ONLINE APPENDIX

This appendix includes the search and coding parameters that we used to identify examples of conflict management strategies and then match them to a corresponding conflict type.

Search Parameters

Following a template used by Ramarajan and Reid (2013) and de Wit et al. (2012), we ran a keyword search in various electronic databases and search engines for journal articles (e.g., ABI/Inform, Google Scholar, PsycINFO). A conflict management strategy is defined as a bounded behavior, attitude, or norm that is enacted deliberately as an intervention to resolve, optimize, or pre-empt conflict (Behfar et al. 2008). It is typically a single directive or alteration to a norm, behavior, or process. To be included in our search, all strategies had to be studied in concert with group conflict as an outcome or an outcome variable that closely corresponded to group conflict.

To begin our search, we employed broad search parameters that included "conflict management," "conflict resolution," and "dispute resolution," and then appended the terms "strategies" or "behaviors." We then narrowed these search parameters to include keywords that reflected the four conflict types ("relationship," "status," "process," "task") and the level of analysis that serves as the focus of our paper ("group," "team"). Note that while we distinguish conflict management from the overarching category of conflict *resolution*, we initially sought to develop the most comprehensive possible understanding of the conflict management landscape rather than pre-emptively constrain our search.

We searched four categories of journals. First, we examined general management journals that regularly publish group and conflict research: *Academy of Management Journal, Academy of Management Review, Administrative Science Quarterly, Journal of Applied Psychology, Journal of Management, Journal of Organizational Behavior, Management Science, Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, Organization Science,* and *Personnel Psychology*. Next, we reviewed work contained in journals focused at the group level of analysis: *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, & Practice, Groups & Organization Management,* and *Small Group Research*. We then focused on prominent conflict management journals, including *International Journal of Conflict Management, Journal of Conflict Resolution*, and *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*. Finally, to capture the breadth of scholarly interest in work in conflict

management, we examined journals from related disciplines, including *American Journal of Sociology*, *American Sociological Review*, *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *European Review of Social Psychology*, *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,* and *Psychological Science.*

As a final check to ensure comprehensiveness in our search, we worked backward. Once a circumscribed intervention that resolved conflict was identified, we searched for that specific intervention in order to surface any additional work that might lead to a more complete understanding of that conflict management strategy.

Coding of Conflict Management Strategies

For each individual conflict management strategy (e.g., superordinate identity, rotating responsibilities), we generated fit scores that reflected the extent to which it managed all four forms of conflict. We used a number of important criteria to generate these scores. First, we accounted for whether a strategy directly influenced one or more of the underlying dimensions of that form of conflict (e.g., a strategy would be a better fit for managing relational conflict to the degree that it directly addressed incompatibility in tastes, preferences, values, and ideology for relational conflict). We based this on a detailed analysis of the definition of each strategy, the context in which it has been studied, and relevant findings. For example, if a strategy directly influences status but not underlying beliefs and social categories, the allocation of roles and responsibilities, or approaches to problem solving, then it would be deemed as closely corresponding to status conflict but not the other conflict types.

Second, we accounted for whether the strategy not only influenced a form of conflict, but set it to its most optimal level for team effectiveness (Doty and Glick 1994) — that is, either minimizing relational, status, and process conflict, or keeping task conflict in moderation. Thus, we not only assessed the fit of each conflict management strategy for each conflict type, but also assessed the extent to which the strategy optimized each form of conflict. There are some examples of conflict management strategies that fit a single conflict type well but do not optimize it. This is particularly relevant for task conflict. A number of interventions would lead to task conflict that is extreme rather than set in moderation. For instance, dialectical inquiry can create an extreme amount of task conflict because teams are burdened with the responsibility of

building toward one solution and then accruing evidence in support of a solution that is contradictory to the initial one (Cosier 1981). In contrast, devil's advocacy is less susceptible to such extreme task conflict because teams are continually pushed by the devil's advocate to question their assumptions, yet this process is less time-consuming and allows teams to remain efficient (Ketchen, Snow, and Street 2004). The fact that dialectical inquiry often imposes greater costs than devil's advocacy can help explain why sometimes it is inferior to devil's advocacy in terms of promoting team performance (Cosier 1981; Schwenk 1990).

Third, we considered the extent to which an example strategy directly acts on the dimensions most central to that form of conflict. For instance, although both status and decision rights are finite hierarchical resources, status is more central than decision rights as an underlying component of status conflict. Thus, status affirmation has a stronger fit score than participative decision making as an intervention that can reduce status conflict.

Fourth, we considered the extent to which a strategy acted on a number of relevant dimensions rather than only one or two. To the extent that a strategy influenced more dimensions underlying the conflict type, it was seen as a better fit. For instance, shared leadership relates to providing parity on multiple hierarchical resources (e.g., including power, status, and decision rights), whereas participative decision making relates to establishing parity only on one hierarchical dimension (decision making). In this way, shared leadership is more inclusive of the multiple dimensions that align in a social hierarchy.

Fifth, we considered the extent to which a strategy is exclusively or predominately geared to manage conflict versus other outcomes studied in different literatures. Some strategies (e.g., ladder of inference, intergroup contact) have been studied exclusively as mechanisms for managing conflict. Others (e.g., procedural justice) have been employed to manage conflict, but are not exclusively used to do so. Rather, they also address other outcomes (to take the previous example, procedural justice has been tested in tandem with a variety of job attitudes). To the extent that an example strategy is studied more exclusively with conflict, scholars will have more clearly spelled out how it can be used to manage the unique properties of conflict as well as how it should specifically be enacted in the context of conflict. Along these same lines, we also consider whether the strategy was originally intended to be a conflict management strategy or evolved from another domain to function as one in some contexts.

To be more confident in our fit scores for each strategy, we asked two scholars (both faculty in management departments who do research relevant to conflict) to code the fit of each of the 36 strategies relative to the ideal types using a continuous measure that reflects Doty and Glick's (1994) notion of fit. Agreement among our ratings and those of the two coders was moderately strong ($\alpha = .67$). We also coded strategies according to the conflict type that they were best positioned to directly and proximally manage. Although this analysis is not as fine-grained as one that keeps the fit scores on their raw continuous dimensions, it allows us to understand which conflict type each strategy is best positioned to optimize. In all cases, we determined that example strategies more closely corresponded to one conflict type than the others. There are likely several reasons for this. The four types of differences that underlie the four types of conflict are theoretically orthogonal (see page 5). In contrast to general orientations, strategies are likely to act on a narrow subset of processes rather than a broad subset because of their targeted, bounded, and circumscribed nature (typically composed of a single directive or single alteration to a norm or behavior). The reality that each conflict type is characterized by distinct underlying differences and interpersonal processes suggests that strategies tailored to one conflict type will be restricted to that conflict type. Although conflict types often co-occur, they are separable because the differences that undergird them are also separable. Reinforcing this idea, strategies have typically emerged to address a single type of conflict. We asked the same two scholars to code each of the 36 strategies according to each category. Given the categorical nature of this coding, we used Cohen's kappa. Agreement with our classification was strong for the first rater ($\kappa = .71$) and second rater ($\kappa = .70$).

We chose examples with the strongest fit scores in each of the categories as the exemplar strategies that we feature in our description of the typology in the text and in Table 1. When our pool of examples in each category was winnowed down to several strategies with equally strong fit scores, we considered other characteristics that would impact how effectively each example could illustrate the ideal conflict management types. Some examples of strategies are likely to more effectively highlight a given category and subcategory because they are better known to groups researchers. Further, some strategies can effectively represent a cluster of closely related strategies (e.g., pro-diversity valuation is strongly related to mutual valuation and

multi-culturalism). In these cases, we focus in the text on one representative example of the cluster of closely related examples.

REFERENCES IN APPENDIX

Behfar, K.J., R.S. Peterson, E.A. Mannix, W.M. Trochim. 2008. The critical role of conflict resolution in teams: A close look at the links between conflict type, conflict management strategies, and team outcomes. *J. Appl. Psych*. **93**(1) 170-188.

Bendersky, C. 2014. Resolving ideological conflicts by affirming opponents' status: The Tea Party, Obamacare and the 2013 government shutdown. *J. Experiment. Soc. Psych*. **53** 163-168.

Cosier, R.A. 1981. Dialectical inquiry in strategic planning: A case of premature acceptance. *Acad. Management Rev*. **6**(4) 643-648.

de Wit, F.R., L.L. Greer, K.A. Jehn. 2012. The paradox of intragroup conflict: a meta-analysis. *J. Appl. Psych*. **97**(2) 360.

Doty, D.H., W.H. Glick. 1994. Typologies as a unique form of theory building: Toward improved understanding and modeling. *Acad. Management Rev*. **19**(2) 230-251.

Ketchen, D.J., C.C. Snow, V.L. Street. 2004. Improving firm performance by matching strategic decision-making processes to competitive dynamics. *Acad. Management Exec*. **18**(4) 29-43.

Ramarajan, L., Reid, E. (2013). Shattering the myth of separate worlds: Negotiating nonwork identities at work. *Acad. Management Rev*. ***38***(4) 621-644.

Schwenk, C. R. (1990). Effects of devil's advocacy and dialectical inquiry on decision making: A meta-analysis. *Organ, Behavior & Human Decision Processes*, **47**(1), 161-176.