively correlated with relationship conflict, task conflict, and process conflict. These findings suggest that if individuals can meet the needs and demands of their workgroup, less conflict perceptions may be perceived. These findings also support the idea that less conflict will occur if individuals can meet the task requirements of the group (i.e., abilities-based PG fit). As conflict literature indicates, differing research exists as to whether task conflict is beneficial or harmful to group settings (see De Dreu & Weingart, 2003, and De Wit et al., 2012), so this finding has the potential to contribute to the broader discussion.

Although the present research cannot be compared directly to the ongoing debate surrounding task conflict, these findings do suggest that being able to complete the tasks required by the group may lead to lower conflict perceptions for relationship, task, and process conflict. All three relationships examined were in the expected direction, meaning the higher the PG fit (values, personality, abilities), the lower the amount of conflict (relationship, task, and process). It is possible that because this study measured subjective perceptions of conflict, the general notion that conflict is automatically negative may have affected responses. It is possible that if task conflict were measured objectively, results could differ, since conflict has been shown to have certain positive outcomes (e.g., tasks requiring higher-level thought processing, Jehn, 1995). Future researchers interested in learning more about whether or not task conflict is beneficial should consider investigating this possibility.
Another contribution of this study is a deeper understanding to the psychometrics of multidimensional PG fit. Analyses show that all three fit types are significantly correlated with one another, indicating collinearity (see limitations). This finding is usually not ideal because it indicates that the values, personality, and abilities based fit can essentially be measuring the same construct. However, this finding supports the idea of multidimensional PG fit best as an all-encompassing construct made up of smaller, individual types of fit (i.e., values, personality, abilities) similar to Seong and Kristof-Brown (2012).

Limitations and Future Research

Although MTurk has many conveniences for collecting a workgroup sample, a lack of supervision when collecting data can create problems, including candidates not filling out the survey accurately or seriously. One individual was able to take the survey twice with the same MTurk worker ID, despite the system supposedly having safe-guards to prevent this from occurring. (This issue was reported to MTurk, and the individual’s second completion was not utilized in any analyses.) For the survey item asking participants how long they were or had been working in the particular workgroup they were using to answer the survey questions, a response of “less than three months” was included so that individuals who did not actually meet the inclusion criteria for the study could be removed. Five individuals chose this response, and thus, were removed.

The qualifications for this study were stated three times: in the title of the study on MTurk, in the description of the study on MTurk, and capitalized and bolded on the informed consent of the study (the first page of the survey on SurveyGizmo). As was indicated, there were still participants whose responses indicated that they did not meet
this criterion, and who were subsequently removed from the data set. Quality checks (e.g., please choose “5” for this item) were also in place to make sure that individuals were taking the survey honestly. Ultimately, issues like these are common when using online surveys (Wright, 2005).

Very little research exists examining the relationships between fit literature and conflict, and only the present study (to this author’s knowledge) has examined PG fit and conflict perceptions in relation to one another. Taken a step further, this study was the first to study PG fit on a multidimensional level in combination with conflict perceptions. As such, these findings should be viewed as preliminary; although this is not in and of itself a limitation of the research, it does make the need for further research on the topic particularly pressing.

Future research may attempt to replicate these findings with a different/multi-item perceived performance measure, but based on these data, it seems unlikely that moderation will emerge without changing the focus of the scale. Additionally, it may have been useful to conduct an experimental study in which perceived performance of a particular group of individuals could have been manipulated (high vs. low performance). However, an experimental study with a participant pool of individuals in the workforce is not practical. Another limitation relates to the task interdependence scale chosen, which had no validity information to support the measure. Using a more established measure for task interdependence might have yielded significant results. For example, Pearce, Sommer, Morris, and Friderger (1992) created and validated a simple six-item task interdependence scale, which other studies have used and validated as well (e.g., Sharma & Yetton, 2003).
Additionally, there are different ways in which task interdependence can be measured, and as mentioned above for perceived performance, an experimental design may have yielded different results. For example, Wageman and Baker (1997) studied task and reward interdependence’s effects on group behavior and performance by using participants and setting up experimental groups. Each group had different levels of task interdependence (e.g., low or high) in which they would have to depend upon others for unique knowledge in a copy-editing task. Simply asking individuals to think about their workgroup experiences and reflect upon how much they depended upon others and how much others depended upon them may not be the best method for measuring task interdependence. A better method may have been to use vignettes or an experimental design so that task interdependence could be manipulated. The method chosen to measure task interdependence was used in this study because the author had hoped using a scale looking at two types of interdependence could yield more information into the studied relationship, such that one type of interdependence may be more important to the PG fit conflict relationship than the other. Also, using a pre-existing scale is a practical method over an experimental design when using an online, working sample due to the online nature of this survey. An experimental design would be more ideal in-person than online because researchers can ensure task interdependence is manipulated properly.

Another limitation which was previously mentioned is that the three types of PG fit were highly correlated. A factor analysis was conducted using Principle Axis Factoring and Direct Oblimin rotation. Only one factor emerged, further indicating that the PG fit scale measures one overall construct of PG fit. Thus, it is unknown as to whether it can be inferred that the multidimensional PG fit scale used measures values,
personality, and abilities separately. This limitation potentially applies to the conflict scales used as well.

Lastly, as mentioned previously with task conflict, future research should consider studying the PG fit – conflict relationship by using an objective form of fit. This study measured fit subjectively by asking participants to self-report their fit levels, but objective measures do exist and could provide different results. Continuing the exploration of supplementary and complementary fit types in relation to multidimensional PG fit should also be considered. Although past research indicates that values and traits are supplementary and abilities are complementary (see Seong & Kristof-Brown, 2012), testing the individual supplementary and complementary items in relation to PG fit can provide more confidence in the accuracy of the measures.

Conclusion

Although the hypotheses were not supported, important information can still be taken away from the results. Significant correlations in a direction consistent with research expectations demonstrate that PG fit and perceived conflict share a relationship that merits further exploration: the higher the group fit, the lower the amount of conflict perceived. This sheds important light on the fit and team building literature. It may be beneficial to structure workgroups so that similar others, in regards to values, personality, and abilities (as defined by this study), are working together on projects, team assignments, and so forth.

Evidence provided in this research study indicates that PG fit and conflict perceptions share a relationship, such that as one’s fit with their workgroup is higher, the amount of conflict they perceive is lower. These results support that it is important to
continue studying this relationship. Researchers interested in the topics of multidimensional fit and conflict perceptions should continue expanding the current literature in ways suggested in this paper, and to one’s imagination. The benefits of perceived group fit have shown positive outcomes in group and team settings, and it is up to future researchers to discover what other aspects in the workplace can be improved by having good group fit.
Chapter VI

Summary

Person-group (PG) fit, also known as person-team fit, is one of the most underresearched person-environment (PE) fit constructs (Kristof-Brown & Zimmerman, Johnson, 2005). PG fit has positively correlated with multiple Industrial/Organizational (I/O) variables, such as job satisfaction, team commitment, and group cohesion, exemplifying the importance of establishing fit among group and team members (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, and Johnson, 2005). However, no research to this author’s knowledge has examined whether PG fit can predict the amount of conflict one perceives in the workplace. Taken further, this study attempts to study PG fit on a multidimensional level including values, personality, and abilities.

Conflict in the workplace can contribute to multiple unwanted outcomes, especially if some individuals perceive conflicts occurring differently than others (Chatman & Jehn, 2000). Primarily, negative effects have been found on group outcomes for relationship and task conflict (De Dreu & Weingart, 2003). Process conflict has been found to negatively affect group outcomes as well (Amason, 1996; Jehn, 1995). Combining the above topics, it is important to investigate how individuals, especially those responsible for team and group formation, can prevent conflicts from occurring. Research presented in this study supports the idea that fit with one’s workgroup can lessen the amount of conflict perceived. Therefore, the relationship between how well
individuals fit their workgroup (i.e., PG fit) and the amount of conflict perceived by these individuals will be examined. There is one main question of the present research: Does PG fit, defined on a multidimensional level (encompassing values-based group fit, abilities-based group fit, and personality-based group fit in one's overall evaluation of fit to a group) affect the amount of intragroup conflict (i.e., relationship conflict, task conflict, and process conflict) perceived by individuals in workgroups?

Although existing constructs can be used to draw links between PG fit and perceived conflict, there is little research simultaneously examining the two constructs. The closest study is the work of Ravlin and Ritchie (2006), who focused on the interrelationship of perceived and actual values fit and attitudinal outcomes of perceived and actual fit on an organizational level. Conflict perceptions were one of the studied outcomes, but very little is discussed about what the authors found in this respect. The type of conflict studied was given and the authors reported perceived and actual fit significantly related to conflict perceptions, along with their interaction. Thus, the rationale as to why these hypotheses are examined is to expand on the ideas of Ravlin and Ritchie and Seong and Kristof-Brown’s (2012) study, building off the finding that values congruence has a positive effect on performance (Adkins et al., 1996).

H1a: The effect of participants’ values-based PG fit on relationship conflict will be moderated by perceived group performance, such that as perceived group performance increases, the relationship between PG fit and relationship conflict will become increasingly negative.

H1b: The effect of participants’ values-based PG fit on task conflict will be moderated by perceived group performance, such that as perceived group
performance increases, the relationship between PG fit and task conflict will become increasingly negative.

H1c: The effect of participants' values-based PG fit on process conflict will be moderated by perceived group performance, such that as perceived group performance increases, the relationship between PG fit and process conflict will become increasingly negative.

Personality-based fit research lacks consistency, but evidence does suggest personality characteristics are important to group outcomes. Past research has found teams work better together when certain personality characteristics are high in groups (Barrick et al., 1998).

H2a: The effect of participants' personality-based PG fit on relationship conflict will be moderated by perceived group performance, such that as perceived group performance increases, the relationship between PG fit and relationship conflict will become increasingly negative.

H2b: The effect of participants' personality-based PG fit on task conflict will be moderated by perceived group performance, such that as perceived group performance increases, the relationship between PG fit and task conflict will become increasingly negative.

H2c: The effect of participants' personality-based PG fit on process conflict will be moderated by perceived group performance, such that as perceived group performance increases, the relationship between PG fit and process conflict will become increasingly negative.
Abilities-based fit depends on whether an individual can meet the demands of their work environment (French, Caplan, & Harrison, 1982; Kristof, 1996). It is likely that one’s abilities will affect how one performs in a group, and thus, how others perceive one’s performance.

H3a: The effect of participants’ abilities-based PG fit on relationship conflict will be moderated by perceived group performance, such that as perceived group performance increases, the relationship between PG fit and relationship conflict will become increasingly negative.

H3b: The effect of participants’ abilities-based PG fit on task conflict will be moderated by perceived group performance, such that as perceived group performance increases, the relationship between PG fit and task conflict will become increasingly negative.

H3c: The effect of participants’ abilities-based PG fit on process conflict will be moderated by perceived group performance, such that as perceived group performance increases, the relationship between PG fit and process conflict will become increasingly negative.

Method

Participants

Participants eligible for this study included any individuals who were working, or had worked, with a team or workgroup for a period of at least three months. All participants \((N = 86)\) were over the age of 18 (79% Caucasian; 68.6% male; 57% American). The mean age was 30 (SD = 10.53) and 46.5% of individuals reported having a bachelor’s degree. The majority (31.4%) of individuals reported working with their
workgroups for a period of three to six months, and the average tenure was around four and a half years (SD = 0.47). Participants were recruited through MTurk, and individuals received 50 cents for completing the brief survey.

**Measures**

**Multidimensional PG fit.** PG fit was measured consistent with the approach used by Seong and Kristof-Brown (2012). All items were assessed on a 7-point scale (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree), with higher scores indicating stronger fit. Seong and Kristof-Brown tested different models of PG fit (i.e., multidimensional vs. non-multidimensional models) and found the best fitting model was one supporting a multidimensional, superordinate construct of PG fit. This suggests that distinctions between perceptions of each individual subtype of PG fit (i.e., values-based fit, personality-based fit, and abilities-based fit) are driven by a superordinate construct of fit. Thus, the authors indicated that the best fitting model tested was one in which individuals first formed an overall perception of compatibility with one’s team or group (superordinate) and then used this perception to assess their own fit on underlying dimensions (values, personality, and abilities). No other studies to this author’s knowledge have attempted to measure the multidimensionality of PG fit this way, except for Seong and Kristof-Brown.

**Values-based fit.** Values-based fit was assessed as Seong and Kristof-Brown (2012) did, with three items from Cable and DeRue’s (2002) study. The coefficient reliability of the values-based PG fit scale in the current study was $\alpha = .87$.

**Personality-based fit.** Personality-based fit was also measured consistent with Seong and Kristof-Brown’s (2012) methodology. Seong and Kristof-Brown used items
from Cable and DeRue (2002) and Cable and Judge’s (1996) measures, constituting a total of three items. Seong and Kristof-Brown (2012) adapted these measures to fit the measurement of PG fit. The coefficient alpha reliability of the personality-based PG fit scale in the current study was $\alpha = .88$.

*Abilities-based fit.* Abilities-based fit was measured in accordance with Seong and Kristof-Brown (2012), by using three adapted items of Cable and DeRue’s (2002) scale. “My job” was adapted to “team task” in order to assess fit to the team’s task. The coefficient alpha reliability of the abilities-based PG fit scale in the current study was $\alpha = .81$.

*Intragroup conflict scale.* The Intragroup Conflict Scale (ICS) established by Jehn (1995) was utilized to measure perceived relationship and task conflict of group members. Three of these items measured relationship conflict and three items measured task conflict. Participants were asked to respond to questions over a prior three month period of working with a group. The scale is scored with a 5-point scale (1 = *none* to 5 = *a great deal*). The coefficient alpha reliability of the relationship conflict scale was .87, and the coefficient alpha reliability of the task conflict scale was .84.

*Process conflict.* Process conflict was assessed using three items from Shah and Jehn (1993), following the process conflict measurement methods of Jehn et al. (1999). The coefficient alpha reliability of the process conflict scale in the current study was $\alpha = .88$.

*Perceived group performance.* Individuals’ perceived group performance was measured by asking participants to subjectively rate their group’s overall performance. Participants answered the question, “Overall, how well do/did you feel your group
performed?” on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (very poorly) to 7 (very well). Past studies have also adopted this method of measuring perceived performance (e.g., DeNisi, Randolph, & Blencoe, 1983; Sansone, 1986). In this section of the survey, participants answered how long they have or had worked in the group, and were given the opportunity to write out any other information they wanted to share regarding their experiences working with this particular workgroup.

**Task interdependence.** Taggar and Haines’ (2006) task interdependence scales were used to measure task interdependence. All items were rated on a scale ranging from 1 (completely independent) to 7 (completely dependent). The coefficient alpha reliability of the initiated task interdependence scale in the current study was $\alpha = .77$; the reliability of the received task interdependence scale in the current study was $\alpha = .71$.

**Demographics.** Demographic information that was collected included age, sex, race, nationality, education, profession, and number of years working for an organization amongst other common demographic questions.

**Procedure**

Participants were told that they were completing the survey to get a better understanding of workgroup functionality, and it was required that electronic consent forms were read and accepted in order to participate in the study. Quality check items were included (e.g., “Please choose “strongly agree” as the answer to this item”) so that participants taking the survey improperly were eliminated. Participants were debriefed about the meaning of the study immediately after completing their surveys.
Results

Mean centered versions of all predictor variables were used in the analyses prior to computing the interaction term. None of the hypothesized moderations emerged. However, significant correlations were found between a number of variables, and many predictors were significant even in the presence of the moderator variable. In summary, values, personality, and abilities based PG fit were all significantly and positively correlated with perceived performance, and all three types of PG fit were significantly and negatively correlated with relationship, task, and process conflict. Values, personality, and abilities-based PG fit were all significantly correlated with one another as well. This finding suggests that the multidimensional PG fit scale measures a single fit factor, and thus, will be discussed more in the limitations section. This finding applies to the conflict measures used as well and will also be discussed as a potential limitation.

Perceived performance did not significantly moderate the relationship between values-based PG fit and any form of conflict, thereby failing to support H1a-1c. Both perceived performance ($\beta = -.31, p = .04$) and values-based PG fit ($\beta = -.24, p < .01$) were significantly predictive of reported relationship conflict, but the interaction term was not ($\beta = .01, \text{ns}$). Similarly, perceived performance ($\beta = -.30, p = .02$) and values-based PG fit ($\beta = -.24, p = .04$) significantly predicted reported task conflict, but the interaction term was not significantly predictive ($\beta = -.13, \text{ns}$), and although perceived performance ($\beta = -.32, p = .01$) significantly predicted reported process conflict, values-based PG fit ($\beta = -.19, \text{ns}$) and the interaction term did not ($\beta = -.09, \text{ns}$). Perceived performance also did not significantly moderate the relationship between personality-based PG fit and any form of conflict (H2a-2c). Similar to the first set of hypotheses, both
perceived performance ($\beta = -.27, p = .04$) and personality-based PG fit ($\beta = -.28, p = .03$) were significantly predictive of reported relationship conflict, but the product of the predictors was not ($\beta = -.09, \text{ns}$). Perceived performance ($\beta = -.34, p < .01$) significantly predicted reported task conflict, but personality-based PG fit ($\beta = -.17, \text{ns}$) and the product of the predictor were not significantly predictive ($\beta = -.18, \text{ns}$). Perceived performance ($\beta = -.35, p = .01$) also significantly predicted reported process conflict, but personality-based PG fit ($\beta = -.21, \text{ns}$) and the product of the predictor did not ($\beta = -.10, \text{ns}$).

Lastly, perceived performance did not significantly moderate the relationship between abilities-based PG fit and any form of conflict (H3a-3c). Although both perceived performance ($\beta = -.32, p = .01$) and abilities-based PG fit ($\beta = -.26, p = .05$) were significantly predictive of reported relationship conflict, the product of the predictors was not ($\beta = -.15, \text{ns}$). Similarly, perceived performance ($\beta = -.31, p = .01$) and abilities-based PG fit ($\beta = -.26, p = .05$) were significantly predictive of reported task conflict, but the product of the predictors was not ($\beta = -.20, \text{ns}$). Finally, perceived performance ($\beta = -.33, p = .01$) and abilities-based PG fit ($\beta = -.29, p = .03$) were significantly predictive of reported process conflict, but the product again was not ($\beta = -.13, \text{ns}$).

**Discussion**

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether multidimensional PG fit affects conflict perceptions one perceives when working in a workgroup. As the results indicate, no hypotheses were supported in this study. Based on the data, it is clear that for many of the regressions, the univariate effects of the predictors were significant, but the
predictors did not statistically interact (see Tables 2 - 10). The correlation matrix shows the relationships between multidimensional PG fit performance predictors and the intergroup conflict variables. As the correlations show, the relationships between the predictors (values, personality, and abilities PG fit, and criteria (relationship, task, and process conflict) are consistently negative and significant. These relationships are all in the $r = -.30$ to $r = -.45$ range, indicating medium to large effect sizes (Cohen, 1992).

**Contributions**

As mentioned previously, significant correlations between many of the variables were found. Values-based PG fit was significantly and positively correlated with perceived performance, initiated task interdependence, and received task interdependence. Values-based PG fit was also significantly and negatively correlated with relationship conflict, task conflict, and process conflict. These relationships indicate that groups who are high on values-based PG fit (i.e., sharing common values and beliefs) perform better, offer and receive knowledge from workgroup members, and experience less intergroup conflict. These relationships line up with past research. For example, value congruence has shown positive outcomes for workgroups such as satisfaction and performance (Adkins, Ravlin, & Meglino, 1996). More specifically, past research supports the significant correlation found in the present study between values-based PG fit and perceived.

Personality-based PG fit was significantly and positively correlated with perceived performance, and significantly and negatively related to relationship conflict, task conflict, and process conflict. Past research has examined particular personality traits as they related to team outcomes, such as conscientiousness, emotional stability, and
extraversion (Mount, Barrick, & Stewart, 1998). A future research direction could be to study individual personality traits (e.g., conscientiousness, emotional stability, and extraversion) in measuring multidimensional PG fit and conflict perceptions.

Abilities based PG fit was significantly positively correlated with perceived performance, and significantly negatively correlated with relationship conflict, task conflict, and process conflict. These findings suggest that if individuals can meet the needs and demands of their workgroup, less conflict perceptions may be perceived. These findings also support the idea that less conflict will occur if individuals can meet the task requirements of the group (i.e., abilities-based PG fit). As conflict literature indicates, differing research exists as to whether task conflict is beneficial or harmful to group settings (see De Dreu & Weingart, 2003, and De Wit et al., 2012), so this finding has the potential to contribute to the broader discussion.

Although the present research cannot be compared directly to the ongoing debate surrounding task conflict, these findings do suggest that being able to complete the tasks required by the group may lead to lower conflict perceptions for relationship, task, and process conflict. All three relationships examined were in the expected direction, meaning the higher the PG fit, (values, personality, abilities) the lower the amount of conflict (relationship, task, and process). It is possible that if task conflict were measured objectively, results could differ, since conflict has been shown to have certain positive outcomes (e.g., tasks requiring higher-level thought processing, Jehn, 1995). Another contribution of this study is a deeper understanding to the psychometrics of multidimensional PG fit. Analyses show that all three fit types are significantly correlated with one another, indicating collinearity.
Limitations and Future Research

Although MTurk has many conveniences for collecting a workgroup sample, a lack of supervision when collecting data can create problems, including candidates not filling out the survey accurately or seriously. For the survey item asking participants how long they were or had been working in the particular workgroup they were using to answer the survey questions, a response of "less than three months" was included so that individuals who did not actually meet the inclusion criteria for the study could be removed. The qualifications for this study were stated three times: in the title of the study on MTurk, in the description of the study on MTurk, and capitalized and bolded on the informed consent of the study (the first page of the survey on SurveyGizmo). Quality checks (e.g., please choose "5" for this item) were also in place to make sure that individuals were taking the survey honestly.

Very little research exists examining the relationships between fit literature and conflict, and only the present study (to this author’s knowledge) has examined PG fit and conflict perceptions in relation to one another. Taken a step further, this study was the first to study PG fit on a multidimensional level in combination with conflict perceptions. As such, these findings should be viewed as preliminary; although this is not in and of itself a limitation of the research, it does make the need for further research on the topic particularly pressing.

Future research may attempt to replicate these findings with a different/multi-item perceived performance measure, but based on these data, it seems unlikely that moderation will emerge without changing the focus of the scale. Additionally, it may have been useful to conduct an experimental study in which perceived performance of a
PARTICULAR GROUP OF INDIVIDUALS COULD HAVE BEEN MANIPULATED (HIGH VS. LOW PERFORMANCE). ANOTHER LIMITATION RELATES TO THE TASK INTERDEPENDENCE SCALE CHOSEN, WHICH HAD NO VALIDITY INFORMATION TO SUPPORT THE MEASURE. ADDITIONALLY, THERE ARE DIFFERENT WAYS IN WHICH TASK INTERDEPENDENCE CAN BE MEASURED, AND AS MENTIONED ABOVE FOR PERCEIVED PERFORMANCE, AN EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN MAY HAVE YIELDED DIFFERENT RESULTS. A BETTER METHOD MAY HAVE BEEN TO USE VIGNETTES OR AN EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN SO THAT TASK INTERDEPENDENCE COULD BE MANIPULATED. ANOTHER LIMITATION WHICH WAS PREVIOUSLY MENTIONED IS THAT THE THREE TYPES OF PG FIT WERE HIGHLY CORRELATED. A FACTOR ANALYSIS WAS CONDUCTED USING PRINCIPLE AXIS FACTORING AND DIRECT OBLIMIN ROTATION. ONLY ONE FACTOR EMERGED, FURTHER INDICATING THAT THE PG FIT SCALE MEASURES ONE OVERALL CONSTRUCT OF PG FIT. THIS LIMITATION POTENTIALLY APPLIES TO THE CONFLICT SCALES USED AS WELL.

Lastly, as mentioned previously with task conflict, future research should consider studying the PG fit – conflict relationship by using an objective form of fit. Continuing the exploration of supplementary and complementary fit types in relation to multidimensional PG fit should also be considered.

**Conclusion**

Although the hypotheses were not supported, important information can still be taken away from the results. Significant correlations in a direction consistent with research expectations demonstrate that PG fit and perceived conflict share a relationship that merits further exploration: the higher the group fit, the lower the amount of conflict perceived. This sheds important light on the fit and team building literature. It may be beneficial to structure workgroups so that similar others, in regards to values, personality,
and abilities (as defined by this study), are working together on projects, team assignments, and so forth.

Evidence provided in this research study indicates that PG fit and conflict perceptions share a relationship, such that as one's fit with their workgroup is higher, the amount of conflict they perceive is lower. The benefits of perceived group fit have shown positive outcomes in group and team settings, and it is up to future researchers to discover what other aspects in the workplace can be improved by having good group fit.
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Appendix A

References and Sources for all Copyrighted Measures

Multidimensional Person Group Fit Measure


Relationship and Task Conflict Measure


Process Conflict Measure


Task Interdependence Measure

Appendix B

Perceived Group Performance Measure

Thinking of the same team or workgroup as before, please answer the following question on a scale from 1 to 7 where 1 = “very poorly”, and 7 = “very well.”

1) Overall, how well do you feel your group or team performs/performed?

1 --------------2 -------------------3 ----------------------4 ---------------5----------------------6-----------------7

Very poorly Average Very well

2) How long have/had you been working with the team or workgroup you used to answer the previous questions in this survey?

a. 3 - 6 months, 6 months - 1 year, 1 - 2 years, 3 - 4 years, 5 or more

years.

3) Please provide any other information you would like to share about your experiences working with your workgroup:
Appendix C

Demographics Scale

Please check the box or write in the answer that best describes you for each question.

1) Please provide your Mturk worker ID number.
   - (fill in)

2) Please indicate your sex.
   - Male, Female, or prefer to not answer

3) Please indicate your age.
   - (fill in)

4) Please indicate your race.
   - (Caucasian/Non-Hispanic, Black or of African descent, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Indian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, American Indian or Alaskan, Multiracial, other, prefer not to answer)

5) Please indicate your nationality.
   - (fill in)

6) Please indicate your country of residence.
   - (fill in)

7) Please indicate how many years you have lived in your country of residence.
   - (fill in)

8) Please indicate your highest level of education achieved.
   - Some secondary education, High School Diploma (or equivalent), Associates degree, Bachelor’s degree, Master’s degree, Doctorate

8) Please indicate your area of profession (e.g., education, engineering)
Appendix C (Cont)

5) Please indicate length of time (e.g., days, months, or years) you have been employed at your current organization.

a. (fill in)
Appendix D

IRB Approval Letter

April 4, 2013

Lindsey Burke
1346 Paxton Ave.
Cincinnati, OH 45208

Re: Protocol #1287, Person-Group Fit and Perceived Conflict in the Workplace

Dear Ms. Burke:

The IRB has reviewed the materials regarding your study, referenced above, and has determined that it meets the criteria for the Exempt from Review category under Federal Regulation 45CFR46. Your protocol is approved as exempt research, and therefore requires no further oversight by the IRB.

If you wish to modify your study, including the addition of data collection sites, it will be necessary to obtain IRB approval prior to implementing the modification. If any adverse events occur, please notify the IRB immediately.

Please contact our office if you have any questions. We wish you success with your project!

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Kathleen J. Hart, Ph.D., ABPP
Vice Chair, Institutional Review Board
Xavier University

KJH: 3b

C: Morrie Mullins, Advisor
Appendix E

Consent Form

You are being given the opportunity to participate in a Master’s thesis study conducted by Lindsey Burke at Xavier University. The purpose of this study is to better understand the relationship between how group members fit in their workgroup and how they function in the workplace. By completing this survey, you will be contributing to the research presently available on how groups function. You are eligible for this study because you have indicated that you have been a part of a workgroup for a period of at least three months. For this study, you will be required to respond to a number of survey items. Please note that some of these items are included for quality check purposes, and that if you fail the quality checks, your data will not be included in the study and you will not be paid for your participation.

This survey is anticipated to take about 20 minutes. There are no known risks associated with participating in this study. Participation in this study is voluntary, and you are free to withdraw from the study at anytime without penalty. If your data passes all relevant quality checks, you will be paid $0.50 for participating. However, if you decide to withdraw before completion (when you will be asked to enter your MTurk worker ID, as described below) or do not pass the quality check items, you will not be compensated. Please be advised that you will only have 60 minutes to complete the survey. You must be at least 18 years old to participate in this study. Your survey answers will be kept confidential. No one, other than the researchers, will have access to your information, and identifying information (e.g., your full name) will not be collected at any time as part of the study. You will be required to enter your MTurk unique worker ID at the end of the survey to receive compensation. MTurk worker ID numbers will be removed prior to any data analyses, further ensuring anonymity.

If you have any questions at any time during the study, you may contact the principal investigator, Lindsey Burke at burkeb@xavier.edu or the faculty advisor, Dr. Morrie Mullins, at mullins@xavier.edu. Questions about your rights as a research subject should be directed to Xavier University’s Institutional Review Board at 513-745-2870, or electronically at irb@xavier.edu.

By clicking on the survey link below, you agree to the following statement: I have been given information about this research study and its risks and benefits and have had the opportunity to ask questions and to have my questions answered to my satisfaction. I freely give my consent to participate in this research project.
Appendix F

Quality Check Items

1) Please choose “5” for this item.
   Will be inserted near the middle of the intragroup conflict scale.

2) Please choose “3” for this item.
   Will be inserted near the middle of the task interdependence scale.
Appendix G

Debriefing Form

Thank you for participating in this study. Its purpose is to understand the relationship between how an individual fits into their workgroup or team in the workplace, and perceptions of conflict within the workgroup or team. This exact relationship has not been explored before, highlighting the importance of your participation in this study.

If you have any questions or concerns, or if you would like to inquire about the results of this study, please contact the principal investigator, Lindsey Burke at burkel@xavier.edu or her faculty advisor, Dr. Morell Mullins, at mullins@xavier.edu.