MOTIVATING EMPLOYEES TO EXPLORE COLLABORATION TECHNOLOGY IN TEAM CONTEXTS

Likoebe M. Maruping

Robinson College of Business, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA 30303 U.S.A. {lmaruping@gmail.com}

Massimo Magni

Department of Management & Technology, SDA Bocconi School of Management, and CRIOS, Bocconi University, 20136 Milan ITALY {massimo.magni@unibocconi.it}

Appendix A

Measurement Scales[1]

Main Study Variables

CT Exploration (Nambisan et al. 1999) [Cronbach α: .75; mean: 3.34; standard deviation: 1.00]
1.   I explore [*system name*] to enhance my work effectiveness.
2.   I explore [*system name*] for potential application in my work.

Team Empowerment (Kirkman et al. 2004) [Cronbach α: .93; mean: 3.44; standard deviation: 0.36]
(*Potency*)
1.   Our team has confidence in itself.
1.   My team believes that we can produce high quality work.
2.   My team believes that we can be very productive.
(*Meaningfulness*)
1.   Our team cares about what it does.
2.   Our team feels that its tasks are worthwhile.
3.   My team feels that its work is meaningful.
(*Autonomy***)**
1.   Our team can select different ways to do the team's work.
2.   Our team determines as a team how things are done in the team.
3.   Our team makes its own choices without being told by management.
(*Impact*)
1.   Our team has a positive impact on this company's customers.
2.   Our team performs tasks that matter to this company.
3.   Our team makes a difference in this organization.

---

[1]Unless otherwise indicated, all multi-item scales were measured on a five-point Likert scale with 1 = "Strongly disagree" to 5 = "Strongly agree."

Continued Intention to Explore (adapted from Nambisan et al. 1999) [Cronbach α: .96; mean: 3.24; standard deviation: .87]
1. I intend to continue exploring how [*system name*] can be used in my work tasks.
2. I intend to continue exploring other ways that [*system name*] may enhance my work effectiveness.
3. I intend to continue spending time and effort in exploring [*system name*] for potential applications to my work.

Continued Expectation to Explore (adapted from Venkatesh et al. 2008) [Cronbach α: .84; mean: 3.24; standard deviation: .83]
1. I expect to continue exploring how [*system name*] can be used in my work tasks.
2. I am likely to continue spending time and effort in exploring [*system name*] for potential applications to my work.
3. I am going to continue exploring how [*system name*] can be used in my work tasks.

Control Variables

Perceived Usefulness (Davis et al. 1989) [Cronbach α: .88; mean: 2.87; standard deviation: .80]
1. [*system name*] will be useful for synchronizing tasks with my teammates.
2. [*system name*] will be effective for sharing information with my teammates.
3. [*system name*] will be effective for managing multiple communications.
4. [*system name*] will be effective for making me accessible while I am traveling outside the office.
5. [*system name*] will be effective for storing and tracking collaboration data.

Facilitating Conditions (Venkatesh et al. 2003) [Cronbach α: .70; mean: 3.18; standard deviation: .82]
1. Team members support each other's efforts to integrate [*system name*] into our work.
2. Our managers suggests ways to integrate [*system name*] into our work.

Personal Innovativeness with IT (Agarwal and Prasad 1998) [Cronbach α: .85; mean: 3.05; standard deviation: .55]
1. If I heard about a new information technology, I would be the first to experiment with it.
2. Among my peers, I am usually the first to try out new information technologies.
3. In general, I am hesitant to try out new information technologies. [reverse-scored item]
4. I like to experiment with new information technologies.

Intention to Explore (Nambisan et al. 1999) [Cronbach α: .94; mean: 3.94; standard deviation: .68]
1. I intend to explore how [*system name*] can be used in my work tasks.
2. I intend to explore other ways that [*system name*] may enhance my work effectiveness.
3. I intend to spend time and effort in exploring [*system name*] for potential applications to my work.

Training (Yi and Davis 2003) [Cronbach α: .86; mean: 2.88; standard deviation: .85]
1. I have undergone training on how to use [*system name*].
2. I attended training sessions about using [*system name*].
3. I was taught how to use [*system name*].
4. I received instructional material on [*system name*].

Task Interdependence (Campion et al. 1993) [Cronbach α: .82; mean: 3.11; standard deviation: .35]
1. Each team member cannot accomplish tasks without information or materials from other members of the team.
2. Members of my team depend on each other for information or materials needed to perform their tasks.
3. Within my team, jobs performed by team members are all related to one another.

Team Dispersion (O'Leary and Cummings 2007)
1. Number of different cities in which team members are located. [obtained from team rosters]

References

Agarwal, R., and Prasad, J. 1998. "A Conceptual and Operational Definition of Personal Innovativeness in the Domain of Information Technology," *Information Systems Research* (9:2), pp. 204-215.

Campion, M. A., Medsker, G. J., and Higgs, A. C. 1993. "Relations Between Work Group Characteristics and Effectiveness: Implications for Designing Effective Work Groups," *Personel Psychology* (46:4), pp. 823-847.

Davis, F. D., Bagozzi, R. P., and Warshaw, P. R. 1989. "User Acceptance of Computer Technology: A Comparison of Two Theoretical Models," *Management Science* (35:6), pp. 982-1003.

Kirkman, B. L., Rosen, B., Tesluk, P. E., and Gibson, C. B. 2004. "The Impact of Team Empowerment on Virtual Team Performance: The Moderating Role of Face-to-Face Interaction," *Academy of Management Journal* (47:2), pp. 175-192.

Nambisan, S., Agarwal, R., and Tanniru, M. 1999. "Organizational Mechanisms for Enhancing User Innovation in Information Technology," *MIS Quarterly* (23:3), pp. 365-395.

O'Leary, M., and Cummings, J. N. 2007. "The Spatial, Temporal, and Configurational Characteristics of Geographic Dispersion in Work Teams," *MIS Quarterly* (31:3), pp. 433-452.

Venkatesh, V., Brown, S. B., Maruping, L. M., and Bala, H. 2008. "Predicting Different Conceptualizations of System Use: The Competing Roles of Behavioral Intention, Facilitating Conditions and Behavioral Expectation," *MIS Quarterly* (32:3), pp. 483-502.

Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., and Davis, F. D. 2003. "User Acceptance of Information Technology: Toward a Unified View," *MIS Quarterly* (27:3), pp. 425-478.

Yi, M. Y., and Davis, F. D. 2003. "Developing and Validating an Observational Learning Model of Computer Software Training and Skill Acquisition," *Information Systems Research* (14:2), pp. 146-169.

Appendix B

Results of Factor Analysis with Direct Oblimin Rotation

Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
CT exploration1	**.77**	.30	.33	.13	.10	.05	.13	.06	.01	.04
CT exploration2	**.79**	.26	.40	.12	.12	.04	.12	.09	.10	.05
Expectation to continue exploring1	.27	**.78**	.35	.23	.11	.02	.17	.14	.14	.18
Expectation to continue exploring2	.29	**.89**	.32	.06	.03	.08	.32	.08	.21	.29
Expectation to continue exploring3	.26	**.71**	.37	.23	.08	.08	.31	.15	.30	.01
Intention to continue exploring1	.19	.21	**.92**	.16	.11	.06	.13	.07	.18	.05
Intention to continue exploring2	.17	.17	**.96**	.15	.04	.12	.15	.06	.14	.19
Intention to continue exploring3	.32	.30	**.93**	.06	.06	.02	.12	.08	.14	.07
Potency1	.04	.04	.08	**.73**	.15	.08	.16	.19	.18	.27
Potency2	.13	.01	.05	**.75**	.05	.01	.03	.06	.17	.06
Potency3	.11	.01	.22	**.74**	.06	.06	.05	.11	.29	.26
Meaningfulness1	.18	.03	.01	**.75**	.08	.01	.01	.08	.16	.14
Meaningfulness2	.05	.03	.10	**.74**	.11	.02	.05	.01	.26	.10
Meaningfulness3	.02	.04	.03	**.70**	.17	.01	.01	.18	.08	.14
Autonomy1	.13	.03	.03	**.80**	.16	.14	.07	.10	.04	.09
Autonomy2	.15	.20	.04	**.72**	.11	.02	.19	.11	.01	.13
Autonomy3	.02	.04	.03	**.84**	.10	.07	.11	.19	.04	.08
Impact1	.06	.11	.01	**.72**	.02	.09	.11	.25	.05	.08
Impact2	.13	.04	.03	**.74**	.07	.01	.13	.01	.29	.04
Impact3	.05	.03	.01	**.72**	.07	.02	.11	.04	.06	.20
Intention to explore 1	.01	.00	.03	.11	**.91**	.05	.11	.12	.12	.04
Intention to explore 2	.00	.03	.01	.14	**.94**	.08	.04	.09	.05	.01
Intention to explore 3	.05	.04	.09	.15	**.90**	.02	.15	.03	.01	.01
Perceived usefulness 1	.03	.06	.11	.10	.03	**.79**	.02	.07	.08	.27
Perceived usefulness 2	.01	.07	.01	.10	.12	**.84**	.01	.15	.16	.43
Perceived usefulness 3	.08	.09	.13	.13	.11	**.81**	.05	.09	.03	.14
Perceived usefulness 4	.15	.17	.04	.07	.11	**.70**	.15	.24	.03	.25
Perceived usefulness 5	.12	.12	.13	.11	.25	**.68**	.02	.10	.05	.08
Personal innovativeness in IT 1	.02	.17	.04	.01	.08	.12	**.84**	.00	.05	.05
Personal innovativeness in IT 2	.10	.24	.10	.12	.15	.09	**.76**	.05	.03	.03
Personal innovativeness in IT 3	.14	.12	.09	.16	.11	.02	**.65**	.09	.03	.13
Personal innovativeness in IT 4	.08	.27	.01	.15	.02	.04	**.78**	.02	.02	.17
Training 1	.05	.04	.33	.09	.03	.05	.03	**.81**	.10	.18
Training 2	.12	.13	.08	.10	.03	.02	.05	**.83**	.08	.02
Training 3	.02	.17	.05	.07	.04	.01	.04	**.79**	.04	.07
Training 4	.16	.06	.13	.18	.04	.02	.10	**.70**	.03	.01
Task interdependence 1	.10	.17	.00	.04	.04	.02	.06	.05	**.75**	.15
Task interdependence 2	.07	.12	.07	.04	.04	.01	.05	.04	**.86**	.11
Task interdependence 3	.11	.16	.14	.12	.06	.12	.04	.22	**.72**	.07
Facilitating conditions1	.10	.10	.13	.21	.18	.24	.07	.03	.09	**.74**
Facilitating conditions2	.15	.20	.25	.28	.09	.13	.03	.06	.13	**.73**

Appendix C

Meso-Mediation Tests

In order to test this cross-level mediation, we followed the guidelines for cross-level mediation testing outlined by Mathieu and Taylor (2007). Cross-level mediation tests (also referred to as meso-mediation tests) build on similar principles to traditional mediation tests outlined by Baron and Kenny (1986) and others (e.g., Krull and MacKinnon 1999, 2001), but differs in that it includes cross-level effects as well (Bauer et al. 2006). Also, depending on the type of cross-level mediation model being hypothesized, considerations of between- and within-group variability need to be addressed (Bauer et al. 2006). In the context of our research model, we posit a 2-1-1 cross-level mediation model, where the relationship between a level-2 (team-level) predictor and a level-1 (individual-level) outcome is mediated by a level-1 (individual-level) mediator (Bauer et al. 2006). Mathieu and Taylor refer to this as cross-level mediation—lower mediation (X→m→y). Cross-level mediation testing follows six steps: (1) account for any level-1 control variables; (2) examine any level-1 outcomes and mediators for between-group variability; (3) establish within-group (level-1) relationships before cross-level mediation testing; (4) establish the relationship between the predictor (X) and the mediator (m); (5) examine the effect of the predictor (X) on the outcome (y) without the mediator (m) in the model; (6) examine the effect of the predictor (X) on the outcome (y) with the mediator (m) in the model. Steps 1 and 2 were followed in that we included level-1 control variables in all models and we established that ICE, ECE, and CT exploration each had sufficient between-team variability. Step 3 was followed in that we found support for H2a and H2b relating ICE (level-1) and ECE (level-1) to CT exploration (level-1). Step 4 was followed in that we found support for H1a and H1b relating team empowerment (level-2) to ICE (level-1) and ECE (level-1). In step 5, we found a positive but nonsignificant cross-level relationship between team empowerment and CT exploration ($\gamma = .10$, $p > .10$). However, a direct relationship is not necessary for indirect effects. In step 6, we observe that this relationship is still nonsignificant ($\gamma = .14$, $p > .10$) in the presence of the mediators, suggesting full mediation. These results provide support for H3a and H3b.

References

Baron, R. M., and Kenny, D. A. 1986. "The Moderator-Mediator Variable Distinction in Social Psychological Research: Conceptual, Strategic, and Statistical Considerations," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* (51:6), pp. 1173-1182.

Bauer, D. J., Preacher, K. J., and Gil, K. M. 2006. "Conceptualizing and Testing Random Indirect Effects and Moderated Mediation in Multilevel Models: New Procedures and Recommendations," *Psychological Methods* (11:2), pp. 142-163.

Krull, J. L., and MacKinnon, D. P. 1999. "Multilevel Mediation Modeling in Group-Based Intervention Studies," *Evaluation Review* (23), pp. 418-444.

Krull, J. L., and MacKinnon, D. P. 2001. "Multilevel Modeling of Individual and Group Level Mediated Effects," *Multivariate Behavioral Research* (36:2), pp. 249-277

Mathieu, J. E., and Taylor, S. R. 2007. "A Framework for Testing Meso-Mediational Relationships in Organizational Behavior," *Journal of Organizational Behavior* (28:2), pp. 141-172.

Appendix D

Results of Supplementary Analysis of Indirect Effects

As noted in the main paper, prior research has treated team empowerment as a unidimensional construct in some studies and a multidimensional construct in others (Seibert et al. 2011). In order to examine potential differences in the effects of the underlying dimensions of team empowerment in this CT exploration context, we conducted the tests of indirect effects using the decomposed dimensions. The results are shown in Table 3 of the main paper. As the results show, the indirect effects of all subdimensions of team empowerment are all significant,providing support for treating it as a unidimensional construct. Similarly, contrasts of indirect effects of each subdimension of team empowerment through ICE versus ECE are all statistically significantly different from 0. These results directly mirror those of the uni-dimensional construct and lend additional support for arguments in favor of this uni-dimensional approach (Seibert et al. 2011).

Reference

Seibert, S. E., Wang, G., and Courtright, S. H. 2011. "Antecedents and Consequences of Psychological and Team Empowerment in Organizations: A Meta-Analytic Review," *Journal of Applied Psychology* (96:5), pp. 981-1003.

Appendix E

Inter-Item Correlations

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. CT exploration1															
2. CT exploration2	.70***														
3. ICE1	.35***	.39***													
4. ICE2	.31***	.37***	.87***												
5. ICE3	.46***	.50***	.80***	.87***											
6. ECE1	.29***	.40***	.44***	.50***	.46***										
7. ECE2	.27***	.22**	.42***	.34***	.47***	.68***									
8. ECE3	.39***	.37***	.49***	.52***	.56***	.71***	.94***								
9. Organizational tenure	-.02	-.12†	.10	-.09	-.06	.00	-.08	-.04							
10. Age	-.09	-.18**	-.12†	-.13†	-.10	-.08	-.14*	-.10	.60***						
11. Gender	.00	.00	.00	.11	.02	.07	.06	.03	.09	-.04					
12. Perceived usefulness1	.03	.10	.01	.00	.03	.07	.02	.03	-.04	-.03	.00				
13. Perceived usefulness2	.07	.10	.10	.03	.06	.02	.02	.02	-.19**	-.17*	-.02	.66***			
14. Perceived usefulness3	.14*	.14*	.12†	.19**	.16*	.09	.16*	.24***	-.11	-.10	.01	.49***	.44***		
15. Perceived usefulness4	.09	.08	.05	.09	.08	.01	.06	.11	-.05	-.02	-.02	.46***	.36***	.51***	
16. Perceived usefulness5	.07	.16*	.18*	.19**	.07	.19**	.01	.07	-.12†	-.10	.00	.31***	.41***	.44***	.41***
17. Facilitating conditions1	.22**	.12†	.27***	.33***	.21**	.29***	.26***	.33***	-.06	.07	-.04	.13†	.10	.17*	.14*
18. Facilitating conditions2	.09	.03	.24**	.08	.24***	.31***	.27***	.25***	-.02	-.04	.01	.12†	.11	.04	.13†
19. PIIT1	.17*	.21**	.16*	.20**	.21**	.25***	.26***	.37***	-.10	-.17*	.10	.04	.01	.17*	.03
20. PIIT2	.25***	.22**	.22**	.26***	.23**	.32***	.34***	.31***	-.09	-.21**	.15*	.03	.02	.05	.02
21. PIIT3	.21**	.20**	.15*	.15*	.08	.14*	.14*	.21**	-.13†	-.24***	.09	.03	.11	.02	.02
22. PIIT4	.20**	.21**	.21**	.23**	.28***	.13†	.29***	.34***	-.22**	-.22**	.09	.01	.06	.06	.07
23. Intention to explore1	.11	.14*	.00	.12†	.00	.04	.21***	.08	-.15*	-.28***	.12†	.13†	.23**	.22**	.17*
24. Intention to explore2	.11	.20**	.01	.12†	.01	.08	.14*	.05	-.14*	-.33***	.10	.12†	.22**	.19**	.21**
25. Intention to explore3	.14*	.20**	.06	.14*	.04	.09	.21**	.14*	-.13†	-.29***	.08	.11	.20**	.22**	.21**
26. Training1	.23**	.08	.01	.04	.08	.13†	.20**	.12†	.10	.04	-.02	.01	.03	.06	.03
27. Training2	.19**	.08	.06	.01	.20**	.11	.18*	.20**	.07	.02	-.03	.01	.06	.03	.08
28. Training3	.27***	.11	.07	.00	.14*	.14*	.15*	.20**	.04	.10	-.10	.01	.04	.08	.04
29. Training4	.19**	.06	.01	.02	.12†	.21**	.19**	.22**	.02	.01	-.02	.11	.01	.07	.02
30. Potency1	.02	.02	.17*	.15*	.07	.21**	.19**	.15*	-.04	.00	.14*	.11	.09	.09	.04
31. Potency2	.10	.16*	.19**	.18**	.15*	.26***	.10	.18**	-.02	-.12†	.18**	.09	.08	.20**	.03
32. Potency3	.04	.11	.14*	.12†	.19**	.25***	.10	.25***	.01	-.09	.09	.04	.04	.02	.17*
33. Meaningfulness1	.12	.20**	.27***	.17*	.22**	.25***	.09	.16*	.03	-.04	.10	.03	.05	.08	.08
34. Meaningfulness2	.02	.08	.16*	.21**	.11	.25***	.07	.20**	-.11	-.10	.14*	.07	.00	.09	.02
35. Meaningfulness3	.04	.03	.13†	.18*	.11	.23**	.12†	.25***	-.03	-.03	.15*	.06	.06	.00	.13†
36. Autonomy1	.03	.05	.25***	.09	.23**	.22**	.17*	.10	.03	-.05	.06	.04	.10	.10	.08
37. Autonomy2	.16*	.16*	.15*	.18**	.17*	.31***	.18**	.23**	.11	-.04	.03	.14*	.02	.16*	.08
38. Autonomy3	.02	.05	.09	.00	.08	.13†	.13†	.11	-.01	-.06	-.04	.07	.04	.11	.03
39. Impact1	.11	.09	.16*	.18**	.17*	.27***	.13†	.22**	-.08	-.02	.12†	.05	.01	.06	.09

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
40. Impact2	.11	.13†	.30***	.30***	.21**	.18**	.21**	.27***	-.14*	-.17*	.17*	.02	.01	.10	.03
41. Impact3	.08	.09	.14*	.19**	.18**	.18**	.17*	.23**	-.05	-.11	.15*	.08	.08	.03	.05
42. Team size	.03	.01	-.04	-.07	.02	.00	.03	.09	.00	.10	-.02	-.08	-.03	-.03	-.16*
43. Task interdependence1	.11	.06	.21***	.14*	.23**	.22**	.28***	.13†	-.06	-.09	.10	.03	.08	.02	.06
44. Task interdependence2	.14*	.00	.16*	.17*	.22**	.19**	.20**	.13†	-.02	.01	-.02	.07	.03	.03	.07
45. Task interdependence3	.29***	.13†	.20**	.17*	.27***	.22**	.17*	.17*	.02	-.04	-.03	.04	.04	.04	.09
46. Team dispersion	.07	.02	.07	.02	.05	.02	.07	.06	.08	.17*	.05	-.02	.01	-.08	-.12†

Variables	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
16. Perceived usefulness5															
17. Facilitating conditions1	.14*														
18. Facilitating conditions2	-.05	.47***													
19. PIIT1	.10	.06	.03												
20. PIIT2	.05	.07	.01	.61***											
21. PIIT3	.11	.05	.06	.54***	.57***										
22. PIIT4	.01	.08	.03	.57***	.51***	.46***									
23. Intention to explore1	.28***	.05	.08	.19**	.23**	.17*	.11								
24. Intention to explore2	.37***	.14*	.13†	.16*	.18**	.18**	.10	.86***							
25. Intention to explore3	.26***	.13†	.17*	.22**	.22**	.13†	.12†	.77***	.85***						
26. Training1	.07	.09	.25***	.00	.00	.31***	.07	.03	.05	.01					
27. Training2	.12	.09	.21**	.03	.03	.20**	.06	.08	.12†	.02	.66***				
28. Training3	.09	.25***	.26***	.04	.05	.23**	.03	.07	.07	.01	.50***	.57***			
29. Training4	.01	.11	.18**	.01	.11	.27***	.05	.01	.01	.08	.41***	.45***	.47***		
30. Potency1	.11	.32***	.32***	.06	.08	.17*	.08	.01	.08	.07	.03	.03	.01	.07	
31. Potency2	.16*	.28***	.29***	.05	.06	.10	.05	.06	.08	.03	.03	.11	.02	.01	.51***
32. Potency3	.08	.22**	.33***	.09	.06	.16*	.12†	.06	.03	.03	.13†	.11	.02	.03	.49***
33. Meaningfulness1	.14*	.27***	.27***	.03	.07	.05	.04	.00	.03	.01	.03	.06	.02	.12†	.50***
34. Meaningfulness2	.13†	.22**	.32***	.09	.04	.06	.15*	.01	.01	.04	.07	.10	.09	.04	.46***
35. Meaningfulness3	.05	.25***	.29***	.14*	.12†	.07	.10	.08	.01	.01	.05	.07	.03	.02	.42***
36. Autonomy1	.02	.21**	.28***	.10	.10	.09	.10	.09	.15*	.14*	.10	.09	.05	.05	.35***
37. Autonomy2	.07	.22**	.31***	.11	.07	.03	.02	.02	.03	.07	.17*	.05	.04	.10	.31***
38. Autonomy3	.08	.14*	.15*	.01	.05	.13†	.02	.04	.10	.08	.06	.06	.21**	.08	.31***
39. Impact1	.07	.30***	.30***	.02	.07	.00	.05	.07	.05	.04	.08	.01	.01	.10	.51***
40. Impact2	.10	.28***	.25***	.01	.04	.10	.14*	.06	.03	.05	.08	.12†	.02	.05	.46***
41. Impact3	.07	.17*	.21**	.06	.07	.04	.08	.06	.08	.07	.01	.05	.08	.00	.40***
42. Team size	.11	.10	.09	-.10	-.14*	-.04	-.06	.02	.06	.09	.09	.07	.03	.07	.40***
43. Task interdependence1	.03	.09	.18*	.03	.09	.09	.11	.07	.05	.00	.09	.06	.03	.15*	.14*
44. Task interdependence2	.01	.23**	.22**	.08	.05	.10	.04	.11	.11	.08	.10	.13†	.08	.12†	.23**
45. Task interdependence3	.11	.18*	.22**	.01	.03	.04	.05	.08	.05	.07	.17*	.11	.17*	.09	.09
46. Team dispersion	.12†	.01	.00	.04	.10	.01	.06	.01	.04	.01	.02	.06	.09	.05	.18*

Variables	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45
31. Potency2															
32. Potency3	.48***														
33. Meaningfulness1	.55***	.51***													
34. Meaningfulness2	.46***	.47***	.51***												
35. Meaningfulness3	.33***	.45***	.45***	.50***											
36. Autonomy1	.29***	.26***	.30***	.29***	.22**										
37. Autonomy2	.34***	.26***	.37***	.33***	.32***	.34***									
38. Autonomy3	.34***	.19**	.24***	.26***	.20**	.26***	.19**								
39. Impact1	.47***	.45***	.38***	.39***	.48***	.28***	.33***	.22**							
40. Impact2	.43***	.40***	.52***	.46***	.44***	.27***	.25***	.15*	.46***						
41. Impact3	.39***	.38***	.43***	.45***	.47***	.21**	.28***	.17*	.39***	.56***					
42. Team size	.06	.01	.07	.00	.10	.06	.06	.03	.04	.01	.07				
43. Task interdependence1	.05	.12†	.18*	.09	.06	.07	.03	.01	.19**	.14*	.12†	.04			
44. Task interdependence2	.04	.03	.11	.10	.09	.22**	.12†	.04	.21**	.19**	.19**	.12†	.49***		
45. Task interdependence3	.15*	.09	.12†	.08	.10	.20**	.10	.03	.22**	.18**	.15*	.05	.38***	.47***	
46. Team dispersion	-.17*	-.13†	-.14*	-.11	-.15*	-.10	-.06	-.08	-.15*	-.13†	-.15*	.56***	-.04	-.03	-.02

Notes: n = 212; gender is dummy coded (0 = women, 1 = men); CT = collaboration technology; ICE = intention to continue exploring, ECE = expectation to continue exploring; PIIT = personal innovativeness in IT.

†p < .10, *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.