

Exploring communication within non-collocated teams: Human factor dimensions of technology, training,
and trust

Ingrid Richrath

EME 5056 - Tuesday Section

Abstract: Although groupware technology has evolved over recent years, technology advancements have far exceeded the understanding of human factors related to collaborative systems. Transferring from a team approach to a virtual team is not as simple as one would anticipate. For example, when the Clampetts moved from “the hills” to Beverly Hills, the Clampetts encountered different trust issues, had communication barriers to overcome in surviving in the “big city”, and experienced the new “fangled thing-a-ma-gigs” that their money could buy. Although life is the same, everything is different. Therefore, if traditional teams choose to act in a similar manner in a virtual environment, the expected outcomes may or may not be identical. It can be suggested that underlying human factors sabotage team performance when utilizing groupware. Defining groupware creates a foundation for this review of literature. The human factors of technology, training and trust are analyzed to help understand how collectivities’ performance is impacted. Determining how to overcome communication boundaries in using new technology is one factor in developing successful virtual teams. Evaluating training needs has become an increasingly critical piece of team communication and group cohesiveness. The challenges in overcoming trust issues in non-collocated teams will be considered. The author examines possible strategies to making a more efficient and effective implementation of a virtual team.

Introduction

Mountain-man-turned-millionaire Jed Clampett moved his family of hillbillies to Beverly Hills. Refusing to conform to modern society, the Clampett family continued living their down-to-earth “back woods” lifestyle. Since the affluent conveniences (technology) were new to them, they had to either learn to use the amenities (training) or to find work-arounds to return to their normal “back woods” lifestyle. For example, although the Clampetts had a refrigerator, a “root cellar” was created for to store food. Granny also continued to make soap instead of purchasing it from the store. Consequently, they did not utilize the modern-day conveniences. In addition, although Granny, a senile, paranoid grandmother, carried a gun, this “communication” technique may have been acceptable in the hills, but was inappropriate in the upper-class of Beverly Hills and sabotaged building any relationships (trust). Similarly, transitioning from a traditional face-to-face environment to a virtual world is an opportunity that will have some obstacles to overcome.

Background

Although the definition of groupware has evolved over the years, the term can be generically defined as the use of information technology to facilitate communication and collaboration. Groupware allows dynamic teams to interact across time and space (Olesen and Myers, 1999). Collaborative components commonly include electronic bulletin boards, on-line chat rooms, audio and video conferencing systems, email, electronic document management system, and threaded discussion databases (Harris and Sherblom, 2002; Warkentin and Beranek, 1999). This seemingly boundaryless network is situated in either an Intranet or Internet (Harris and Sherblom, 2002) for sharing documents, files discussions, issues, and tasks (Harris and Sherblom, 2002; Zielinski, 2000). Furthermore, collaborative software tools can be used for brainstorming, alternative rating, and consensus building (Satzinger and Olfman, 1995).

Collectivities encompass two terms that often appear synonymous - groups and teams. It is important to distinguish between the two. Groups are collections of participants that are individually accountable (i.e., exhibiting individualistic values). Teams are collections of participants who work jointly to meet a common task or goal (i.e., demonstrating collectivistic values), who are evaluated based on deliverables and who are accountable as a team (Lussier, 1997).

Communication tools used for information exchange are generically referred to as groupware. However, a variety of similar terms have evolved and eventually have blended together: Computer-Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW), Group Decision Support Systems (GDSS), Group Support Systems (GSS), Electronic Meeting Systems (EMS), Computer-Support Collaborative Work (CSCW), Computer-Mediated Communications (CMC) or Group Negotiation Support Systems (Caouette and O'Connor, 1998; Olesen and Myers, 1999; Qureshi and Vogel, 2001; Satzinger and Olfman, 1995).

Technology-driven support for collectivities can be based on time and location. Two types of synchronous collaborations can occur - at the same place or at various locations. Computer support can be supplied for the traditional, face-to-face meetings that occur at the same time in the same place. These meetings include collocated teams who meet to discuss issues, report progress, or finalize agreements. The second type of synchronous meetings occurs at various locations and is generically defined as electronic meetings. Groupware supplements electronic meetings that occur at the same time

but in different locations to dynamically exchange information in real time. Conversely, asynchronous meetings occur when teams need to interact with each other electronically at different times and at different locations. These asynchronous meetings are necessary for planning future meetings and following through with tasks after the conclusion of meetings (Satzinger and Olfman, 1995). Allowing the users to have more time to compose documentation, asynchronous teams require highly structured meetings and provide a greater exchange of documents (Warkentin and Beranek, 1999).

Technology

With companies trying to maintain a sustainable competitive advantage, staying on the cutting edge of technology has been one of the top priorities. Improving the corporate infrastructure includes software and hardware upgrades, web-enabling technologies, and high-speed network access. Increasing the technological responsibilities, groupware has recently been incorporated into the telecommunications and information network of companies. John Masciantoni, previously the Information Director of a software company, stated, "It is critical to any corporation to have an integrated information system that includes a central file repository. Every person should have access to files to increase the effectiveness of completing their job in a timely manner." (J. Masciantoni, personal communication, November 10, 2001.) Although the concerns of any Information Systems Department is predominately focused on the functionality of the technology, compatibility with the current technological infrastructure, and the portability of the collaborative system, the human factor in implementing technology must be an important consideration as well.

Using collaborative software as a communication device to distribute information is a viable resource involving human interaction (Alford, 1999). Therefore, collaborative teams should have groupware systems that support and enhance the communication network among non-located members. Encouraging human interaction and not technical interaction maximizes the efficiency of group members; thereby groupware should not be technology driven (Harris and Sherblom, 2002; van der Smagt, 2000; Warkentin and Beranek, 1999).

Conversely, some have the opinion that the primary motivational factor in information system purchases should be focused on the technology. Communication infrastructures demand a level of technical complexity in order to maintain an integrated environment. When making purchasing decisions, minimal (if any) considerations include organizational and human interaction issues (Carletta et al., 2000; Jackson, 1999). However, to significantly increase the potential of a team's success in a technology-enhanced environment, it is important to understand the impact the end users will have in a team achieving their objectives (Jackson, 1999). Tunnel vision in using the latest and greatest technology has transcended an opportunity into an obstacle and consequently, the obstacle will have to be overcome by understanding the human factor.

Three studies supported that group members' attitudes towards teams and groupware impacts the team's performance. Researchers of one study suggested that attitudes and experience could be important in determining team performance (Satzinger and Olfman, 1995). Another field study determined that corporate culture, attitudes and team norms impacted the acceptance of groupware after participants demonstrated a positive attitude toward the technology and team work (Satzinger and Olfman, 1995). Researchers of a third study found that groupware provided motivational factors to produce quality ideas (Caouette and O'Connor, 1998).

Therefore, determining how and when collectivities use technology-supported systems is a consideration that will impact the success of the team (Carletta et al., 2000). Just as the technological benefits vary depending on the software, hardware, and network, creating a high performance team will depend on a number of human factors.

Media Rich

Traditional collocated teams conduct meetings in a face-to-face environment. With non-collocated teams in a virtual environment, technology will substitute the face-to-face communication. Furthermore, the term "virtual teams" is considered by some as an oxymoron given that meetings in a physically dispersed environment lose face-to-face communications (Qureshi and Vogel, 2001). Since computer-augmented teams have minimal non-verbal and paraverbal cues (van der Smagt, 2000), non-collocated members have been challenged to overcome the constraints of collaborative systems (Jackson, 1999; Warkentin and Beranek, 1999).

Verbal and non-verbal cues are important aspects in determining the intent of messages and promoting taking turns in a conversation. Non-verbal cues during a face-to-face interaction include hand gestures, eye movements, facial expressions, and other body language (van der Smagt, 2000; Warkentin and Beranek, 1999) while paraverbal cues encompass vocal tone, inflection, and voice volume (Warkentin and Beranek, 1999). These cues facilitate a conversation by providing meaning and promoting taking turns in a conversation. Traditional (face to face) communication develops relational links and includes exchanging social information naturally (Harris and Sherbloom, 2002; Warkentin and Beranek, 1999).

Conversely, if an on-line discussion occurred on the internet in a chat room or on a discussion board, the text-based communication limits the traditional face-to-face cues. Overcoming the social information boundaries in a virtual environment, users have learned to use socioemotional on-line interactions, such as utilizing 'emoticons' to indicate smiling faces (facial expressions), typing text in upper case to reflect shouting (vocal inflections), and entering acronyms to simulate pseudo-audio response such as LOL (i.e., laughing out loud) (Jackson, 1999; Warkentin and Beranek, 1999).

Media richness theory is defined as using the communication medium that matches the task requirements. Specifically, rich media includes face-to-face communication and lean media includes textual-based communication (Warkentin and Beranek, 1999) with various degrees in between. Therefore, the level of richness is conditional on how the multimedia system conveys the message (Jackson, 1999).

If the messaging process contains equivocal information, rich media is needed for effective and timely communication. Rich media facilitates the transmission of nonverbal cues (van der Smagt, 2000) and should be used to overcome disagreements and minimize misunderstandings in complex tasks (Wong and Burton, 2000). Conversely, lean media is more often used in routine situations where impersonal communication is an acceptable form to process textual information (Daft and Lengel, 1986).

Two studies supported that collaborative systems improved team performance. First, Townsend et al. (1998, p. 19) reported that desktop video conferencing systems replaces face-to-face interaction while "making possible more complex levels of communication among team members." Second, although not reporting any substantiated data, one writer's position is that virtual teams are more productive and can provide an effective use of workers' time (Solomon, 2001). However, it is critical to determine if face-to-face interaction should be incorporated into non-located, computer-augmented teams.

Face-to-face interaction includes emotional, attitudinal, relational, contextual, and informational content (Harris and Sherblom, 2002) and should supplement collaborative communication in a non-located environment (Jackson, 1999). Although media rich communication can be used, if uncertainty exists within intentions, face-to-face communication should occur in an attempt to clarify the misunderstandings by distinguishing the various non-verbal cues (van der Smagt, 2000).

Social Information Processing Theory

As technology's sophistication had evolved over the years, researchers have displayed diverse opinions (from technology-based theories to human interaction theories) on the effectiveness and efficiency of computer-augmented communication devices. One human interaction theory, the social information processing theory (Walther, 1996), is defined as the socioemotional exchanges establishing and enhancing relational links. Although face-to-face communication has a quicker transfer rate, computer-augmented teams can develop socioemotional interaction. Furthermore, Warkentin and Beranek (1999, p. 276) had emphasized, "Because stronger relational links in groups have been associated with higher task performance, anything that improves the level of exchange of socioemotional information can improve the outcomes of virtual team processes."

Non-located collaborative teams focus on exchanging content information and due to the nature of electronic communication systems, unintentional counter forces diminish the relational links between team members. However, innovative technology has replicated various socioemotional exchanges and collaborative systems are currently being used to foster personal interaction between team members (Carletta et al., 2000). As noted earlier, computer-generated non-verbal cues include various emotions such as "smiley" faces, sad faces, and hugs (Harris and Sherblom, 2002).

It is important to note that although communication occurs naturally in person-to-person interactions, transferring from the traditional environment to using groupware is not as simple as one would anticipate. Warkentin and Beranek (1999) inferred in one exploratory study using longitudinal series of tasks that social information processing can be enhanced with "virtual team communication" (VTC) training and can be considered as a value-added process to team building. One factor of the training included technology-based etiquette and common abbreviations used in computer-augmented teams to improve interpersonal dynamics. The researchers incorporated a networked socializing phase at the start of a project to strengthen the binding force of a physically distributed team. The researchers concluded that although the VTC experimental group rated lower relational factors in the onset of the study, the participants evaluated the relational variables higher than the control group at the end of the project. Furthermore, the increase in interpersonal socioemotional intensity improved performance and

consequently, the researchers concluded that social information processing could be developed over time (Warkentin and Beranek, 1999).

Training

As the eruption of technology innovations continue, training has become more important than ever. Although some corporations are providing training to enhance the computer literacy of employees, the human factor has also become an increasingly critical piece of team communication and group cohesiveness using collaborative systems.

To exemplify the need for more training, researchers inferred that team members receive little, if any, training (Warkentin and Beranek, 1999) and one writer reported that corporations believe that their staff needed more technology training (Heads buried in the e-sand, 2001). Although another writer determined that the first step to end user training is to focus the curriculum on navigating through the collaborative systems, the writer also concluded that training on team development is another critical element in overcoming the challenges in working in a non-located team (Furst, 1999).

Not only should instruction include training on the collaborative system technologies, it is imperative to advise the team on how to establish acceptable conducts of behavior (Pape, 1997; Qureshi and Vogel, 2001; Townsend, 1998; Warkentin and Beranek, 1999). One company requires a 40 hour training program for all members participating in any process improvement teams (Pape, 1997).

In order to minimize any individualist tendencies to shine in the group, team members should be advised that their team's success is based on developing partnerships within the collectivity (van der Smagt, 2000). A team member's attitude should reflect a level of commitment to the team and not toward individual objectives (Caouette and O'Connor, 1998). Although a corporation is made up of individual participants, staff should collectively work together to achieve the projects' or organization's objectives. Without a collectivist approach, collaborative systems are viewed as individual productivity tools and does not promote success for the team (Olesen and Myers, 1999).

To demonstrate the impact of "soft-skills" training on teams, the purpose of one study was to determine the effect of virtual team communication (VTC) training on the interpersonal interactions among group participants (Warkentin and Beranek, 1999). With the study based on the premise to have technology supportive computer-augmented systems and not technology driven, the researchers instructed the participants on how the absence of non-verbal and paraverbal cues can result in misunderstandings and poor communication. The researchers concluded that teams receiving VTC

training enhanced relational links faster than teams who did not receive VTC training. Therefore, the researchers recommended corporations offer some form of social information interaction at the onset of projects – either by providing end-users VTC training or by commencing the projects with face-to-face meetings to include all participants.

Diversity Initiative Training

Since non-collocated teams are global entities, it is important to understand the dynamics of on-line asynchronous communication in a culturally rich environment. If equivocal information is transmitted via electronic correspondence, due to time-zone differences, the misunderstanding may take a few days to clear up. Therefore, educating the end users to create explicit and concise messages is of utmost importance. In addition, to assist culturally diverse teams, a “group dictionary” can be created to assist users in learning unfamiliar terms (Qureshi and Vogel, 2000). Furthermore, participants must be cognizant of the various cultures they will be associated with in the collaborative teams.

In a computer-augmented team, determining the gender, race, ethnicity, age, national origin of another end-user is elusive at best. Although Jackson et al. (1995) described readily detectable attributes of teams included age, gender, and national/ethnic origin, this research would only be applicable to non-computer augmented groups. For example, if a user communicated with another end-user via on-line messaging, it is not possible to discern any physical attributes (readily detectable) of the other individual during textual transmissions. It is for this reason that diversity training must be placed at a higher priority than if the team was in a traditional (face-to-face) team. To strengthen the team’s cohesiveness and effectiveness in a culturally diversified group, the team’s participants must be trained of the cross-cultural differences and advised on proven methods to minimize any cultural barriers (Townsend, 1998).

Therefore, with companies diminishing cultural barriers to become global corporations, diversity initiative training must be included in any rollout of collaborative software to maximize the team’s performance in achieving departmental or corporate goals. In addition to improving commitment and frank expression, researchers concluded that providing training in virtual communication enhanced trust exhibited by teams (Warkentin and Beranek, 1999).

Trust

Effective non-collated teams have to develop high trust in order to have confidence that others will do what is expected of them. If individuals trust at “face” value, how is trust established in a “faceless” virtual world? Establishing team building skills should be dovetailed with developing trusting collaborations (Qureshi and Vogel, 2001). One set of researchers concluded that high trust is a characteristic of successful collaborative system implementations whereas low trust contributed to unsuccessful implementations (Fjermestad and Hiltz, 2000).

Without visual, non-verbal or paraverbal cues, the intention of the messages cannot be determined since the symbols (cues) are not exhibited (Harris and Sherblom, 2002; Platt, 1999). Without historical background data on team members, determining if participants are worthy of trust is a difficult, although critical, task (van der Smagt, 2000). Furthermore, the lack of daily interaction with non-collocated team members will hinder the building of trust.

Intel incorporated face-to-face meetings to develop a foundation of trust within teams. These early onset meetings provided a more efficient non-collocated collaboration. Consequently, trust is an antecedent to an environment that induces a free flow of feedback and open communication (Solomon, 1995). Teams that do not establish trust in the onset of any project will eventually create turmoil in subsequent collaborative sessions (Griggs, 1995).

Conversely, Jarvenpaa et al. (1998) concluded in a study that providing a team-building exercise did not improve or diminish trust in 75 teams – neither the control or experimental groups. Although the participants could not make an audio or visual contact with other team members, the researchers disclosed that this study did not simulate computer-augmented teams in the corporate world. It seems reasonable to point out that collectivities outside any research studies will normally include some form of audio or visual communications (i.e., telephone call, audio conferencing, or video conferencing.)

Feedback

In order prevent groupthink in traditional collocated teams, positive feedback is necessary for the team to encourage creativity, thereby minimizing replicating the traditional protocols and preventing conformance to the status quo (Harris and Sherblom; Olesen and Myers, 1999). Groupthink (Janis,

1982) is defined as rushing to conclusions resulting from the pressures to form a consensus. Therefore, not analyzing all possible solutions to a particular issue could result in diminishing team effectiveness (Yellen et al., 1995).

Although positive feedback is needed in traditional face-to-face teams to develop creativity, researchers suggest that constructive feedback on content can supplement team performance for virtual teams (Jarvenpaa et al., 1998; Qureshi and Vogel, 2001). High trust teams provided frequent constructive feedback and communication among other team members thereby developing an interdependent team instead of a collectivity of independent participants (Jarvenpaa et al., 1998). Therefore, it is cyclical in nature.

The teams benefited from feedback since the messages included suggestions on improving content. High trust teams felt more secure in offering and receiving feedback since suggestions are viewed as professional (and not personal) criticisms (Griggs, 1995; Jarvenpaa et al., 1998) and developed team competencies (Platt, 1999). Although some team members inadvertently duplicated work efforts of others, high trust teams believed that the extra work provided higher-quality results and consequently participants requested for additional feedback to strive for enhanced performance (Jarvenpaa et al., 1998).

Conversely, low trust teams had minimal communication during collaborative virtual projects. Not providing any critical messages that subsequently improved the project, the cursory feedback from low trust teams included verifications the messages were read or a display of a virtual pat on the back (Jarvenpaa et al., 1998).

Whereas high trust members developed the team's interdependence, low trust team members created independent members by circumventing responsibilities to others. In addition, members of low trust teams sabotaged the collaboration by taking on negligible tasks (Jarvenpaa et al., 1998; Mayer et al., 1995; Schnake, 1991) and by refusing to cooperate with others (Mayer et al., 1995; Schnake, 1991). Low trust teams found it difficult to ask for feedback (Platt, 1999). Although there were few disagreements among low trust team members, the researchers inferred that this resulted from the antecedent of minimal feedback; whereas the high trust teams overcame various disagreements by providing constructive alternative solutions (Jarvenpaa et al., 1998).

Low trust teams could be analogous to poor-performing groups, or “pseudo-teams” (Katzenbach and Smith, 1993). “Pseudo-teams” is described as a collectivity of participants portraying individualist instead of collective behavior, performing destructive actions instead of developing the team, and conforming to group norms instead of creating innovative solutions to the project. Participants of low trust teams might withhold information thereby damaging team performance (Jackson, 1999). As noted earlier, groups exhibit individualistic values whereas teams demonstrate collectivistic values.

Participants from high trust and low trust teams needed confirmation that messages were reviewed by receiving timely responses and both teams exchanged minimal social communication (Jarvenpaa et al., 1998). However, the members of the high trust team demonstrated empathy toward others whereas the low trust team rarely offered understanding to others (Jarvenpaa et al., 1998). To minimize equivocality, richer media should be used as noted earlier (van der Smagt, 2000).

Although determining how to develop trust rapidly in computer-augmented teams is unknown (Qureshi and Vogel, 2001), some physically dispersed collectivities have established trust quickly. Some collaborative teams did not assess great significance in enhancing trust to warrant expending valuable time in building it (Odenwald, 1996; Platt, 1999). Furthermore, participants in temporary short-term teams exhibited trust at the onset in order to expedite implementing the project (Jarvenpaa et al., 1998).

Strategies

Technology

Just as the technological benefits vary depending on the software, hardware, and network, enhancing a team's performance will depend on a number of human factors. As noted earlier, telecommunication systems for collaborative teams should be human interaction driven and not technology driven (Alford, 1999; Wong and Burton, 2000).

However, when looking at the technological factors, the latest innovative technological systems may provide for productive communications (Corbin, 1997) and may provide reliability and validity of data for the team (Furst, 1999). However, assessments of the available technology and of the potential uses of the collaborative systems should ascertain the technological tools needed for your virtual team (Harris and Sherblom, 2002). Determine the collaborative equipment appropriate for the function of the team (Pape, 1997) or to coordinate work logistics (Cantu, 1997). For example, sales and marketing should utilize application-sharing tools so that presentation files can be shared.

Richer media is recommended to communicate for more difficult and non-routine tasks, to develop social presence (Harris and Sherblom, 2002), and to minimize equivocality in collaborative on-line discussions (Qureshi and Vogel, 2001; van der Smagt, 2000). At times, it might be necessary to hold periodic face-to-face meetings (Corbin, 1997).

Although leaner media is recommended for routine communication (Harris and Sherblom, 2002), one suggestion is to start with a traditional face-to-face meeting and to finish with leaner media (van der Smagt, 2000). Using whichever media-based technology, remote employees need to understand their value to the company (Corbin, 1997) while norms should be established for group interaction (Warkentin and Beranek, 1999). For example, since some participants might be included in several teams (either traditional or virtual), establishing team identities helps a virtual team have a sense of affiliation with other team members (Jackson, 1999).

To promote social information interactions, the corporate infrastructure must foster interaction among all participants. Coordinate social events for face-to-face interaction or on-line coffee breaks

(Corbin, 1997). Synchronous electronic meetings should be kept sort and informal in order to promote interactivity and sociability (Carletta et al., 2000).

Training

To minimize ad hoc training, corporations must promote training opportunities available to the employees (Alford, 1999; Corbin, 1997). Training programs should provide an opportunity to develop skills for virtual team communication (Furst, 1999).

To maximize a pool of knowledge, develop electronic newsletters to communication projects and to share lessons learned (Corbin, 1997; Qureshi and Vogel, 2001; Zielinski, 2000) or create a central file repository to share files (Zielinski, 2000). For example, ask users to contribute their technique in overcoming obstacles in their project. However, since users will transition from an individualistic to collectivistic approach, learning to share information can be a difficult task (Carletta et al., 2000). Corporations must support information sharing among virtual teams (Qureshi and Vogel, 2001). Since decision making in an electronically enhanced environment is based on pulling data instead of pushing, it is critical to have all the information available.

Developing and implementing diversity initiative programs will train end-users the importance in becoming cognizant of disparate backgrounds. A “group dictionary” can be created to assist users in learning unfamiliar terms (Qureshi and Vogel, 2000). As corporations become global, the cultural barriers will have to be conquered in order to create high-performance teams.

Trust

Trust must be fostered in a multitude of ways. If the corporate culture supports shared processes, decision-making authority should be bestowed to the team (Alford, 1999; Cantu, 1997). Decentralized decision making allows people at all levels to generate critical decisions (Qureshi and Vogel, 2001). Consensus building must be supported by managers who should be prepared to relinquish the authority to make decisions (Vickery et al., 1999).

If managers have to provide performance appraisals on non-located team members, deliverables must be evaluated instead of basing the appraisal on perceptions (Alexander, 2000). In traditional located offices, evaluations can include subjective opinions based on daily perceptions.

However, in a virtual environment, appraisals must be performed on meeting the teams' objectives. Furthermore, the performance appraisals can include other team member's evaluations of their co-workers (Alexander, 2000). If everyone is to be held accountable for their responsibilities, trusting relationships are developed (Cantu, 1997).

Encourage team members to communicate frequently and to provide constructive feedback in order develop trust (Furst, 1999; Jarvenpaa et al., 1998). For example, if a user frequently gets responses to their emails, then a foundation is established to further build trust. In addition, when communicating electronically, messages sent should be expressed clearly and concisely (Alexander, 2000) while messages received should not be quickly misinterpreted (Qureshi and Vogel, 2001).

Conclusion

As the Clampetts moved from the hills to Beverly Hills, although life was the same, everything is different. The new "fangled thing-a-ma-gigs" were too innovative to them (technology) and either the Clampetts learned to use the novelties or they created work-arounds by returning to their normal-lifestyle. For example, although swimming pools are for human fun and relaxation, their "cement pond" was used as a pool of water for their "critters." Perhaps educating the Clampetts of modern societies colloquialism (training), they could have minimized any communication barriers. Furthermore, if the Clampetts did not have spit habits or if they dressed in modern fashions instead of their raggedy clothes with rope belts, following acceptable conducts of behavior could have established foundation for relationships to build (trust). Therefore, when transitioning from a traditional work environment to a virtual world, although the job is the same, everything is different.

References

- Alexander, S. (2000). Virtual teams going global. InfoWorld, 22 (46), 55-56.
- Alford, R. J. (1999). Going virtual, getting real. Training & Development, 55 (1), 34-44.
- Cantu, C. (1997). Virtual teams. Center for the Study of Work Teams, University of North Texas. [On-line]. Retrieved September 25, 2001, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.workteams.unt.edu/reports/Cantu.html>
- Caouette, M. J., & O'Connor, B. N. (1998). The impact of group support systems on corporate teams' stages of development. Journal of Organizational Computing and Electronic Commerce, 8 (1), 57-81.
- Carletta, J., Anderson, A. H., & McEwan, R. (2000). The effects of multimedia communication technology on non-collocated teams: A case study. Ergonomics, 43 (8), 1237-1251.
- Corbin, C. (1997). Tips to ensure good communication in a virtual office. Workforce, 76 (11), 4-5.
- Daft, R. L., and Lengel, R. H. (1986). Organizational Information Requirements, Media Richness and Structural Design. Management Science, 32 (5), p. 554-571.
- Fjermestad, J., & Hiltz, S. R. (2000). Group support systems: A descriptive evaluations of case and field studies. Journal of Management Information Systems, 17 (3), 115-159.
- Furst, S., Blackburn, R., & Rosen, B. (1999). Virtual team effectiveness: A proposed research agenda. Information Systems Journal, 9, 249-269.
- Griggs, L. B., & Louw, L. L. (1995). Diverse teams: Breakdown or breakthrough? Training & Development, 49 (10), 22-29.
- Harris, T. E., & Sherblom, J. C. (2002). Small group and team communication (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Heads buried in the e-sand. (2001). Design Engineering, 5.
- Jackson, P. J. (1999). Organizational change and virtual teams: Strategic and operational integration. Information Systems Journal, 9, 313-332.

Jackson, S. E., May, K. E., & Whitney, K., (1995). Understanding the dynamics of diversity in decision-making teams. Team effectiveness and decision making in organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 204-261.

Janis, I. (1982). Groupthink (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Jarvenpaa, S.L., Knoll, K. & Leidner, D.E. (1998). Is anybody out there? Antecedents of trust in global virtual teams. Journal of Management Information Systems, 14 (4), 29-64.

Katzenbach, J. R., & Smith, D. K. (1993). The wisdom of teams: Creating the high-performance organization. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Lussier, R. N. (1997). Management. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western College Publishing.

Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. Academy of Management Review, 20, 709-734.

Odenwald, S. (1996). Global work teams. Training & Development, 50 (2), 54-57.

Olesen, K., & Myers, M. D. (1999). Trying to improve communication and collaboration with information technology: An action research project which failed. Information Technology & People, 12 (4), 317-332.

Pape, W. R. (1997). Group insurance. Inc., 19 (9), 29-30.

Platt, L. (1999). Virtual teaming: Where is everyone? Journal for Quality & Participation, 22 (5), 41-43.

Qureshi, S., & Vogel, D. (2001). Adaptiveness in virtual teams: Organisational challenges and research directions. Group Decision and Negotiations, 10, 27-46.

Satzinger, J. W., & Olfman, L. (1995). Computer support for group work: Perceptions of the usefulness of support scenarios and end-user tools. Journal of Management Information Systems, 11 (4), 34-49.

Schnake, M. E. (1991). Equity in effort: The sucker effect in co-acting groups. Journal of Management, 17, 41-55.

Shaw, J. B., & Barrett-Power, E. (1998). The effects of diversity on small work group processes and performance. Human Relations, 51 (10), 1307-1325.

Solomon, C. M. (1995). Global teams: The ultimate collaboration. Personnel Journal, 74 (9), 49-53.

Solomon, C. M. (2001). Managing virtual teams. Workforce, 80 (6), 60-64.

Townsend, A. M., DeMarie, S. M., & Hendrickson, A. R. (1998). Virtual teams: Technology and the workplace of the future. Academy of Management Executive, 12 (3), 17-29.

van der Smagt, T. (2000). Enhancing virtual teams: Social relations v. communication technology. Industrial Management & Data Systems, 100 (3/4), 148-156.

Vickery, C.M., Clark, Jr., T.D. & Carlson, J.R. (1999). Virtual positions: An examination of structure and performance in ad hoc workgroups. Information Systems Journal, 9, 291-312.

Walther, J. B. (1996). Computer-mediated communication: Impersonal, interpersonal, and hyperpersonal interaction. Communication Research, 23, 3-43.

Warkentin, M., & Beranek, P. M. (1999). Training to improve virtual team communication. Information Systems Journal, 9, 271-289.

Wong, S. & Burton, R.M. (2000). Virtual teams: What are their characteristics, and impact on team performance? Computational & Mathematical Organization Theory, 6, 339-360.

Yellen, R. E., Winniford, M. A., & Sanford, C. C. (1995). Extraversion and introversion in electronically-supported meetings. Information & Management, 28, 63-74.

Zielinski, D. (2000). Have you shared a bright idea today? Training, 37 (7), 65-68.