When Discordance Becomes Social Capital: The Role of Task Conflicts in Sharing Knowledge[*]

Jaeun Lim[**]

Although organizational studies have revealed the impact of conflicts on creativity, its mechanisms still remain a "black box": they somehow influence some aspects of creativity under some circumstances. Thus, the relationship between conflicts and organizational outcomes, especially creative performance, has been a highly controversial topic in organizational research. This study reviews prior literature on group conflicts and creativity and propose how intra-group conflicts affect group creativity; through which mechanisms they function; and under what circumstances those relationships would strengthened or attenuated. For these purposes, this study examines mediating role of two contrasting types of knowledge management behavior: knowledge sharing and hiding. In addition, current study predicts the role of organizational justice to identify the contexts for both knowledge sharing and hiding under circumstances of task and relationship conflicts. I expect that task

---

conflicts enhance knowledge sharing behavior among employees only under certain condition, whereas relationship conflicts generally hamper knowledge exchanges and combinations in a group. In particular, I postulate that task conflict, contrary to relationship conflict, promotes knowledge sharing in a group with high levels of procedural and distributive justice. This study further proposes that knowledge sharing behaviors among employees driven by task-related conflict will enable them to produce novel and useful ideas, thereby improving their creativity. Implications and contributions are discussed.

Key words: group conflicts and creativity, knowledge sharing and transfer, knowledge hiding, organizational justice, creative performance

Ⅰ. Introduction

Work groups or work teams, defined as "a distinguishable set of two or more people who interact, dynamically, interdependently, and adaptively toward a common and valued goal, objective, mission" (Salas, Dickinson, Converse, & Tannenbaum, 1992, p. 4) are burgeoning as a key function for work performed in organizations (Sundstrom, 1999). Organizations are increasingly relying on groups to respond to changing environments. At the same time, it is known that one of the key capacities for an organization to effectively react to the rapidly changing environment is creativity (Tjosvold, Tang, & West, 2004). Recent reviews of creativity literature suggest that creativity also developed thorough functioning of groups rather than individuals (Shalley, Zhou, & Oldham, 2004). Accordingly, not only the influences of group conflicts on employee attitudes but also the links between different types of

conflicts and overall team creativity have become a recent focus of organizational research (Farth, Lee & Farth, 2010).

This study infers the effects of different types of intra-group conflict on a group creativity. Although past studies on intra-group conflict had largely focused on the negative influence of conflict on group outcomes, some studies have shown positive impact of task conflict on group behaviors and performances (e.g., Jehn, 1995; De Dreu, 2006; Bradley, Postlethwaite, Klotz, & Hamdani, 2012). On the other hand, recent research indicates that task conflict may positively associates with organizational outcomes only under certain conditions (e.g., Todorova, Bear, & Weingart, 2014). In respond to this ongoing argument, this study scrutinizes the effect of task conflict as well as relationship conflict on group creativity and the mediating role of knowledge sharing and hiding behaviors among group members. This study further identified contextual factors for this relationship: organizational procedural and distributive justice. Several types of organizational justice (e.g., procedural, distributive, informational, and interpersonal justice) has long been studied in organizational literature in various settings, especially as conditions for positive outcomes (e.g., Andrews, Kacmar, and Harris, 2009). Several studies also have shown that negative moods and disputatious climate can positively affect creativity when reward for creative performance is high (George & Zhou, 2002). As distributive justice reflects employees' perceptions of level of transparency of rewards, current study predicts that the high level of organizational justice would be a condition for positive association of task conflict and creativity. This study expects that under high levels of organizational distributive and procedural justice, task conflict may enhance group creativity, particularly through promoting sharing knowledge and opinion among group members.

This study also anticipates the negative relationship between relationship conflict and workgroup creativity; and the mediating role of knowledge hiding. Knowledge

hiding, defined as "an intentional attempt by an individual to withhold or conceal knowledge that has been requested by another person" (Connelly, Zweig, Webster, and Trougakos, 2012), is usually triggered by distrust among employees (Connelly et al., 2012). Since relationship conflict is both a reflection and a consequence of lacking faith among people, this study expects that knowledge hiding also arises from relationship conflicts among employees. Current study further anticipates that interactional justice would alleviate the negative effect of relationship conflict on knowledge hiding. Contrary to the expected effect of task conflict on creativity, however, I expect that knowledge hiding would generally hamper the creativity of a group regardless of its contexts. Moreover, I expect that two contrasting types of knowledge management behaviors—knowledge sharing and hiding—mediate the relationships between two types of intra-group conflicts—task and relationship conflicts—and group creativity.

Knowledge sharing enables group members to acquire and exchange different opinions, ideas, and perspectives among them (Jehn, 1995; Pelled, Eisenhardt, & Xin, 1999). Task conflict is one of the mechanism through which people discuss about the different problems and suggestions on collective tasks. (Jehn, 1997; Jehn & Bendersky, 2003). During the arguments, existing information is elaborated (Hoever, Van Knippenberg, van Ginkel, & Barkema, 2012) and brainstorming is enhanced (Paulus & Yang, 2000) of which are positively associates with group creativity. On the other hand, recent study that has explored the concept of knowledge hiding suggested that knowledge hiding destroys employees' creativity (Cerne, Nerstad, & Dysvik, 2014). Therefore, this study expected that knowledge sharing among group members enhance group creativity while knowledge hiding behaviors exacerbates the creativity of a group.

Thus, this study scrutinizes the mediating mechanisms of knowledge sharing and hiding behaviors among group members through which task and relationship conflicts

affect group creativity. Furthermore, the study forecasts moderating role of three types of justice; distributive, procedural, and interactional. These suggestions would provide following implications. First and foremost, this study prospects the positive influences of intra-group task conflicts on creativity by identifying their mechanisms that based on knowledge management behaviors. Although organizational studies have revealed the impact of conflicts on creativity, its mechanisms still remain a "black box": they somehow influence some aspects of creativity under some circumstances. This study suggests that task conflicts can enhance group creativity through triggering knowledge sharing within a group. This study further indicates that therefore managing the task-related conflicts in a group is critical for constructing effective knowledge flow structure. Second, this study identifies contextual factors which moderates the relationship between conflicts and knowledge transfer among group members; organizational justice catalyzes the positive effects of task conflicts on knowledge exchange within work-groups. Third, the study implies how the knowledge management behavior differently response to two distinct types of conflict; that is, task conflicts would encourage spirals of knowledge among employees, whereas relationship conflicts hinder knowledge exchange and combination in general. Last but not least, this study reveals that two different types of group conflicts—task and relationship conflicts—as well as two contrasting types of knowledge management behaviors—knowledge sharing and hiding—are not mutually exclusive, indicating that the interplays between conflicts and behaviors are much more complex than previously known.

Ⅱ. The concept of intra-group conflict

These days most employees' in organizations work by groups rather than by themselves in order to benefit from cooperation and synergies. And often or sometimes, most groups necessarily experience intra-group conflict as mutual interactions, communications and discussions can bring about disagreements on decisions, process, or values. Conflicts in a group can influence its member's attitudes and behaviors including commitment, affects, turnover, and creativity, and overall group outcomes such as performance and innovation.

Prior studies on intra-group conflict have largely focused on its negative influences on group outcomes; conflicts reduce employees' productivity (Gladstein, 1984); jeopardize their satisfaction (Wall & Nolan, 1986); and impede employee retention (Pondy, 1967). They tend to regard the group conflict as a single-dimensional construct, possibly overlooking the distinct natures of different types to conflicts, failing to recognize difference of their causes. On the other hand, few studies have pointed out bright sides of conflict; conflicts in a group can bring about employees to come up with new ideas (Baron, 1984); and can contribute to provide better solutions for problems (Kahn & Boulding, 1964). Most of them ground their analyses in two distinct types of conflict: relationship and task (Jehn, 1994; 1995; 1997) whereas some argues three types: relationship, task, and process conflict (Jehn & Mannix, 2001). In this study, I would take the former view that is conceptualized by Jehn (1994, 1995, 1997), as those two types of conflict—task and relationship—are most commonly discussed in recent conflict literature.

Relationship conflict refers to emotional discord between people caused by interpersonal incompatibilities including tension, hostility, antagonism, wariness, and disfavor whereas task conflict is work-related conflict reflecting disagreements about task-related issues, problems, and content of decisions (Jehn, 1995; Simons &

Peterson, 2000). According to meta-analysis conducted by De Dreu & Weingart (2003), task conflict and relationship conflict are significantly correlated with each other, suggesting that certain type of conflict can trigger another and further implying that both types of conflict can exist at the same time. Choi and Cho (2011) empirically tested the causal relationship between task and relationship conflict and identified the mediating and moderating mechanisms; according to their longitudinal study, relationship conflict strongly and positively predicts future task conflict; in contrast, the study revealed that task conflict was not associated with future relationship conflict. Simons and Peterson (2000) investigated contingent factors that intensify the effects of relationship conflict on task conflict; they found out that task conflict is more strongly affected by relationship conflict especially when the level of intra-group trust is low and when the level of aggressive conflict management tactics is high. Jehn (1995) conceptualized organizational conflict into two types—task and relationship conflict—and emphasized the positive aspects of task conflict, arguing that certain conditions are required for task conflict to positively function in a group or an organization. In response to this argument, many studies have examined the relationship between task conflict and group outcomes (e.g., De Dreu, 2006; Shaw, Zhu, Duffy, & Scott; 2011), showing that task conflict can enhance group effectiveness as well as employees' outcome. In contrast, a meta-analysis conducted by De Dreu and Weingart (2003) has shown that both task and relationship conflicts hamper group functioning. Given these controversial points in mind, I aim to provide a better understanding of group conflict and its causal mechanisms through which they affect key group outcomes and to identify the contextual factors that impact these mechanisms.

Task conflict

Task conflict describes disagreements among people in a group due to the difference in ideas, viewpoints, and disputes among group members on directions or solutions about the task-related issues (Jehn, 1994; 1995). Many studies have examined the relationship between intra-group task conflict and group functioning and outcomes, suggesting that task conflict can enhance group outcomes only under certain condition; otherwise it negatively affects key figures of group functioning such as trust (Langfred, 2007), satisfaction (De Dreu & Weingart, 2003), and integration (Li & Hambrick, 2005). For instance, Jehn (1995) differentiated task conflict from relationship conflict, maintaining that task conflict can benefit group outcomes under certain condition: task conflict ameliorates group performance when task is not routine but highly complex. Jehn's study (1995) led many researchers to investigate the benefits of task conflict and their required conditions. Farth, Lee & Farth (2010) explored the inverted-U relationship between task conflict and team creativity, implying that task conflict would initially improve creativity up to certain level; although this direction can be inverted if the level of task conflict goes extremely high. In a similar vein, De Dreu (2006) also suggested inverted-U relationship between task conflict and innovation. Recent study conducted by Bradley, Postlethwaite, Klotz, and Hamdani (2012) investigated the relationship between task conflict and team performance, finding that positive effects of task conflict on team performance are possible only when the level of psychological safety climate of a team is high; to be specific, when psychological safety climate is high, team members are more likely to suggest innovative ideas and tend to strive for finding solutions for problems under the existence of task-related conflict. Chun & Choi (2014) examined the positive relationship between task conflict and group performance while controlling the effect of relationship conflict and status conflict. Shaw, Zhu, Duffy, and Scott (2011) also provided a contingency model of the task

conflict and predicted its effects on performance, identifying the moderating role of relationship conflict. Another research that based on contingency model investigated that task conflict enhances team performances when the average level of teams' openness to experience and emotional stability are high (Klotz, Postlethwaite, & Brown, 2013). Todorova, Bear, and Weingart (2014) asserted that task conflict can energize individuals to acquire new knowledge and information; task conflict improves individuals' job satisfaction through leading them to acquire more useful information and knowledge as well as promoting their positive emotions. Based on the prior literature, it could be concluded that task conflict may improve individual, organizational, or group-level outcomes; and the significance as well as strength of this relationship largely depend on the situations. Thus, this study postulates that one of key issues in predicting the effects of task conflict is to identify moderating variables of which impact the effects of task conflict on key outcomes including collective as well as individual creativity.

Relationship conflict

Relationship conflict refers to interpersonal problems among group members, triggering the negative affect such as tension, hostility, antagonism, wariness, or disfavor (Jehn, 1994, 1995). Relationship conflict has been generally discussed as detrimental to group functioning, leading a group to ineffective communication and to lack of cooperation (Jehn, 1995, 1997; Jehn & Mannix, 2001). De Dreu and Van Vianen (2001) argued that "one reason why teams fail to be productive is because they fail to develop a positive team climate and instead develop relationship conflicts" (De Dreu & Van Vianen, 2001, p. 310). Unlike task conflict, relationship conflict has been considered harmful to the groups and organizations. For instance, Chen, Sharma, Edinger, Shapiro, and Farth (2011) investigated the effects of relationship conflicts on employees' attitudes, finding that relationship conflicts

jeopardize a team's level of psychological empowerment and team members' affective commitment. Relationship conflicts also encourage abusive supervision (Tepper, Moss, & Duffy, 2011), hamper group performance (Chun & Choi, 2014). In similar vein, Jehn and Mannix (2001) concluded that high performing groups tend to have low level of relationship conflicts. Moreover, Choi and Cho, (2011) has shown that relationship conflicts trigger task conflict through both direct and indirect ways; relationship conflicts increase negative group affect, thereby enhancing task conflicts. Thus, this study views relationship conflict, contrary to task conflict, is harmful to groups or organizations regardless of their conditions and environments, rendering them have low levels of effectiveness as well as high levels of negative affect.

Ⅲ. Knowledge sharing and hiding

Knowledge Sharing

Knowledge has been an extensive focus of recent literature in various organizational and group settings. Knowledge-based view suggests that managing and creating knowledge are crucial for organizations to acquire competitive advantage (Argote & Ingram, 2000; Grant, 1996). As organizations create novel idea of which contribute to innovation through exchanging and combining existing knowledge among subgroups and employees, knowledge sharing is key capacity for organizations and groups should have in order to create values in rapidly changing environment. Prior studies suggest that knowledge sharing behaviors are positively related to various organizational outcomes including performance (Srivastava & Bartol, & Locke, 2006; Collins & Smith, 2006; Kim & Yun, 2015) and productivity (Arthur & Huntley, 2005). Nonaka (1994) defined knowledge as "justified true belief" (Nonaka, 1994, p. 15) and classified knowledge into two types: tacit and explicit. The former refers to

knowledge accumulated through personal experiences and observation as well as know-how, of which are not easy to imitate; whereas the latter is the knowledge that are usually included in formalized document, thereby relatively easy to utilize. Thus, it is important for employees and group members to share not only explicit knowledge through exchanging formal documents but also tacit knowledge by unofficial communication and socialization.

Many scholars investigated the determinants and their mechanisms through which knowledge sharing and transferring behaviors among employees are enhanced. For instance, Lin (2007) has shown that co-worker congruence, employees' organizational commitment, task interdependence, and participative decision-making process increases employees' knowledge sharing behaviors. Human resource practices of an organization such as reward policy, incentive structure, and compensation system also affect knowledge exchange and combination among employees (Collins & Smith; 2006; Wang, Noe, & Wang. 2014). Collins & Smith (2006) further examined that organizational social climates, especially climates of trust, cooperation, and shared codes and language encourage knowledge exchange and combination among employees. Another study conducted by Srivastava and Bartol (2006) emphasizes the role of a group leader, particularly his or her empowering behaviors; those behaviors promotes knowledge sharing among subordinates.

Therefore, managing knowledge and encouraging members to share and combine their knowledge and information are critical for an organization and a group in order to produce creative performance. And it is known that employees exchange their knowledge on different areas through mutual discussions, debates, and communication (Jehn, 1995; Pelled, Eisenhardt, & Xin, 1999). As several studies suggested that task conflict could trigger effective as well as active group discussion (Jehn, 1997; Jehn & Bendersky, 2003), this may lead group members to exchange their knowledge and information. That is, task conflict can benefit a group if it is processed and managed

in a proper way, by bringing about knowledge sharing among group members. And it is also known that combined knowledge often produce novel and useful idea, which is the definition of creativity (Zhou, 1998).

Knowledge Hiding

Knowledge hiding, defined as "an intentional attempt by an individual to withhold or conceal knowledge that has been requested by another person" (Connelly et al, 2012), is an emerging construct which is relatively new thereby remained unexplored heretofore. Even though several scholars discussed seemingly similar constructs such as knowledge withholding (Besnier, 1989; Hass & Park, 2010; Lin & Huang, 2010) and information concealing (Tomas, & Butera, 2009), the term 'knowledge hiding' was first introduced by Connelly et al. (2012). They distinguished knowledge hiding from several relevant notions: deception, workplace incivility, social undermining, aggression, counterproductive workplace behaviors (CWBs), knowledge withholding, and knowledge hoarding. According to Connelly et al. (2012), knowledge hiding is different from above concepts in terms of its intension; most of aforementioned behaviors are largely based on deliberate and malicious motivations while knowledge hiding behaviors are triggered by more diverse, broader motivations. For example, CWBs are the behaviors that are "intended to have a detrimental effect on organizations and their members'' (Fox, Spector & Miles, 2001, p. 292), whereas knowledge hiding behaviors are not necessarily caused by detrimental or jeopardous intentions (Connelly et al., 2012). On some occasions, knowledge hiding behaviors could be motivated by reasonable and even favorable causes, such as secrecy or keeping others' secret weakness.

Thus, Connelly et al. (2012) attempted to validate knowledge hiding as an independent construct and developed its unique measurement. They conducted exploratory factor analysis (EFA) in order to examine discriminant validity of the

measurement; and based on the results of the analysis, they categorized knowledge hiding behaviors into three dimensions: rationalized hiding, evasive hiding, and playing dumb. Rationalized hiding is when hider hides his or her knowledge based on logical reasons; for example, hiding knowledge from a competing department. In contrast, evasive hiding and playing dumb include certain level of deceptions; evasive hiding includes speaking vaguely and shirking; and playing dumb involves pretending that he or she has no information.

Although knowledge hiding behaviors could be separated into different types, recent study conducted by Cerne, Nestad, and Dysvik (2014) suggested that these behaviors negatively affect group functioning regardless of their types. They investigated that knowledge hiding behaviors increase distrust in a group, and in turn, impede group creativity. On the other hand, Connelly et al. (2012) claimed that knowledge hiding behaviors are resulted from distrust, arguing the causal relationship that is opposed to Cerne et al. (2014). Others also explored antecedents of knowledge hiding behaviors; knowledge hiding behaviors are triggered by both individual- and group-level causes such as psychological ownership of knowledge (Peng, 2013), individuals' personalities (Anand & Jain, 2014), group justice (Tsay, Lin, Yoon, & Huang, 2014; Xeonoudaki & Stafyla, 2012), characteristics of knowledge and organizational contexts, leader-member exchange (LMX) and perceived organizational politics (Pan & Zhang, 2014).

Important feature of knowledge hiding is that it is different from merely absence of knowledge sharing. Instead, knowledge hiding is independent construct, which is clearly distinguishable from low-level of knowledge sharing; it is possible that the levels of both knowledge sharing and hiding are both high at the same time in a group. Even though most people generally regard the two concepts as mutually exclusive behaviors—to share or to hide knowledge—, they can exist at the same time as their motivations are vary (Connelly et al., 2012). In general, absence of

knowledge sharing largely caused by a lack of certain knowledge, whereas knowledge hiding occurs even when he or she owns the knowledge (Connelly et al., 2012). Thus, it is necessary to explore the antecedents and outcomes of both knowledge hiding and sharing behaviors in order to clarify knowledge flow patterns among individuals.

Ⅳ. The concept of organizational justice

Majority of studies on organizational justice categorize it into three basic types—distributive, procedural, and interactional justice (e.g., Barsky & Kaplan, 2007)—while some argues that there are four types; distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice (e.g., Colquitt, 2001; Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001; Colquitt & Rodell, 2011). Others claimed that because employees may not separately perceive different types of justice, overall justice best represents the level of justice in a group or an organization (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009; Greenberg, 2001; Holtz & Harold, 2009).

Distributive justice is largely related with compensation, referring the level of employees' perceptions of fairness of their groups or organizations' process and policy of sharing gains including profits, interests, and incentives. And procedural justice is the perceived fairness of procedures of decision makings in an organization (Greenberg, 1990). Interactional justice is consisted with four factors; respect, propriety, justification, and truthfulness (Bies & Moag, 1986) and conceptualized into two sub-dimensions; interpersonal and informational justice. Respect and propriety represent interpersonal justice while justification and truthfulness compose informational justice (Bies, 2005; Colquitt, 2001; Colquitt & Shaw, 2005; Greenberg, 1993).

For recent two decades, considerable attention has been paid to different types of organizational justice in organizational literature. They mostly treated organizational justice as beneficial to a group or an organization; high level of organizational or group justice positively related to group or organizational functioning, especially to employees' positive attitudes toward a group or an organization. Recent meta-analytic study suggested that both procedural and informational justice positively affect a group's level of quality of social exchange, employees' task performance, employees' organizational citizenship behavior; while distributive justice and interpersonal justice increase social exchange among employees (Colquitt, Scott, Rodell, Long, Zapata, & Conlon, 2013). Several researches have attempted to investigate determinants of specific types of organizational justice; for instance, positive affect and employee voice elevates distributive, procedural, and interactional justice; whereas negative affect and doubt among employees discourages them (Barsky & Kaplans, 2007; Greenbaum, Kuenzi, & Shteynberg, 2009). Perceived organizational support was positively associates with procedural justice (Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor, 2000; Wayne, Shore, Bommer, & Tetrick, 2002) and the level of supervisor's charisma (Scott, Colquitt, & Zapata-Phelan, 2007) and leader-member exchange (Cropanzano, Prehar, & Chen, 2002; Masterson et al., 2000) enhanced employee perception of interactional justice.

Organizational justice is positively relates to individual as well as group level outcomes, such as employees' job satisfaction, supervisor satisfaction, commitment, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), evaluations of authority, performance (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001; Simons & Roberson, 2003; Wayne, Shore, & Bommer, 2002); and a group's level of effectiveness, performance, and withdrawal (Whitman, Caleo, Carpenter, Horner, & Bernerth, 2012).

Many studies investigated organizational justice as a moderator, a factor that synergizes positive effects or a factor that attenuates negative relationships. For example, organizational justice weakened the negative effects of employees' perceptions of organizational politics on employees' job performance as well as their level of organizational citizenship behavior (Andrews, Kacmar, & Harris, 2009). Distributive justice negatively interacts with abusive supervision, weakening the relationship between a supervisor's abusive supervision and subordinates' deviant behaviors (Thau & Mitchell, 2010). In this study, I also predict that justice, especially procedural and distributive justice, may affects the relationship between the group conflict and groups' level of knowledge sharing as well as hiding.

Ⅴ. Group creativity

Creativity, defined as both novel and useful idea (Zhou, 1998; Zhou & Shalley, 2003) has been studied for decades as a key explanatory variable as it improves innovative performance of a group or an organization (Amabile, 1988). Many studies suggested that creativity is a critical capability of which employees and groups should have in order to cope with rapidly changing environment; to maintain organizational effectiveness; and to obtain competitive advantage that enables organization to survive for a long-time (Amable, 1996; Bharadwaj & Menon, 2000; Nonaka, 1991).

Many scholars attempted to investigate antecedents, consequence, and contextual factors of creativity (Shalley, Zhou, & Oldham, 2004); time pressure had inverted-U shaped relationship with creativity (Baer & Oldham, 2006); contextual factors including positive affect (Parke, Seo, & Sherf, 2015), job complexity (West & Farr, 1990), evaluation and rewards policy (Amabile, 1996; Eisenberger, 1992; Zhou &

Shalley, 2003) were related with creativity both in direct and indirect ways. Group characteristics such as autonomy (Liu, Chen, & Yao, 2011; Zhou, 1998), team-member exchange (Liao, Liu, & Loi, 2010), team practices (Hirst, Van Knippenberg, Chen, & Sacramento, 2011), group process (Sung & Choi, 2012) and group diversity (Shin, Kim, Lee, & Bian, 2012; Hoever, van Knippenberg, van Ginkel, & Barkema, 2012) directly affected group creativity. Individual attributes such as personalities (Oldham & Cummings, 1996), the level of motivation (Amabile, 1983), and individuals' creative self-efficacy (Tierney & Farmer, 2002, 2011; Richter, Hirst, van Knippenberg, & Baer, 2012), group and organizational commitment (Madjar, Greenberg, & Chen, 2011), and an individual's emotional intelligence (Parke et al., 2015) were also positively associated with both individual-and group-level creativity. Some emphasized the role of social networks, especially that of weak ties (Granovetter, 1973; Hansen, 1999); they argued that strongly tied networks are homophilious in terms of contents of knowledge in the networks; whereas weak ties are more heterogeneous thereby better to acquire novel knowledge (Baer, 2010); Venkataramani, Richter, and Clarke (2014) examined that a leader's network centrality and the level of density among employees' networks interactively affect group creativity. Others investigated factors related to the relationship between a group leader and group members including leadership (Gong, Huang, & Farth, 2009; Shin & Zhou, 2003), leader-member exchange (Tierney, Farmer, & Graen, 1999), and supervisor expectations (Tierney & Farmer, 2004); and found that they also strongly affect group-level creativity. Zhou (2003) argued the role of coworkers; insisting that the presence of creative coworkers and a supervisor's monitoring interactively affect team members' creativity. On the other hand, Change, Jia, Takeuchi, and Cai (2014) point out the importance of structural figures, arguing that strategic human resource management practice, particularly high-commitment work system, enhances group creativity.

Furthermore, as work groups are key functions for work performed in organizations (Sundstrom, 1999), recent research has shown that organizations pay greater attentions to group creativity rather than that of individuals (Shalley, Zhou, & Oldham, 2004). Thus, in this study, I focus on the group creativity, which defined as "the production of novel and useful ideas concerning products, services, processes, and procedures by a group of employees working together" (Shin & Zhou, 2007, p. 1715). As its definition implies, creative performance is produced by the group process of sharing ideas, concerns and knowledge. Other studies also suggested that workgroup creativity is affected by information elaboration (Hoever et al., 2012), and brainstorming (Paulus & Yang, 2000) among individuals. In a similar vein, Richter, Hirst, van Knippenberg, and Baer (2012) suggested the notion of "knowledge of who knows what" (KWKW) as a key factor that contributes to group creativity and innovation; and KWKW could enhanced through knowledge sharing among group members. It is also known that high level of cooperation among group members enhances group creativity (Amabile, 1996; Tushman, Anderson, & O'Reilly, 1997). As many prior studies proved the role of workgroups and strong effects of their group members' behaviors on group creativity and creative outcomes, this study also focus on the group dynamics and their impacts on group creativity.

VI. Effect of group conflict on knowledge management behaviors

Direct impacts of conflict on knowledge sharing and hiding

Organizational studies have revealed the impacts of task conflict on knowledge sharing behaviors; and the relationship between group-level attributes and knowledge hiding behaviors have also been investigated. Task conflict could improve group-level outcomes through promoting effective discussions and sharing opinions. In contrast,

relationship conflict, in general, is detrimental to group outcomes; for example, relationship conflict may hamper the productive discussion as it arises from relatively long-term emotional hostility rather than temporal disagreements of opinions among members. Based on prior findings, this study expects that two different types of group conflicts—task and relationship conflict—would affect two distinct types of knowledge management behaviors—knowledge sharing and hiding—on a different scale.

I addition, although studies have revealed task conflict can increase employees' knowledge sharing behaviors (Panteli & Sockalingam, 2005; Chen, Zhang, & Vogel, 2011), most of them indicated that task conflict can enhance group creativity only under certain conditions (e.g., Todorova et al, 2014). On the other hand, relationship conflict usually hampers group outcomes. Chen, Zhang, and Vogel (2011) explores that task conflict triggers knowledge sharing through work-engagement process, whereas relationship conflict generally impedes knowledge sharing among employees.

Thus, as the relationship and its strength between task conflict and group creativity are largely depend on contextual factors, I also aim to propose interactive effects of conflict and justice on group creativity. As considerable number of studies investigated positive effects of task conflict on sharing knowledge while proving negative effects of relationship conflict on communication among group members (Jehn, 1995; Farth & Lee, 2010; De Dreu, 2006; Bradley et al., 2012; Chun & Choi, 2014; Shaw et al., 2011; Klotz et al., 2013; Todorova et al., 2014), I also expect task conflict and relationship conflict will independently and directly affect knowledge sharing and knowledge hiding, respectively. Moreover, I also anticipate that the positive effects of task conflict on knowledge sharing would be significant only under the certain circumstances.

> *Proposition 1: Task conflict in a group is positively related to knowledge sharing among the group members only when certain conditions are satisfied.*

Proposition 2: In general, the level of relationship conflict in a group is positively related to knowledge hiding among the group members.

Justice as a moderator

This study proposes moderating roles of three types of justice; distributive, procedural, and interactional. Prior research has shown contextual effects of organizational justice (Andrews, Kacmar, & Harris, 2009; Thau & Mitchell, 2010). It has been also revealed that negative moods and debates can positively affect group creativity when both the level and clarity of reward for creative performance is high (George & Zhou, 2002). As negative moods, debates, and arguments are strongly associated with group task conflict, and the clarity of rewards is one of definitions of distributive justice, I expect that procedural and distributive justice would also moderate the relationship between task conflict and group creativity.

Distributive justice refers the employees' perceptions of fairness of the distributions of organizational outcomes. Therefore, group members who perceive their groups level of distributive justice as high may willing to share their knowledge during group discussions. Similarly, as procedural justice is the perceived fairness of procedures of decision makings in a group or an organization (Greenberg, 1990), group members will more likely to exchange their ideas when the level of the group's procedural justice is high. I also expect that interactional justice, which reflect respect, propriety, justification, and truthfulness among people (Bies & Moag, 1986), will attenuate the relationship between relationship conflict and knowledge hiding behaviors.

Proposition 3: When distributive justice is high, task conflict will positively relate to group creativity.

Proposition 4: When procedural justice is high, task conflict will positively relate to group creativity.

Proposition 5: Interactional justice moderates the relationship between relationship conflict and knowledge hiding, such that the positive relationship becomes weaker when interactional justice is high than when it is low.

Ⅶ. Effects of knowledge management behaviors on group creativity

Group creativity is generally enhanced through knowledge exchange behaviors of group members such as information elaboration (Hoever et al., 2012), and brainstorming (Paulus & Yang, 2000). This study expects that knowledge sharing would enable group members to come up with novel and useful ideas, which is the definition of creativity. On the other hand, knowledge hiding will jeopardize group creativity because it hiders knowledge exchange and combination among group members. Therefore, this study predicts that knowledge sharing behaviors among group members will enhance group creativity while knowledge hiding would hamper creativity of a group.

Proposition 6: Knowledge sharing is positively related to group creativity.

Proposition 7: Knowledge hiding is negatively related to group creativity.

This study also anticipates that intra-group task conflict will improve group creativity through knowledge sharing among group members whereas relationship conflict will destroy group creativity by enhancing knowledge hiding behaviors among individuals.

Proposition 8: Knowledge sharing mediates the relationship between task conflict and group creativity.

Proposition 9: Knowledge hiding mediates the relationship between relationship conflict and group creativity.

Ⅷ. Conclusion

This paper proposed the underlying mechanism of the relationship between group conflict and group creativity by linking how knowledge sharing and hiding affected by and affects to those concepts. In addition, this study explained whether those relationships are moderated by contextual factors; in particular, procedural, distributive, and interactional justice. In summary, this paper showed how the task and relationship conflict in a group related to group creativity by affecting group members' knowledge management behaviors: knowledge sharing and hiding. Moreover, this study demonstrated that procedural and distributive justice in a group will benefit a group with high level of task conflict; while interactional justice will alleviate negative effects of relationship conflict on sharing knowledge.

This study would contribute to group creativity research by showing the significance of the task conflict to group creativity and by pointing out its influence on knowledge sharing, which is one of the key antecedents of group creativity. Furthermore, this study also clarified negative effects of relationship conflict on group creativity, by showing how it could manipulate employees' knowledge hiding behaviors. In addition, this study has shown the importance of justice, when considering the effect of contexts on group creativity. Justice is critical for a group not only because it strengthened the positive influence of conflict on creativity, but also it alleviates negative impacts.

Reference

Amabile, T. (1996). *Creativity in context*: Westview press.

Amabile, T. M. (1983). The social psychology of creativity: A componential conceptualization. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 45*(2), 357.

Amabile, T. M. (1988). A model of creativity and innovation in organizations. *Research in organizational behavior, 10*(1), 123-167.

Ambrose, M. L., & Schminke, M. (2009). The role of overall justice judgments in organizational justice research: a test of mediation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(2), 491-500.

Anand, P., & Jain, K. K. (2014). Big Five Personality Types & Knowledge Hiding Behaviour: A Theoretical Framework. *Archives of Business Research, 2*(5), 47-56.

Andrews, M. C., Kacmar, K. M., & Harris, K. J. (2009). Got political skill? The impact of justice on the importance of political skill for job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(6), 1427-1437.

Argote, L., & Ingram, P. (2000). Knowledge transfer: A basis for competitive advantage in firms. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes, 82*(1), 150-169.

Arthur, J. B., & Huntley, C. L. (2005). Ramping up the organizational learning curve: Assessing the impact of deliberate learning on organizational performance under gainsharing. *Academy of Management Journal, 48*(6), 1159-1170.

Baer, M. (2010). The strength-of-weak-ties perspective on creativity: a comprehensive examination and extension. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(3), 592-601.

Baer, M., & Oldham, G. R. (2006). The curvilinear relation between experienced creative time pressure and creativity: moderating effects of openness to experience and support for creativity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(4), 963-970.

Baron, D. P., & Besanko, D. (1984). Regulation and information in a continuing relationship. *Information Economics and Policy, 1*(3), 267-302.

Barsky, A., & Kaplan, S. A. (2007). If you feel bad, it's unfair: a quantitative synthesis of affect and organizational justice perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(1), 286-295.

Besnier, N. (1989). Information withholding as a manipulative and collusive strategy in Nukulaelae gossip. *Language in Society, 18*(03), 315-341.

Bharadwaj, S., & Menon, A. (2000). Making innovation happen in organizations: individual creativity mechanisms, organizational creativity mechanisms or both? *Journal of product innovation management, 17*(6), 424-434.

Bies, R. J. (2005). Are procedural justice and interactional justice conceptually distinct? Greenberg, Jerald (Ed); Colquitt, Jason A. (Ed), (2005). *Handbook of organizational justice.* , (pp. 85-112). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. *Research on negotiation in organizations, 1*(1), 43-55.

Bock, G.-W., Zmud, R. W., Kim, Y.-G., & Lee, J.-N. (2005). Behavioral intention formation in knowledge sharing: Examining the roles of extrinsic motivators, social-psychological forces, and organizational climate. *MIS quarterly*, 87-111.

Bradley, B. H., Klotz, A. C., Postlethwaite, B. E., & Brown, K. G. (2013). Ready to rumble: How team personality composition and task conflict interact to improve performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 98*(2), 385-392.

Bradley, B. H., Postlethwaite, B. E., Klotz, A. C., Hamdani, M. R., & Brown, K. G. (2012). Reaping the benefits of task conflict in teams: the critical role of team psychological safety climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*(1), 151-158.

Černe, M., Nerstad, C. G., Dysvik, A., & Škerlavaj, M. (2014). What goes around comes around: Knowledge hiding, perceived motivational climate, and creativity. *Academy of Management Journal, 57*(1), 172-192.

Chang, S., Jia, L., Takeuchi, R., & Cai, Y. (2014). Do high-commitment work systems affect creativity? A multilevel combinational approach to employee creativity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 99*(4), 665-680.

Chen, G., Sharma, P. N., Edinger, S. K., Shapiro, D. L., & Farh, J.-L. (2011). Motivating and demotivating forces in teams: cross-level influences of empowering leadership and relationship conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(3), 541-557.

Choi, K., & Cho, B. (2011). Competing hypotheses analyses of the associations between group task conflict and group relationship conflict. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 32*(8), 1106-1126.

Chun, J. S., & Choi, J. N. (2014). Members' needs, intragroup conflict, and group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 99*(3), 437-450.

Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes, 86*(2), 278-321.

Collins, C. J., & Smith, K. G. (2006). Knowledge exchange and combination: The role of human resource practices in the performance of high-technology firms. *Academy of Management Journal, 49*(3), 544-560.

Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: a construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 386-400.

Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: a meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 425.

Colquitt, J. A., & Rodell, J. B. (2011). Justice, trust, and trustworthiness: A longitudinal analysis integrating three theoretical perspectives. *Academy of Management Journal, 54*(6), 1183-1206.

Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., Rodell, J. B., Long, D. M., Zapata, C. P., Conlon, D. E., & Wesson, M. J. (2013). Justice at the millennium, a decade later: A meta-analytic test of social exchange and affect-based perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 98*(2), 199-236.

Colquitt, J. A., & Shaw, J. (2005). How should organizational justice be measured. *Handbook of organizational justice, 1*, 113-152.

Connelly, C. E., Zweig, D., Webster, J., & Trougakos, J. P. (2012). Knowledge hiding in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 33*(1), 64-88.

Cropanzano, R., Prehar, C. A., & Chen, P. Y. (2002). Using social exchange theory to distinguish procedural from interactional justice. *Group & Organization Management, 27*(3), 324-351.

De Dreu, C. K. (2006). When too little or too much hurts: Evidence for a curvilinear relationship between task conflict and innovation in teams. *Journal of management, 32*(1), 83-107.

De Dreu, C. K., & Van Vianen, A. E. (2001). Managing relationship conflict and the effectiveness of organizational teams. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 22*(3), 309-328.

De Dreu, C. K., & Weingart, L. R. (2003). Task versus relationship conflict, team performance, and team member satisfaction: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(4), 741-749.

Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative science quarterly, 44*(2), 350-383.

Eisenberger, R. (1992). Learned industriousness. *Psychological review, 99*(2), 248-267.

Farh, J.-L., Lee, C., & Farh, C. I. (2010). Task conflict and team creativity: a question of how much and when. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(6), 1173-1180.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*.

Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Miles, D. (2001). Counterproductive work behavior (CWB) in response to job stressors and organizational justice: Some mediator and moderator tests for autonomy and emotions. *Journal of vocational behavior, 59*(3), 291-309.

Gladstein, D. L. (1984). Groups in context: A model of task group effectiveness. *Administrative science quarterly*, 499-517.

Gong, Y., Huang, J.-C., & Farh, J.-L. (2009). Employee learning orientation, transformational leadership, and employee creativity: The mediating role of employee creative self-efficacy. *Academy of Management Journal, 52*(4), 765-778.

Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American journal of sociology*, 1360-1380.

Grant, R. M. (1996). Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm. *Strategic management journal, 17*(S2), 109-122.

Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of management, 16*(2), 399-432.

Greenberg, J. (1993). Stealing in the name of justice: Informational and interpersonal moderators of theft reactions to underpayment inequity. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes, 54*(1), 81-103.

Greenberg, J. (2001). Setting the justice agenda: Seven unanswered questions about "what, why, and how". *Journal of vocational behavior, 58*(2), 210-219.

Haas, M. R., & Park, S. (2010). To share or not to share? Professional norms, reference groups, and information withholding among life scientists. *Organization science, 21*(4), 873-891.

Hirst, G., Van Knippenberg, D., Chen, C.-H., & Sacramento, C. A. (2011). How does bureaucracy impact individual creativity? A cross-level investigation of team contextual influences on goal orientation–creativity relationships. *Academy of Management Journal, 54*(3), 624-641.

Hoever, I. J., Van Knippenberg, D., van Ginkel, W. P., & Barkema, H. G. (2012). Fostering team creativity: Perspective taking as key to unlocking diversity's potential. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*(5), 982-996.

Holtz, B. C., & Harold, C. M. (2009). Fair today, fair tomorrow? A longitudinal investigation of overall justice perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(5), 1185-1199.

Jehn, K. A. (1994). Enhancing effectiveness: An investigation of advantages and disadvantages of value-based intragroup conflict. *International journal of conflict management, 5*(3), 223-238.

Jehn, K. A. (1995). A multimethod examination of the benefits and detriments of intragroup conflict. *Administrative science quarterly*, 256-282.

Jehn, K. A. (1997). A qualitative analysis of conflict types and dimensions in organizational groups. *Administrative science quarterly*, 530-557.

Jehn, K. A., & Bendersky, C. (2003). Intragroup conflict in organizations: A contingency perspective on the conflict-outcome relationship. *Research in organizational behavior, 25*, 187-242.

Jehn, K. A., & Mannix, E. A. (2001). The dynamic nature of conflict: A longitudinal study of intragroup conflict and group performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 44*(2), 238-251.

Kahn, R. L., & Boulding, E. (1964). Power and conflict in organizations.

Kim, S. L., & Yun, S. (2015). The effect of coworker knowledge sharing on performance and its boundary conditions: An interactional perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 100*(2), 575-582.

Langfred, C. W. (2007). The Downside of Self-Management: A Longitudinal Study of the Effects tf Conflict on Trust, Autonomy, and Task Interdependence in Self-Managing Teams. *Academy of Management Journal, 50*(4), 885-900.

Li, J., & Hambrick, D. C. (2005). Factional groups: A new vantage on demographic faultlines, conflict, and disintegration in work teams. *Academy of Management Journal, 48*(5), 794-813.

Liao, H., Liu, D., & Loi, R. (2010). Looking at both sides of the social exchange coin: A social cognitive perspective on the joint effects of relationship quality and differentiation on creativity. *Academy of Management Journal, 53*(5), 1090-1109.

Lin, C.-P. (2007). To share or not to share: Modeling tacit knowledge sharing, its mediators and antecedents. *Journal of business ethics, 70*(4), 411-428.

Lin, T.-C., & Huang, C.-C. (2010). Withholding effort in knowledge contribution: The role of social exchange and social cognitive on project teams. *Information & Management, 47*(3), 188-196.

Liu, D., Chen, X.-P., & Yao, X. (2011). From autonomy to creativity: a multilevel investigation of the mediating role of harmonious passion. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(2), 294-309.

Madjar, N., Greenberg, E., & Chen, Z. (2011). Factors for radical creativity, incremental creativity, and routine, noncreative performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(4), 730-743.

Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B. M., & Taylor, M. S. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*(4), 738-748.

Mayer, D. M., Greenbaum, R. L., Kuenzi, M., & Shteynberg, G. (2009). When do fair procedures not matter? A test of the identity violation effect. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(1), 142-161.

Nonaka, I. (1991). The knowledge-creating company. *Harvard business review, 69*(6), 96-104.

Nonaka, I. (1994). A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. *Organization science, 5*(1), 14-37.

Oldham, G. R., & Cummings, A. (1996). Employee creativity: Personal and contextual factors at work. *Academy of Management Journal, 39*(3), 607-634.

Pan, W., & Zhang, Q. (2014). A Study on Motivations of Graduate Students' Knowledge Hiding Based on Wuli-Shili-Renli System Approach. *2nd International Conference on Education, Management and Social Science*

Parke, M. R., Seo, M.-G., & Sherf, E. N. (2015). Regulating and facilitating: The role of emotional intelligence in maintaining and using positive affect for creativity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 100*(3), 917-934.

Paulus, P. B., & Yang, H.-C. (2000). Idea generation in groups: A basis for creativity in organizations. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes, 82*(1), 76-87.

Pelled, L. H., Eisenhardt, K. M., & Xin, K. R. (1999). Exploring the black box: An analysis of work group diversity, conflict and performance. *Administrative science quarterly, 44*(1), 1-28.

Peng, H. (2013). Why and when do people hide knowledge? *Journal of Knowledge Management, 17*(3), 398-415.

Pondy, L. R. (1967). Organizational conflict: Concepts and models. *Administrative science quarterly*, 296-320.

Richter, A. W., Hirst, G., Van Knippenberg, D., & Baer, M. (2012). Creative self-efficacy and individual creativity in team contexts: Cross-level interactions

with team informational resources. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*(6), 1282-1290.

Salas, E., Dickinson, T. L., Converse, S. A., & Tannenbaum, S. I. (1992). Toward an understanding of team performance and training. (Ed); Salas, Eduardo (Ed), (1992). Teams: Their training and performance. , (pp. 3-29). Westport, CT, US: Ablex Publishing.

Scott, B. A., Colquitt, J. A., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2007). Justice as a dependent variable: subordinate charisma as a predictor of interpersonal and informational justice perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(6), 1597-1609.

Shalley, C. E., Zhou, J., & Oldham, G. R. (2004). The effects of personal and contextual characteristics on creativity: Where should we go from here? *Journal of management, 30*(6), 933-958.

Shaw, J. D., Zhu, J., Duffy, M. K., Scott, K. L., Shih, H.-A., & Susanto, E. (2011). A contingency model of conflict and team effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(2), 391-400.

Shin, S. J., Kim, T.-Y., Lee, J.-Y., & Bian, L. (2012). Cognitive team diversity and individual team member creativity: A cross-level interaction. *Academy of Management Journal, 55*(1), 197-212.

Shin, S. J., & Zhou, J. (2003). Transformational leadership, conservation, and creativity: Evidence from Korea. *Academy of Management Journal, 46*(6), 703-714.

Shin, S. J., & Zhou, J. (2007). When is educational specialization heterogeneity related to creativity in research and development teams? Transformational leadership as a moderator. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(6), 1709-1721.

Simons, T., & Roberson, Q. (2003). Why managers should care about fairness: the effects of aggregate justice perceptions on organizational outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(3), 432-443.

Simons, T. L., & Peterson, R. S. (2000). Task conflict and relationship conflict in top management teams: the pivotal role of intragroup trust. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(1), 102-111.

Srivastava, A., Bartol, K. M., & Locke, E. A. (2006). Empowering leadership in management teams: Effects on knowledge sharing, efficacy, and performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 49*(6), 1239-1251.

Sundstrom, E. D. (1999). *Supporting work team effectiveness: Best management practices for fostering high performance*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sung, S. Y., & Choi, J. N. (2012). Effects of team knowledge management on the creativity and financial performance of organizational teams. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes, 118*(1), 4-13.

Tepper, B. J., Moss, S. E., & Duffy, M. K. (2011). Predictors of abusive supervision: Supervisor perceptions of deep-level dissimilarity, relationship conflict, and subordinate performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 54*(2), 279-294.

Thau, S., & Mitchell, M. S. (2010). Self-gain or self-regulation impairment? Tests of competing explanations of the supervisor abuse and employee deviance relationship through perceptions of distributive justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(6), 1009-1031.

Tierney, P., & Farmer, S. M. (2002). Creative self-efficacy: Its potential antecedents and relationship to creative performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*(6), 1137-1148.

Tierney, P., & Farmer, S. M. (2004). The Pygmalion process and employee creativity. *Journal of management, 30*(3), 413-432.

Tierney, P., & Farmer, S. M. (2011). Creative self-efficacy development and creative performance over time. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(2), 277-293.

Tjosvold, D., Tang, M. M., & West, M. (2004). Reflexivity for team innovation in China the contribution of goal interdependence. *Group & Organization Management, 29*(5), 540-559.

Todorova, G., Bear, J. B., & Weingart, L. R. (2014). Can conflict be energizing? A study of task conflict, positive emotions, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 99*(3), 451-467.

Toma, C., & Butera, F. (2009). Hidden profiles and concealed information: Strategic information sharing and use in group decision making. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*(6), 793-806.

Tsay, C. H.-H., Lin, T.-C., Yoon, J., & Huang, C.-C. (2014). Knowledge withholding intentions in teams: The roles of normative conformity, affective bonding, rational choice and social cognition. *Decision Support Systems, 67*, 53-65.

Tushman, M. L., Anderson, P. C., & O'Reilly, C. (1997). Technology cycles, innovation streams, and ambidextrous organizations: organization renewal through innovation streams and strategic change. *Managing strategic innovation and change, 34*(3), 3-23.

Venkataramani, V., Richter, A. W., & Clarke, R. (2014). Creative benefits from well-connected leaders: Leader social network ties as facilitators of employee radical creativity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 99*(5), 966-975.

Wall, V. D., & Nolan, L. L. (1986). Perceptions of inequity, satisfaction, and conflict in task-oriented groups. *Human Relations, 39*(11), 1033-1051.

Wang, S., Noe, R. A., & Wang, Z.-M. (2014). Motivating Knowledge Sharing in Knowledge Management Systems A Quasi–Field Experiment. *Journal of management, 40*(4), 978-1009.

Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., Bommer, W. H., & Tetrick, L. E. (2002). The role of fair treatment and rewards in perceptions of organizational support and leader-member exchange. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(3), 590-598.

West, M. A., & Farr, J. L. (1990). Innovation and creativity at work: Psychology and organizational strategies: Chichester, England: Wiley.

Whitman, D. S., Caleo, S., Carpenter, N. C., Horner, M. T., & Bernerth, J. B. (2012). Fairness at the collective level: A meta-analytic examination of the consequences and boundary conditions of organizational justice climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*(4), 776-791.

Xenoudaki, C., & Stafyla, A. Contextual Factors and Personality Traits in the Exhibition of Deceiving and Hiding-Related Behaviors of Employees, in Post Layoff Environments in Greece.

Zhou, J. (1998). Feedback valence, feedback style, task autonomy, and achievement orientation: Interactive effects on creative performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*(2), 261-276.

Zhou, J. (2003). When the presence of creative coworkers is related to creativity: role of supervisor close monitoring, developmental feedback, and creative personality. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(3), 413-422.

Zhou, J., & Shalley, C. E. (2003). Research on employee creativity: A critical review and directions for future research. *Research in personnel and human resources management, 22*, 165-218.

과업갈등이 그룹 창의성에 미치는 영향: 그룹 구성원의 지식관리행동 및 그룹 공정성의 역할

임 자 은*

요 약

본 연구는 그룹 내부의 과업갈등과 관계갈등이 어떠한 경로를 통해 그룹 창의성에 각기 다른 영향을 미치는지 그 메커니즘을 규명하고, 그 경로를 제언하고자 한 연구이다. 기존의 여러 연구들이 그룹, 팀, 또는 조직 내의 갈등과 창의성에 관계에 대해 논하고자 시도하였으나 그 메커니즘은 여전히 모호하며, 그 방향 또한 학자들 간의 이견이 존재한다. 이 논문은 그룹의 과업갈등과 관계갈등이 구성원들이 지식을 관리하는 구체적인 방식(지식공유 행동과 지식은폐 행동)에 어떠한 영향을 주는지 기존의 연구들을 통해 그 원리를 논의하고 영향을 제언한다. 그리고 궁극적으로 이러한 요인들이 어떻게 그룹 창의성에 영향을 미치는지 제언한다. 또한 본 연구는 이러한 관계들에 영향을 미칠 수 있는 맥락적 요인으로 그룹 공정성(절차적, 분배적, 상호관계적 공정성)의 역할을 제시한다. 본 연구는 이를 통해 그룹 창의성을 결정하는 하나의 메커니즘을 제시하며, 갈등 관리와 지식공유의 중요성을 확인한다. 나아가 본 연구는 이러한 메커니즘의 효과적 작동에 있어 공정성이 가지는 의미를 다시금 강조한다.

---

* 서울대학교 경영학과 박사과정 수료