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ABSTRACT

IF WE ARE ON THE SAME PAGE, WE CAN MAKE A DIFFERENCE: PROSOCIAL MOTIVATION, SHARED MENTAL MODEL AND CONFLICT MANAGEMENT

By

Rameez Hamid Ahmed

Masters of Business Administration,
Business Administration

Scholars have researched prosocial motivation, conflict management and mental models separately but have yet to combine these concepts in one study to understand the effects of their relationship on achieving objectives. Prosocial motivation is the desire to benefit others. Perspective taking, as a creation of prosocial motivation, helps explain how individuals work through conflict to reach their goals. I propose that prosocial motivation will lead to positive conflict management outcomes when individuals work as a team and have a shared mental model. Individuals working as part of a team completed questionnaires asking them about their motivation, perspectives, team mental models, and conflict management strategies. This research focuses on a growing trend in business called social entrepreneurship in the small business sector and social responsibility in corporations. The results will contribute to ongoing research on prosocial motivation, which will help organizations understand how to identify untapped motivation in their workforce.
**Introduction**

Motivation in its many forms is foundational as it drives our most basic behaviors (Mitchell & Daniels, 2003). One specific type of motivation, prosocial motivation, can be an effective force that pushes individuals to work for the benefit of others (Grant, 2007). It can do so by first enabling an “inner desire to make an effort” (Dowling & Sayles, 1978, p. 16). This effort is then focused on achieving a goal to benefit others (Batson, 1987); thus, prosocial motivation becomes the will to accomplish a task that can benefit others. This may be especially important in a team environment as encountering conflict and obstacles are a common occurrence in teams. Team members’ prosocial motivation will likely affect the process of dealing with conflict situations and will affect the outcome the team experiences. This is important in the team context because employees who are prosocially motivated may be driven to work harder when the outcome of their work has effects on others. Prosocial motivation would drive team members to work in a compromising manner in order to reach the project completion. These prosocially motivated workers utilize this motivational drive (i.e. desire to help others) to complete their tasks, which will bring them satisfaction. This prosocial force guides teams to be end goal focused, which is important for any sustainable team and therefore, company. Organizations may not be utilizing their employees’ full potential because they are not capitalizing on this motivational factor. If an employee is not in a role where he/she has the ability to make a perceived difference on others, their prosocial motivation can go unused resulting in dissatisfaction. Employees at any given time can have multiple motivational forces driving them; organizations use these forces in combination with rewards to achieve business related goals. Relatively few studies, however, have looked
at prosocial motivation as a motivating factor in teams and organizations. Thus, the goal of the present study is to examine prosocial motivation in the team context as an antecedent of team processes.

The importance of prosocial motivation goes beyond simply driving an individual to put forth effort for the benefit of others. This specific type of motivation uses a focus on others to enhance stable trait behaviors that may aid the individual to reach his/her goal. Prosocial motivation is the predominant motivational factor in the nonprofit sector of our economy (Leete, 2000), but its application outside of the nonprofit environment may have an important impact on team interaction. Because prosocial motivation focuses on others, it creates an environment where individuals working together are essentially a team striving towards goal completion. Traits that are part of prosocial motivation include empathy, concern for others, and integration, all of which are beneficial when working within a team because they likely help predict team-related communication outcomes.

Scholars have identified that prosocial motivation has the ability to enhance the cognitive process of perspective taking in an individual (Grant & Berry, 2011). Motivated information processing theory (Kunda, 1990) helps explain the connection of this relationship by identifying prosocial motivation as the desire that provides individuals with the ability to adopt perspectives. In a team environment, having enhanced perspective taking can have a positive effect on communication and knowledge sharing (Grant & Berry, 2011). As a result, conflict may be likely to ensue in teams consisting of individuals with low levels of prosocial motivation and thus perspective taking.
Accordingly, the present study builds on this research by linking prosocial motivation to perspective taking and conflict management in teams.

Individuals in teams are differentially motivated, thus, their perceptions on how a given task should be completed or team interaction should be conducted may differ. Motivations drive individuals toward certain desires or wants, and establish goals for that particular individual. Driven by motivation, an individual’s mental model provides him/her a road map on how to go about achieving his/her goals. When team members share an understanding of how to complete a task or agree on how to interact as a team, they may share a mental model or a conceptualization of how the team should reach its goals. Shared mental models have been shown to affect team processes such as decision-making models (Kellermanns, Floyd, Pearson, & Spencer, 2008). Teams consisting of members with different mindsets (mental models) may create more opportunities for conflict to arise when compared to teams consisting of members with similar mindsets (Hinsz et al., 1997). Examining the effect of a team’s shared mental model on other team related processes, this study seeks to determine if shared mental models impact the relationship between team member’s prosocial motivation and conflict management.

This study brings areas of research together that have previously been examined separately. This is important because prosocial motivation may have a significant relationship with these variables (e.g., perspective taking, conflict management, shared mental model). If prosocial motivation predicts compromising conflict management being used in a team, it may also predict other team related outcomes. The findings of this research may have implications for candidate selection (e.g., hiring process) if companies are interested in reviewing job candidates’ motivations (e.g., Intrinsic,
Extrinsic, Prosocial). Furthermore, organizations and scholars should find value in this research as it explores concepts that are part of a new trend in business called social entrepreneurship. These new style operations connect for-profit business ideas with nonprofit social missions. Essentially, these businesses are founded on prosocially motivated individuals working together to provide a good or service to the community, and prosocially motivated consumers desire products or services because the exchange benefits people. This new business model and related research directs attention to prosocial motivation being a primary force that enables these individuals to put forth effort. Prosocial motivation may be a primary driver in a nonprofit sector but in the for-profit sector of business, it may be only secondary. This rising trend of social focus and increase in social businesses create an environment where prosocial motivation may be a primary motivational factor and highlights the need for additional research on this motivation in other contexts.

The current research study seeks to investigate whether and how team prosocial motivation enhances perspective taking which in turn affects team conflict. Prior research has directly studied the connection of prosocial motivation and perspective taking at the individual level (Grant & Berry, 2011), but has not linked it to compromising conflict management in teams. Prosocial motivation research has also focused on creativity, performance, and productivity, which not only helps establish a link to other behavioral outcomes, but also provides an opportunity to understand their relationships in different contexts as called for by scholars (Grant, 2008; Grant & Berry, 2011). The current study seeks to extend this research by exploring the effect of prosocial motivation on compromising conflict management at the team level. Integrating previous research
linked to prosocial motivation, perspective taking is placed as the mediator to explain why prosocially motivated teams use compromising styles of conflict management. Responding to calls for further research on shared mental models, conflict management, perspective taking and prosocial motivation (Grant & Berry, 2011; Kellermanns, Floyd, Pearson, & Spencer, 2008), this study bridges gaps identified in these areas to uncover the relationship among these team attributes and behaviors.

The remainder of my introduction will discuss the theory behind prosocial motivation as a predictor of compromising conflict management in teams. Then, I present perspective taking as a mediator for the relationship between prosocial motivation and compromising conflict management. Finally, I position shared mental model as a moderator of the relationship between perspective taking and compromising conflict management.

**Theoretical Background**

**Prosocial Motivation**

The drive that pushes individuals to put forth effort that benefits others is defined as prosocial motivation (Batson, 1987). Prosocial motivation was identified by the human relations movement (Grant, 2008) and is part of self-determination and intrinsic motivation theories (e.g., Deci, 1975; Deci & Ryan, 1985). Like intrinsic motivation, prosocial can be viewed in both trait and state contexts (Amabile, 1993). A trait refers to an individual’s personality attribute (e.g., empathy), which is shown to be stable and consistent across situations and time, as opposed to state, which is temporary in duration and affected by the situation (Amabile, 1993). Because this motivation can be understood in trait-like and state-like terms, individuals may possess prosocial type of trait qualities.
based on their existing motivation, and also may be affected by situational factors that create or enhance this particular type of motivation.

Prosocial motivation has similarities to intrinsic motivation but should be thought of as independent based on three distinctions (Grant, 2008); self-regulation, goal directness, and temporal focus. The first distinction, self-regulation, focuses on the different levels of autonomy needed for these two motivation constructs. Self-regulation is needed in prosocial motivation because an individual must put self-regulated effort toward reaching the completion of the process or task to achieve a goal and reach a level of satisfaction driven by the motivation, making the decision less autonomous. This is different from intrinsic motivation, in which enjoyment and pleasure comes from the task itself, little self-regulation is needed to obtain satisfaction from the invested motivation. Similarly, goal directness for prosocial motivation is focused on the outcome, unlike intrinsic motivation where process of the work itself motivates the individual, but the outcome does not necessarily need to be connected to the motivation. The third distinction, temporal focus, is important due to its focus on time. Prosocial motivation’s temporal focus is on the future – the outcome and goal (Batson, 1988), whereas intrinsic motivation is present focused, which occurs in the moment and entails enjoying the experience itself (Quinn, 2005). These distinctions draw attention to not only how prosocial motivation is different from intrinsic motivation but how it affects individuals’ thought process about the situation in which they are involved.

In exploring how prosocial motivation drives individuals to think differently, prior studies have uncovered that prosocial motivation is an “others-focused” psychological process that drives individuals to take on other perspectives (i.e., a
psychological process that focuses on other individuals, rather than oneself; Grant, 2007; Grant & Berry, 2011). Research has suggested that collectivism, also an “other-focused” psychological process, shares similar value characteristics (e.g., conformity, harmony, and meeting others expectations) of prosocial motivation (Goncalo & Staw, 2006); yet, contrary to collectivism, prosocially motivated people also value focusing on the importance of others (Grant 2008; Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz & Bardi, 2001). Prior research has looked at the effects of this motivation at the individual level, whereas the present study aims to focus on how this motivation affects a group at a team level. Individuals possess their own motivation, which influences how they interact with other team members and team dynamics. The team interaction allows them to share their knowledge, feelings and perspectives on how to complete team tasks.

**Conflict Management**

Conflict is the “process in which one party perceives that its interests are being opposed or negatively affected by another party” (Wall & Callister, 1995). This study’s focus will be on intra-group conflict; that is, conflict occurring among group members. Research has identified five conflict management styles (i.e., avoidance, accommodation, competition, collaboration, and compromise), which are commonly seen in conflict situations (Rahim 1983, 1992). These conflict management approaches can be driven by an individual’s motivations, past experience or goals (Wall & Callister, 1995). Avoidance is a failure to confront or being evasive, accommodation is obliging concern for others’ decisions or suggestions, competition involves using the power of domination, collaboration focuses on achieving outcomes that involve the interests of all parties included, and compromise is understanding the differences and working to meet in the
middle (Weiss, Massey, & Song 2001). In the present study, I focus on compromising conflict management because prosocial motivation is a strong others’ focused psychological process (Grant & Berry, 2011). Prosocial motivations’ attention on others provides an individual the desire to expend effort in order to understand the needs of the team and its members and to reach a goal. Teams with prosocial motivation will have their goal directness focused on the completion of the task; this direction will guide the team to use other members’ viewpoints in an integrative fashion in the event of conflict. Prosocial motivations ability to push an individual to integrate information around them directs him/her to use views from multiple team members, in order to solve the conflict. Compromising conflict management is a combination of four conflict management styles; integrating, obliging, dominating, and avoiding (Rahim, 1983). Prosocial motivation’s focus on others’ directs the individual to use integration for understanding team member’s viewpoints, while prosocial behavior patterns like empathy and concern for others focus on using obliging and accommodating team member’s needs. The other’ focus of prosocial motivation utilizes both integration and accommodation styles, but while the individual will try to integrate others members’ views, and accommodate their needs, the desire to achieve the goal will drive them to use a dominating style as well to ensure that goal achievement is the main priority. The combination of these styles being used, driven by prosocial motivation, will lead to compromising conflict management styles being used in team.

Drawing from personality research, I analyze how prosocial motivation's trait-like qualities may affect attitudes and behavior. Further, personality traits have been shown to affect the type of conflict management styles utilized and may help predict the type of
style used (Antonioni, 1998). Prosocial motivation is represented in the personality traits such as agreeableness (Grant 2008; Graziano, Habashi, Sheese, & Tobin, 2007), empathy and helpfulness (Penner, Dovidio, Piliavin, & Schroeder, 2005), and values of concern for others (De Dreu, 2006; Grant, 2008; Meglino & Korsgaard, 2004; Perry & Hondeghem, 2008; Schwartz, 1992). Because prosocial motivation may be represented in trait-like qualities, a prosocially motivated worker in a team will more likely possess the traits of agreeableness, empathy and concern for others as part of stable traits. When workers encounter conflict, prosocial motivation may affect their response to the situation based on its influence on behavior (Antonioni, 1998). Thus, prosocial motivations will likely motivate an individual to work through a conflict using compromise, by influencing prosocial behaviors that are focused on others’ (e.g., team member, co-workers), to effectively reach the target goal.

Motivated reasoning (Kunda, 1990) provides a theoretical foundation for why prosocial motivation may affect conflict management. This concept states that motivation can affect reasoning through the use of biased cognitive processes (Kunda, 1990). These processes shape how we use and act on information. Research in this area identifies how directional goals have been shown to affect strategies, beliefs and attitudes (Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Kunda, 1990). Each motivation type has its own unique goal directness (Grant & Berry, 2011). Because goals can change behavior, this research highlights the importance of individuals having the same goal when on a team. When prosocially motivated individuals are grouped with prosocially motivated others, team members will share the same others’ focused cognitive processes and goal directness allowing them expend effort towards achieving the goal. However, when team members have different
goals they may experience increased levels of conflict because their work efforts will not be focused on the same outcome, thereby causing a situation where multiple team members’ goals are not being met.

Motivated reasoning also identifies the idea of bias memory search where individuals only access a biased subset of information during their cognitive processes (Kunda, 1990). When applied to interacting with others, individuals showed bias towards traits reflecting their desired self-concept (Sanitioso, Kunda & Fong, 1990). Motivated reasoning explains why prosocial motivation, being a goal-focused trait, guides individuals to use bias traits and cognitive processes that are similar to their desired self-concept to reach their goal. When an individual encounters conflict he/she will use traits biased on their desired self-concept (e.g., empathy, goal focus) to interact with others and resolve the issue. Because the individual possesses prosocial motivation his/her bias traits (e.g., empathy, concern for others, integration) allow them to expend effort to resolve conflict in a positive way (Grant & Berry, 2011).

In the team context, when members are prosocially motivated they are focused on achieving a goal that benefits others and reaching the project outcome to achieve satisfaction. If the team experiences conflict they will work to resolve the issue because this is an obstacle to achieving the goal and reaching satisfaction. Prosocial motivation will influence team members’ behavior (e.g., using select bias cognitive processes), allowing them to focus on how to benefit others (e.g., beneficiaries, team members, co-workers). This guides team members to utilize their prosocially motivated desire to resolve conflict. A compromising conflict management style would be used due to prosocial motivations’ concern for others, which can be applied internal or external to the
team or organization such as beneficiaries, co-workers, and supervisors (Grant & Berry, 2011). Prosocial motivation is more likely to yield compromising conflict outcomes because the team will benefit from reducing or eliminating conflict. If a dominating style like competition was only used, conflict can reoccur and would likely delay goal completion (Weiss, Massey, & Song 2001). Because prosocial motivation is focused on others, this motivation guides an individual to have concern for others’ (e.g., teammates) viewpoints on issues during conflict situations. Teams with high levels of prosocial motivation will have strong goal directness and expend effort to reach their goals. Conflict in this group may occur, but will be dealt with in a compromising style because the team not only has similar goals but also may share similar prosocial behaviors (i.e., empathy, helpfulness, concern for others). Teams with low levels of prosocial motivation may disagree on the target goal. These teams may be prone to conflict because the team members are not focused on the same goal and their motivation may not enhance or utilize behaviors that focus on compromising outcomes. Based on prior research on prosocial motivation and its dispositions of state and trait-like qualities, I propose that prosocial motivation will lead to positive conflict management outcomes of compromise in a team environment.

*Hypothesis 1: Prosocially motivated teams will be more apt to choose compromising conflict management styles during conflict situations.*

**Perspective Taking as a Mediator**

Perspective taking is the cognitive process where an individual adopts others’ viewpoints to understand their needs, values and preferences (Grant & Berry, 2011; Parker & Axtell, 2001).
Motivation in some contexts and circumstances can change the level of perspective taking for individuals (Batson, Early, & Salvarani, 1997; De Dreu Weingart & Kwon 2000). As prosocial motivation drives individuals to reach a goal that benefits others, it creates the contextual environment for an individual to be motivated to take on the perspectives of others to reach their intended goal.

Motivated information processing theory (Grant, 2011; Kunda, 1990) provides a framework for why prosocially motivated individuals utilize this heightened cognitive process of perspective taking to better understand the views of their teammates to then manage conflict in a compromising way. This theory’s main premise is that motivations mold how we view or process information; thus our motivations shape how we obtain, retain and utilize information (Grant, 2011; Kunda, 1990; Nickerson, 1998). Motivated information processing theory and perspective taking research suggests prosocially motivated employees are more likely to think in an integrative style, and consolidate and align perspectives (De Dreu et al., 2000; Grant & Berry 2011). Motivated reasoning theorists explain how biased cognitive processes allow us to see what we want to see (Kunda, 1990). Prosocial motivation being an others-focused psychological process drives an individual to put forth effort to benefit others. Motivated information processing affects his/her cognitive processes so the individual can use modified behaviors (e.g., empathy) to understand how to benefit others. This biased focus is shaped by motivation and allows the individual to put effort to integrate information, and align viewpoints of others, in order to reduce or eliminate conflict to reach a goal.

Perspective taking may be a common bias utilized in prosocially motivated individuals; this bias allows individuals to utilize their heightened state of perspective taking to analyze a
team members’ viewpoint in order to better understand their position to complete a task or team-related action. Empathy and concern for others are traits that are represented in prosocial motivation. These traits along with biased focused cognition on others, drive a prosocially motivated individual to put forth effort toward understanding the perspectives of others. Perspective taking would result in compromise due to its ability to adopt other’s viewpoints. The effort to adopt other’s viewpoints from perspective taking along with concern for others’ created by prosocial motivation guides the individual to be empathetic to others’ and their viewpoint, creating the context for compromise.

Prosocial motivation has been shown to enhance perspective taking in an individual (Grant & Berry, 2011); when that person is part of a team, this ability to adopt perspectives may be applied to the team-related interactions. Because prosocial motivation is end goal focused (Batson, 1988), its goal directness drives an individual to expend effort to reach a project or goal completion. Thus prosocial motivation aligns an individual’s goal directness towards the outcome, and as a result, the individual’s behavior is modified by biased cognitive processes that is focused on helping others (Kunda, 1990). This focus enhances perspective taking which allows individuals to work with their team members to resolve conflict and reach the desired goal.

Teams with low levels of prosocial motivation may have lower levels of perspective taking and based on the goal directness of their motivation, this may in turn increase conflict occurrences. Teams differing in goal directness will have increased conflict because individuals will expend their own effort based of their motivated desire, which may be directed at different goals. If a team has low levels of prosocial motivation they may not have any motivated desire to take on the perspectives of others (i.e., team
members), thereby increasing the opportunity for conflict. Perspective taking is a key reason why prosocial motivation leads to compromising conflict management because it is focused on understanding viewpoints of others in order to reach a goal. Because prosocial motivation is focused on helping others, it leads an individual to have to understand others’ points of view in order to help them. When in a work environment, as part of a team, this motivation will guide a team to take on perspectives of team members and those around them in order to identify information that is beneficial in helping others and reaching the goal (De Dreu, 2006). Applying established theory derived from motivated reasoning, I propose that prosocial motivation will enhance perspective taking in an individual which will lead to positive conflict management outcomes of collaboration in a team environment.

_Hypothesis 2: Perspective taking explains the association between team prosocial motivation and compromising conflict management._

**Shared Mental Model as a Moderator**

Mental models allow individuals to explain the behavior of the world around them, by enabling an individual’s ability to predict and explain behavior based on recognition and remembrance of relationships in the environment. These mental models provide individuals the ability to make expectations on what is likely to occur (Rouse & Morris, 1986). A simple view of a mental model is it allows people to explain, describe and predict events in their environment (Mathieu, Heffner, Goodwin, Salas, & Cannon-Bowers, 2000). In a team environment, shared mental models help explain how teams deal with difficult situations, by adapting and adjusting strategies (Cannon-Bowers, Tannenbaum, Salas & Volpe, 1995; Mathieu et al., 2000; McInttyre & Salas, 1995).
Shared mental models allow team members to understand and agree on task or team level interactions without direct communication because members share an understanding of the mental model (Mathieu et al., 2000). If the team members do not share a model, they will need to directly communicate with each other to agree and understand the information. A shared mental model is important for a team because it can minimize the communication needed between members, which can help reduce misinformation and conflict. Shared mental models allow team members to easily understand other member’s knowledge sets, enabling the team to use the shared knowledge to reduce task or team-related issues (Cannon-Bowers et al., 1995). Teams use mental models when interacting with other team members. These shared mental models help team members agree and conceptualize task and team level communication.

Research has been conducted on shared mental models and conflict management (e.g., De Dreu & Van Vianen, 2001; Jehn & Mannix, 2001; Wicks, Berman, & Jones, 1999). Scholars found that when two team members have similar knowledge structures the quality of the team processes can be predicted (Mathieu et al., 2000). Additionally, research found when teams utilize a process to deal with conflict this can reduce the negative impact caused by the situation (Behfar, Peterson, Mannix, & Trochim, 2008). In order for a team to utilize a process to manage conflict, the process would need to be agreed upon by the team before it can have an effect. Whether team members have or do not have a shared understanding of how the process is utilized may affect how the team manages conflict. This suggests that shared mental models and knowledge are important during conflict situations and team interactions.
There are many types of mental models that exist and research suggests that at any given time multiple mental models may co-exist between team members (Klimoski & Mohammed, 1994). Two main domains have been identified that describe shared mental models for teams namely task related and team related (Mathieu et al., 2000). This categorization is also consistent with how teams develop two main tracks of behavior, a teamwork track and task work track (McIntyre & Salas, 1995). Task-related content includes items like task procedures, likely scenarios or contingencies. Team-related content includes items like roles and responsibilities, teammate’s knowledge, role interdependencies and communications channels. Together these two main categories can describe team-related shared models and interactions. This current study focuses on team mental models to understand if shared team knowledge affects the relationship between motivation and conflict management. Team shared mental models are important because shared knowledge about team specific actions allows teammates to adapt their behavior as to what they expect from other team members (Mathieu et al., 2000).

The understanding of similar knowledge sets by multiple individuals in a team allows team members to apply their knowledge more effectively. The benefits of a shared mental model can be understood when analyzing how teams use shared knowledge. Researchers have found adaptability as an important skill seen in high performance teams (Cannon-Bowers et al., 1995). This ability to adjust behavior or strategy can been explained by the accessibility of shared knowledge within the team (Mathieu et al., 2000). Teams are able to communicate and coordinate more effectively when the team members have a very similar understanding of the team model (Lim & Klein, 2006). Research on shared cognition and team shared models has shown that shared models
provide a team with the ability to predict future expectations, task activities, and coordinate with their team based on these prior experiences (Autere & Autio, 2000). Shared models in teams have also been shown to change behavior of teammates based on the their understanding of a situation (e.g., air traffic controllers are more proactive in providing support and back up to team mates, based on the work load and stress of the position; Autere & Autio, 2000).

When a prosocially motivated team encounters conflict, its members are more apt to take on the perspective of their teammates to resolve conflict in a compromising way in order to reach the project goal. If the team has high levels of prosocial motivation then they will be more likely to utilize perspective taking to understand each other’s needs to reach the intended goal. If the team is low on prosocial motivation, then their focus on the goal may differ, and cause conflict. Teams that agree on how a task or team should operate will share a mental model of task or team interaction. This shared knowledge allows the team members to communicate more efficiently with each other and brings a shared understanding of how to complete a task, and how to interact as a team. The prevalence of a shared mental model will increase the opportunity for team members to use perspective taking to reach compromising conflict resolutions. When teams share the same view on task and/or team interaction, they will adopt each other’s perspective and thus engage in compromising conflict management. When prosocially motivated teams do not share the same view on task or team interaction, they will try take on the perspectives of each other but may have difficulty resolving conflict because team members have different understandings of the way a task should be completed or team interaction should be held, and may not be able to utilize others’ perspectives. Perspective
taking of team members still may guide this group to work to compromising outcomes, but this would be driven by their motivation, not shared team knowledge. Teams with low levels of perspective taking, may have different types of motivated team members who may have different goals. The outcome of this situation may be managed by leadership but will be driven by the motivations of each team member involved. Based on prosocial motivation being goal focused and perspective taking allowing an individual to better understand others’ actions, I propose a third hypothesis which includes a shared mental model and its effect on conflict management while directed by prosocial motivation and perspective taking.

Hypothesis 3: A shared mental model moderates the mediated relationship between prosocial motivation and conflict management such that the relationship between perspective taking and compromising conflict management will be stronger in a team with a high shared mental model than teams with a lower shared mental model.

Method

Participants

The responding participant group consisted of 52 full-time workers employed at one of two telecommunication organizations in the Western United States. The total sample consisted of 52 employees from two organizations: 48% (n = 25) from organization one and 51% (n = 27) from organization two. The survey was sent out to 105 participants with a response rate of 49% (n = 52). After removing surveys that were partially completed, the usable sample size (n = 29) consisted of 44% (n = 13) men and 55% (n = 16) women. The ethnic breakdown of the participants was as follows: 55% White (n = 16), 13% Black or African American (n = 4), 6% Asian (n = 2), 3% American
Indian / Alaskan Native (n = 1) and 17% other (n = 5). The average team tenure was 2 to under 3 years with 7% working with their group 1 to 6 months (n = 2), 10% 6 to 12 months (n = 3), 10% 1 to under 2 years (n = 3), 28% 2 to under 3 years (n = 8), 7% 3 to under 4 years (n = 2), and 35% 4 or more years (n = 10). The average percentage an individual worked with their team per day was 50-74% with 32% who worked with their team 1 to 24% (n = 9), 28% who worked with their team 25 to 49% (n = 8), 10% who worked with their team 50-74% (n = 3) and 28% who worked with their team 75 to 100% (n = 8).

**Procedure**

The selected departments that participated in the study were segmented into teams based on the project groups to which employees were assigned to for their everyday tasks. Managers or organizational contacts provided the team structures. Team members were sent an email from their manager and asked to login to an internet site and fill out a survey online. The designated team names were entered in as options in the survey to allow for each individual to be properly grouped with their designated team. All data was obtained confidentially and no unique identifying information was captured. The individual participant data were then aggregated to the team level before any statistical analyses were conducted.

**Measures**

Prosocial ($\alpha = .95$) and intrinsic motivation ($\alpha = .91$) were measured with items adapted from self-regulation scales developed by Ryan and Connell (1989). Four items assessed intrinsic motivation and four items assessed prosocial motivation. The scale items open with a leading question asking, “Why are you motivated to do your work?”
Two sample items from the intrinsic scale are, “because it’s fun” and “because I enjoy the work itself.” Two sample prosocial motivation items are “because I want to help others through my work” and “because it’s important for me to do good for others through my work.” This scale was measured on a seven point Likert-scale ranging from disagree strongly (1) to agree strongly (7).

Perspective taking ($\alpha = .79$) was measured with items adapted by Davis, Conklin, Smith, and Luce (1996) and used in a recent article by Grant and Berry (2011). The instructions asked the participant to “indicate the extent to which you take others’ perspectives.” Two sample items from the four-item scale are, “At work I often imagine how other people are feeling” and “On the job I frequently try to take other peoples perspectives.” This scale was measured on a seven point likert-scale ranging from disagree strongly (1) to agree strongly (7).

Team shared mental model was measured using a matrix model developed by (Mathieu et al., 2000). The participants were presented with 18 matrix questions; 9 for their understanding of a team model and 9 for their understanding of a task model. The matrix had eight attributes that were compared to one another. The attributes’ description was provided for each question. Participants were asked to rate the relatedness of each attribute ranging from -4 (negatively related; a high degree of one attribute requires a low degree of the other attribute) to 4 (highly related, a high degree of one attribute requires a high degree of the other attribute); “0” equals no relation. The attributes selected for the team mental model were adapted from the literature based on teamwork dimensions and team taxonomy (Marks, Mathieu, & Zaccaro, 2001). The nine team items used were: project review and planning, goal identification, strategy, monitoring progress, team
support and backup, coordination, conflict management, motivation and confidence building, and making a difference. “Making a difference” was added to understand if prosocial motivational factors influenced team members to relate the attribute of “making a difference” to other team attributes. The task mental model matrix attributes were adapted from the literature based on team task activities (e.g., Cannon Bowers et al., 1993; Mathieu et al., 2000). The nine task items were role assignment / hierarchy, task identification, planning, on-time task delivery, team communication, leadership, team support / assistance, and escalation management. These task-related items like the team attributes comprise group interactions from project/group creation to project/assignment completion.

I utilized a network analysis software (UCINET; Borgatti, Everett, & Freeman, 2002) to correlate the shared mental models using the individual data sets. UCINET allows for two matrices to be correlated using a QAP correlation function which provides a person calculation. These correlations are between identical responses in each individual’s mental model matrix response. The correlation value provides a range from -1 completely unshared to 1 completely shared; this methodology has been used in prior studies (e.g. Mathieu et al., 2000). Individual data was aggregated in SPSS using the team as the break variable. The aggregated matrix QAP correlations were entered into SPSS by creating separate variables for team mental model and task mental model.

Conflict management was measured using 19 items developed by Rahim (1993) and adapted by Montoya-Weiss, Massey and Song (2001). The items cover the five identified conflict management styles; avoidance ($\alpha = .74$), accommodation ($\alpha = .85$), competition ($\alpha = .83$), collaboration ($\alpha = .84$), and compromise ($\alpha = .82$). Instructions for
the questions stated “please indicate the conflict management style experienced in your team.” Sample items for each conflict management style include “I tried to keep my disagreement with my teammates to myself in order to avoid hard feelings” (Avoidance), “I accommodated to the wishes of my teammates” (Accommodation), “I used my power to win in a competitive situation” (Competition), “I tried to bring all our concerns out in the open so that the issues could be resolved in the best possible way” (Collaboration), and “I proposed a middle ground for breaking deadlocks” (Compromise). The questions were rated on a five-point scale from almost never (1) to almost always (5). For the purpose of my research question, only compromising conflict management was analyzed in this study.

Results

First, individual data sets were aggregated to the team level. The correlations of all team-level variables appear in Table 1; no significant correlations between the variables of interest were found.

________________________________________________________________________

Insert Table 1 and Figures 2 and 3 about here

________________________________________________________________________

I then proceeded to test my hypotheses. Hypothesis 1 predicted that prosocial motivation would lead to higher levels of compromising conflict management. Using a linear regression in SPSS, the model did not show any significance and the hypothesis was not supported; findings appear in Table 2. Intrinsic motivation was used as a control variable in the study. Prosocial and or intrinsic motivation did not predicted compromising conflict management.
Then, I tested Hypothesis 2, which predicted that perspective taking mediates the relationship between prosocial motivations and compromising conflict management. I used the PROCESS macro in SPSS (Hayes, 2012) to test the mediated relationship. The PROCESS macro calculates the 95% bias corrected bootstrap confidence intervals of the mediation on the basis of 10000 bootstrap samples. The results showed that prosocial motivation was not significantly related to compromising conflict management. The findings did not show significance for prosocial motivation being a predictor of perspective taking, which is contrary to prior research (Grant & Berry, 2011). Thus, the model tested did not support Hypothesis 2, but perspective taking predicted comprising conflict management ($b = 1.65, SE = 0.55, t = 3.01, p < .05$); findings are located in Table 3.

Next, I tested Hypothesis 3, predicting perspective taking mediating the relationship of prosocial motivation and conflict management, and shared mental model moderating the relationship between perspective taking and conflict management. I utilized the PROCESS macro in SPSS (Hayes, 2012), this time testing whether a shared mental model moderated the mediated relationship between prosocial motivation and
compromising conflict. Hypothesis 3 did not show significance in the model tested ($R = .99, R-sq = .98, p < .01$). Table 4 includes all factors tested. While the whole model as proposed in Hypothesis 3 is not supported ($R = .99$), there are notable significant relations. Prosocial motivation ($b = .32, SE = .06, t = 5.36, p < .05$) and perspective taking ($b = .93, SE = .25, t = 3.61, p < .05$) both predicated compromising conflict management. Intrinsic motivation was placed as a control variable and was found to also predict compromising conflict management ($b = .49, SE = .07, t = 6.69, p < .01$). A shared team mental model predicted compromising conflict management ($b = -.37, SE = .12, t = -2.97, p = .02$). As a result, the hypothesis was partially supported because a shared mental model was found to moderate the relationship between perspective taking and compromising conflict management ($b = 4.30, SE = .87, t = 4.92, p < .05$). This relationship has perspective taking mediating prosocial motivation and compromising conflict management, while a shared team mental model moderated the mediated relationship between prosocial motivation and compromise.

-----------------------------------------------

Insert Table 4 about here

-----------------------------------------------

Post Hoc Analysis

Due to a low sample size, a post hoc analysis was conducted in order to review Hypothesis 1 and fully take into account individual level data. Using HLM software (Bryk & Raudenbush, 1992), multilevel regression equations were computed using individual-level compromising conflict management as the criterion variable. The effect of team level prosocial motivation on individual level compromising conflict
management was tested taking into account individual intrinsic motivation. Table 5 presents the multi-level regression findings with compromising conflict management as the criterion variable. The main effect of prosocial motivation (Hypotheses 1) was regressed on compromising conflict management. The findings show that the relationship between prosocial motivation and compromising conflict management was marginally significant ($\gamma = .42, p = .06$). The evidence would support hypothesis one and highlight the connection prosocial motivation has with compromising conflict management. With a larger sample, significant findings may be found at the team level.

Insert Table 5 about here

Discussion

Research has investigated the effect of prosocial motivations on negotiation (e.g., Beersma & De Dreu, 1999), which has found that social motives that are driven by prosocial motivation affected negotiation outcomes. Additionally research on prosocial motivation, perspective taking and creativity (Grant, 2008; Grant & Berry, 2011) has identified how prosocial motivation in the presence of intrinsic motivation increases creativity. Prior research has laid a foundation of how prosocial motivation may affect an individuals’ cognitive process such as perspective taking and how this motivation may affect a group outcome based of social motives. Building on this prior research, the purpose of this study was to examine prosocial motivation’s effect on team compromising conflict management. Based on the prevalence of conflict in a team environment, this study focused on determining if prosocial motivation effects
compromising conflict management by first impacting perspective taking, and if a shared mental model affects the relationship between perspective taking and conflict management.

The results show that prosocial motivation did not directly predict compromising conflict management style, which did not support my hypothesis, but a post hoc analysis showed marginal significance. Second, perspective taking did not mediate the relationship between prosocial motivation and conflict management but it did prove to be a strong predictor of compromising conflict management. The final model tested showed partial significance when analyzing the team shared mental model as a moderator. Prosocial motivation predicted compromising conflict management when the team was high on perspective taking and shared a team mental model.

Overall, prosocial motivation did not directly predict the conflict management style used but it did predict compromising conflict management when teams shared a mental model and had high levels of perspective taking. Perspective taking predicted the use of compromising conflict management and was strengthened when the teams had a shared mental model.

**Theoretical Implications**

There are several theoretical implications based on the findings in this study. First, the results show that prosocial motivation is important in teams. Though the main results did not find a strong direct link between prosocial motivation and compromise, post hoc analysis findings supported this relationship. Compromising conflict management as a result of prosocial motivation may draw attention to prosocial motivation being an others’ focused psychological process. The focus on others driven by
prosocial motivation may have influenced team members in our study to compromise during situations of conflict. These findings expand prosocial motivation research to further investigate team interactions. Prosocial motivation should be looked at as an antecedent to team processes, and its goal directness may affect team-related outcomes. The input-process-output model (i.e., I-P-O) can be considered when analyzing prosocial motivation in the team context (Marks, Mathieu, & Zaccaro, 2001). The I-P-O framework may provide an additional explanation on how motivated information processing biases driven by prosocial motivation (Kunda, 1990) affect team processes and outcomes.

Second, as mentioned, though I found some support that prosocial motivation was related to conflict management, this relationship was not consistent across models. However, it seems likely that prosocial motivation is important in team interactions. One possible reason for this inconsistent finding can be how this study only focused on trait motivation. Individuals may possess certain stable traits that are a part of prosocial motivation (e.g., empathy, concern for others, integration), which may explain how this motivation affects team interactions. The marginal link prosocial motivation had to compromise suggests motivations may shape team outcomes, and provides an opportunity for a stronger connection to be identified. The effect of a state motivation (e.g., motivation influenced by the situation) may provide additional insights on the relationship between motivation and conflict. This study’s focus on traits rather than states may have also been the reason why the link between prosocial motivation and perspective taking was not made. Prior research (e.g., Grant & Berry, 2011) has established a connection between these variables but utilized state motivation in their
research. The lack of a strong connection found in my results may guide other research to incorporate both trait and state prosocial motivation into their studies.

Third, this study connected different areas of research into a combination that has not previously been explored. The findings show that a shared mental model affected the interaction between the cognitive process of perspective taking and compromising conflict management. Teams with a high shared mental model used higher levels of perspective taking leading to higher levels of compromising conflict management. This is opposed to teams with a low shared mental model which used lowers levels of perspective taking and had lower levels of compromising conflict styles used. The relationship established should draw attention to teams shared mental model moderating effect of a cognitive processes’ (e.g., perspective taking) interaction with a team outcome (e.g., compromise). This study extends research on shared knowledge and may highlight the use of other cognitive processes (e.g., perception, attention, problem solving) and their connection to team outcomes and shared knowledge.

**Practical Implications**

The current findings have several practical implications. First, the findings suggested that workers in for-profit business sectors may have differing levels of prosocial motivation and intrinsic motivation. The findings of the post hoc analysis suggest prosocial motivation has a marginally significant relationship with compromising conflict management. Organizations can review if their incentive and merit systems meet the needs of prosocially motivated workers. The company may have employees who are already in positions that view a portion of their work as benefitting others in society. Workers who are prosocially motivated want to help others to receive benefits through
their effort. If by job design, the workers’ output in their view helps others, they may be partly motivated to produce output because of its benefit to others. Organizations may be able to tailor job designs for workers who are highly prosocially motivated and workers who have lower prosocial motivation. By aligning the resource with a job that matches their motivated interest, organizations may increase the performance, productivity and creativity of workers (Grant, 2008; Grant & Berry, 2011).

Second, most organizations in the private sector do not have incentive systems in place that reward prosocial effort. Organizations can directly benefit and utilize this motivation by identifying positions that may be perceived to have a prosocial impact. The next step would be to survey individuals in these positions to see if they are prosocially motivated and/or intrinsically motivated (e.g., employees who love what they do vs. employees who love to help others through their work). The final step would be to create a system to internally recognize these individuals among their colleagues. Prosocially motivated workers may derive more satisfaction by recognition, which may garner interest in the prosocially motivated workers’ cause. This type of reward system can be cost efficient and an effective way to provide rewards, recognition and exposure to deserving employees and their goals.

Third, organizations should review their training and team creation processes, as findings show perspective taking directly affects the use of compromising conflict management. Implementing training practices that focus on perspective taking may help teams deal with intra-group conflict. Training in perspective taking should focus on thinking about how others view a situation. Enhancing this cognitive process in team members may help guide team conflict situations to be handled in a compromising
manner. Organizations should also look to identify individuals with high perspective taking and group similar workers together to create a team high on perspective taking. Conversely, organizations can augment groups low on perspective taking with individuals who may be able to influence group interactions with their ability to take others’ perspectives. Team training courses should also focus on team interaction activities to build team shared mental models. Organizations should also aim to develop standard processes that govern team interactions, which can allow individuals to have shared understandings of how team interaction occurs and may decrease team conflict thereby increasing the opportunity to perform. The overall importance of this research helps organizations improve team-related training processes and uncovers an area of motivation that the company may not be addressing.

Limitations

There are four potential limitations that should be considered when reviewing this research. First, the sample size for this study was very small. Data for only nine teams was captured. Sample size could have influenced the findings, but may have also affected the failure in supporting the hypotheses. Even though sample size has been identified as an issue, the significant findings should not be overlooked. Based on the post hoc analysis conducted, a larger samples size would have likely led to significant findings to support the direct relationship between prosocial motivation and compromise conflict management. This research should pave the way for further studies to obtain a larger sample, with a more diverse set of participants.

Second, the selected industry and participating organizations may not have provided enough variance, which may have limited the outcomes and findings. The
organizations involved were technology firms, which centered in a for-profit industry. Different industries, job roles and designs may affect the interactions of the variables tested in this research. Replicating my research in other industries (i.e., manufacturing and service) would provide a more generalizable application of the findings. Nonprofit industries may also provide another view on interpreting the relationship between prosocial motivation and conflict management. The distinction of for profit and nonprofit business models should also be reviewed in future studies as motivational factors may be more pronounced in nonprofit sectors.

Third, the amount of unusable survey data was around 49%, drawing attention to the survey design. Mental model questions may have been deemed more complex than other sections and caused mental fatigue thereby disengaging the participants from the survey and affecting their willingness to respond to questions. Listwise deletion was used thereby removing data due to the lack of response to questions regarding shared mental models. Future work on mental models may need to ensure the complexity and redundancy of attributes being tested are minimized to reduce the prevalence of disengagement.

Fourth, the data captured may not be representative of full teams. The study was voluntary and subsequently not all team members took the survey and some departments did not participate. This limits the impact of the findings because the results may not be fully generalizable to team attributes and behavior. Researchers should work to add question as part of survey design to control for team size representation.

Future Research
The lack of support showing prosocial motivation’s effect on conflict management does not diminish the value of this motivational factor but draws attention to the need for more research in this area based on other significant findings. The findings indicate a majority of individuals in the organizations surveyed have some level of prosocial motivation (83%), which based on motivational theories may affect their behavior and attitudes (Grant, 2011; Kunda, 1990; Nickerson, 1998). The effect prosocial motivation has on compromising conflict management, with the presence of perspective taking and a shared mental model, highlights the importance of prosocial motivation but research should go further to identify additional individual and team outcomes of this motivation. Scholars may benefit by investigating prosocial motivations effect on behaviors. Stable traits’ link to outcomes driven by the motivation may also differ.

The shared mental model findings provided interesting results for this study. There was an important interaction found between perspective taking and a shared mental model predicting compromising conflict management styles being used but only in regards to a team mental model, not task mental model. The significance draws attention to the importance of shared knowledge and its effect on cognitive processes that may affect team outcomes such as conflict management. The interaction of perspective taking should inspire scholars to uncover if shared models interact with other cognitive processes and lead to common team outcomes such as team cohesion.

Perspective taking was highly significant in the model, which predicted the team related process outcome of compromising conflict management. Future research should determine if there are ways to enhance perspective taking by increasing team awareness and shared knowledge. Intrinsic motivation had a strong effect on perspective taking and
may also identify other area of further research by identifying how mixed motivations are handled by individuals and teams. Perspective taking was used as a mediating factor in this study but may be a stronger predictor of team related outcomes due to its direct influence on conflict management.

**Conclusion**

This study has helped to expand the understanding of prosocial motivation and its effect on team processes. The importance of perspective taking and its impact on a team with shared team values may lead to other team-related outcomes that could be influenced by these relationships. Organizations should take care in reviewing their reward and merit structures to ensure they are utilizing and rewarding this type of motivation which can be realized as actual work effort and productivity. These companies should also focus on reviewing their hiring or training methods in regard to team development and coordination. Training in methods that help teams share their knowledge may help build a team model, and allow for team members to share perspectives easier. This can allow team members to be on the same page in their work activities, and hopefully with the right motivation, make a difference.
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Table 1

*Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial Motivation</td>
<td>(0.95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>(0.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective Taking</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>(0.79)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromising Conflict Management</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>(0.83)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Shared Mental Model</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Shared Mental Model</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| M       | 6.08   | 5.64   | 6.09   | 3.58   | 0.62   | 0.33   |
| SD      | 0.85   | 0.69   | 0.27   | 0.71   | 0.40   | 0.53   |
Table 2

Linear Regression -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²=.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R²=.41, ΔR²=.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R²=.79, ΔR²=.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial Motivation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective Taking</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.65*</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
Table 3

Mediation Model With Perspective Taking Using PROCESS - Model 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Perspective Taking</th>
<th>Compromising Conflict Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>$R^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective Taking</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial Motivation</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\beta$, $SE$, $t$

- Constant: 6.22*** $SE$ 1.01 $t$ 6.13
- Perspective Taking: $- - -$
- Prosocial Motivation: $-0.03 0.13 0.20$
- Intrinsic Motivation: $0.01 0.17 0.04$

* $p < .05$  ** $p < .01$  *** $p < .001$
Table 4

*Moderated Mediation Model Using PROCESS - Model 14*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Perspective Taking</th>
<th>Compromising Conflict Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>$R^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>β</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-10.87*</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective Taking (PT)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.94*</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial Motivation</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Shared Mental Model (TSMM)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT x TSMM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.30*</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
Table 5

*Multilevel Estimates for Prosocial Motivation Predicting Conflict Management*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables (Fixed Effects)</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial Motivation</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>2.24†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2: Intrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† $p < .10$
Figure 1. Prosocial Motivation and Conflict Management Moderated Mediation Model
Figure 2. Two-way interaction between perspective taking and team shared mental model in predicting compromising conflict management.