

Introduction to the Social & Psychological Perspectives in Collaboration Research Minitrack

Triparna de Vreede, Gert-Jan de Vreede, Roni Reiter-Palmon
The Center for Collaboration Science
University of Nebraska at Omaha
{tdevreede, gdevreede, rreiter-palmon}@unomaha.edu

Technology supported collaboration and communication between individuals entails complex social and psychological situations. An understanding of social and psychological aspects of collaboration is essential to creating productive work environments. The use of collaboration and communication systems is framed by the psychological and social factors concerning the users and their work environment. It is important to understand these factors to successfully facilitate the sustained use of these technologies. Further, knowledge of the psychosocial aspects of technology-supported collaboration and communication also assists in detecting, avoiding, and effectively resolving issues that may arise from using such technologies. This minitrack provides a venue for studying issues related to the dynamic interplay between people, their environment, and the collaboration technologies they use to create collaborative value.

This year, the minitrack accepted 6 papers. The first paper by Risius and Beck, “You Reap What You Sow? How Knowledge Exchange Effectiveness is affected by Different Types of Communication in Enterprise Social Media” investigates enterprise social media communication. The researchers coded and analyzed the content and tone of 15,505 enterprise microblogging messages created by 1,166 employees of an international financial institution. They expose difference in the effectiveness of knowledge exchanges in two general communication types. Their results suggest that a generally factual oriented communication type of ‘knowledge seeker’ is a determinant of the success in knowledge interactions.

The second paper by Fieseler, Grubenmann, Meckel, and Müller, “The Leadership Dimension of Coping with Technostress” describes a survey among salespersons using ICT to investigate the consequences of technology-induced stress and the role that supervisors may or may not play in mitigating the negative consequences of ICT usage. Their data show that leadership has a significant compensatory influence on work exhaustion and on job satisfaction.

The third paper by Briggs, Reinig, and de Vreede, “An Empirical Field Study of the Yield Shift Theory of Satisfaction” reports on a field study of 282 professional knowledge workers doing technology-supported work on real problems to examine the theoretical propositions of Yield Shift Theory (YST). The authors find that the satisfaction responses of the knowledge workers are consistent with the relationships proposed by YST.

In the fourth paper, “The Impact of Posting URLs in a Disaster-Related Tweet on Rumor Spreading Behavior”, Tanaka, Sakamoto, and Honda present an experiment to examine the effect of URLs on the spread of disaster-related tweets. Their results show that posting URLs in tweets increases rumor-spreading behavior despite the experimental manipulation in which the URLs did not have the hyperlink function.

In the fifth paper, “Task Characteristics, Team Processes and Individual Use of Collaboration Technology: Test of a Cross-level Mediation Model”, Maruping and Magni present a study on the effect of task structure on the extent to which individual team members use collaboration technology to execute their tasks. Their field data reveal that task structure—represented by task interdependence and task uncertainty—indirectly influence individual collaboration technology use through their effects on team communication processes and team collaboration processes.

The final paper, “The Antecedents of Commitment towards Collaborative Work Practice Outcomes” by Kocsis, Alothaim, de Vreede, Najjar, and de Vreede looks at drivers of commitment to team work outcomes that result from a newly introduced collaborative work practice. Their results suggest that perceived magnitude of net value and satisfaction with outcomes predict commitment while satisfaction with process partially predicts commitment, with perceived magnitude of net value the strongest predictor.