The Influence of Team Task Conflict and Team Communication on Employee Life Satisfaction:

Beyond the Effects of Work-Family Conflict

Professor Jarrod M. Haar
School of Management, College of Business
Massey University (Albany)
Private Bag 102904 North Shore City 0745
j.haar@massey.ac.nz

and

Professor Ted E.Zorn
Pro-Vice Chancellor’s Office, College of Business
Massey University (Albany)
Private Bag 102904 North Shore City 0745
T.E.Zorn@massey.ac.nz
The Influence of Team Task Conflict and Team Communication on Employee Life Satisfaction: Beyond the Effects of Work-Family Conflict

This paper takes a multi-level approach (298 employees from 80 teams) where task conflict and communication were captured at the team level and work-family conflict at the individual level, and tests these towards individual life satisfaction. Overall, work-family conflict was positively related to team task conflict, negatively to life satisfaction, and both work-family and family-work conflict were negatively related to team communication. Team communication was negatively related to team task conflict and positively to life satisfaction, and team task conflict was negatively related and team communication positively related to life satisfaction. Importantly, the influence of team task conflict towards life satisfaction was fully mediated by team communication. Findings highlight the importance of team communication towards understanding employee life satisfaction.

1. Introduction

Research has indicated that organizations are increasingly reliant on work teams (LaFollette, Hornsby, Smith & Novak, 1996). Team work and the associated dynamics are likely to play an important role for employees and their organization, especially given teams can produce conflict which leads to stress (Chung-Yan & Moeller, 2010). Roloff (1987) stated that “conflict occurs when members engage in activities that are incompatible with those of colleagues within their network” (p. 496). This is similar to work-family conflict, which suggests that work and family roles can provide challenges and issues for employees (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985) that are highly detrimental (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2005). Despite this theoretic alignment, few studies compare the influence of work and family roles on conflict occurring in teams. Work-family issues are of vital importance in understanding work-life balance in today’s diverse workplace (Haar, 2013).

Another gap in the literature is the outcome explored in the present study, as team studies typically focus on job outcomes such as job satisfaction (e.g., Jackson & Schuler, 1985). Chung-Yan and Moeller (2010) noted that the influence of workplace conflict can extend beyond the workplace to include mental health outcomes, but team studies have not explored life satisfaction, despite the meta-analysis support for such an influence from individual work-family conflict (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). Indeed, towards life satisfaction, Mesmer-Magnus and Viswesvaran (2005) found conflict originating
in the workplace was the dominant predictor. Finally, Rahim (2002) asserts that communication within teams might help resolve conflict, and Jones, Watson, Gardner, and Gallois (2004) noted the need for multi-level analysis of the effects of communication to better understand how it operates.

The present study make three contributions by bringing these related, but presently, untapped lines of research, together. (1), in addition to exploring work-family conflict on life satisfaction, we test, using multi-level analysis, individual employee work-family and family-work conflict and find them both detrimentally linked to team communication (how well a team communicates and shares ideas), while work-family conflict is positively related to team task conflict (conflict between team members towards their tasks), indicating individual conflict can erode a team’s ability to communicate effectively and focus on their tasks. (2), individual work-family conflict and team communication are found to have direct effects towards team task conflict, with team communication partially mediating the influence of work-family conflict. Finally, (3), testing a unique outcome (life satisfaction) on team constructs, we again find support for direct effects from both individual and team dimensions, with team communications fully mediating the direct effects of team task conflict. Overall, we find that both individual and team conflict are detrimental to employee outcomes, but team communication appears to be a key variable in understanding these relationships.

2. Theory and Hypotheses

2.1. Work-Family Conflict

Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) defined work-family conflict as “participation in the work (family) role is made more difficult by virtue of participation in the family (work) role” (p.77). Haar (2013) asserted that because employees participate in many roles, they register conflict “due to unavailability of resources for participation in a role” (p. 2). Unlike typical organizational based constructs, work-family conflict occurs bi-directionally, with conflict originating in either the workplace or the home and entering the other domain. These are typically referred to as work-family conflict (WFC) and family-work conflict (FWC). WFC and FWC relate to a number of different factors, including time-, strain- and behavior-based conflict sources. For example, spending excessive time at work may leave little time for family, which creates problems. Conversely, anxiety and fatigue from personal issues at home may flow into the workplace, having detrimental consequences. The outcomes of work-family
Conflict on employees are well documented. In their meta-analysis, Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux and Brinleya (2005) noted that conflict has been shown to be detrimental to a wide range of employee outcomes, including non-work outcomes. As noted above, meta-analyses have shown strong support for links between work-family conflict and life satisfaction (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2005). This leads to our initial hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 1:** Work-family conflict will be negatively related to life satisfaction.

### 2.2 Teamwork

While employee studies typically focus on the individual, this does not reflect typical workplace contexts. As work teams become more popular (Lester, Meglino & Korsgaard, 2002), an increasing number of researchers have turned their attention to teams (e.g. De Dreu & Weingart, 2003). Keyton (1993) defined a work team as a group within an organization, which is established and maintained in order to complete a common task, and where members are collectively responsible for the task. When employees work towards a common task they become interdependent on each other (Bertcher, 1994) and thus how team members relate to one another can impact upon the team. Hunter, Perry, Carlson, and Smith (2010) found team resources based on “critical social resources at work that help individuals to grow and develop” (p. 305) were positively related to work-family enrichment and project satisfaction. As such, team members can provide positive enhancing influences in the workplace. Despite this, not all the interactions with team members are positive.

### 2.3. Team Conflict

Olaniran (2010) noted that when people work in teams that conflict is inevitable. Conflict has been defined as perceived incompatibilities (Boulding, 1963), or the belief that the parties involved are incompatible, based on either the views they hold or their personalities (Jehn, 1995). In the context of work teams, Martínez-Moreno, González-Navarro, Zornoza and Ripoll (2009) defined conflict as a “process emerging from team members’ tension for real or perceived differences” (p. 252). Conflict is a result of the substance of the task or the group’s interpersonal relations (Jehn, 1995). Irrespective of its genesis, conflict is a form of distress (Spell, Bezrukova, Haar & Spell, 2011), and when a team is experiencing conflict, the ability of members to work as a team is inhibited (Jehn, 1995).
The present study focuses on task conflict, which Weingart, Todorova, and Cronin (2010) noted is central in an employees’ core work activity, and relates to workplace problem solving and decision making. Hinds and Bailey (2003) defined task conflict as “disagreements focused on work content” (p. 616), and is likely to result when team members have different understandings of their particular tasks (Jehn et al. 1997). Spell et al. (2011) provided the example of “group members’ disagreements over different opinions or viewpoints related to work” (p. 311). Hinds and Bailey (2003) stated “task conflict may emerge because some team members are operating with incomplete information” (p. 629), and they noted that while some studies find a positive relationship between task conflict and performance, these are not consistent. Indeed, Jehn et al. (1997) found teams task conflict was negatively related to performance. Our approach towards team task conflict is warranted given Polzer, Crisp, Jarvenpaa, and Kim (2006) highlighted the importance of understanding the innate processes of group functioning.

Although research has indicated that conflict can have beneficial effects, such as encouraging greater cognitive understanding (Simons & Peterson, 2000), there is evidence that too much conflict produces negative outcomes (Gersick, 1989). For example, Jehn (1995) found that group members generally felt that task conflict was detrimental and contributed to low performance and dissatisfaction. In their meta-analysis, De Dreu and Weingart (2003) stated that team conflict is inexorably detrimental and produces “tension, antagonism, and distracts team members from performing the task” (p. 741). Despite the similarities with task conflict and work-family conflict, the links between these constructs is neglected. We argue that while work-family conflict originates from different domains (work and family) and from different sources (time, strain and behavior), it is still likely to influence task conflict amongst team members. Spell et al. (2011) suggests that task conflict is central to employe core work function and the present study suggests that conflict originating in the workplace and interfering with home life, are likely to create additional disagreements between team members, creating higher task conflict amongst team members. Consequently, employees dealing with work or family issues are more likely to create additional tensions within their work teams resulting in greater team task conflict. This leads to the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis 2: Work-family conflict will be positively related to team task conflict.
2.3.1. Team Task Conflict and Outcomes

Jehn (1995) suggests that conflict within teams’ means members will become less receptive to the ideas of other team members and may respond by becoming defensive, hampering the completion of tasks and attention towards decision-making (Ayoko, 2007). Ultimately, team conflict can influence performance. Ayoko (2007) suggests that when team members experience conflict they often choose to compete with each other, leading to less team efficacy, but also higher feelings of distrust and negative emotions. Overall, high levels of conflict are detrimental to team members, both personally and in terms of their productivity at work (Jehn, 1995). Brett, Shapiro, and Lytle (1998) noted that employee issues may be a stressor that leads to ever-increasing spirals of task conflict, and Spell et al. (2011) stated that “ultimately, conflict is a form of distress; it is a behavioral analogue of stress and a reaction of group members” (p. 312) to various workplace issues. In their meta-analysis of 45 studies with 13,000 employees, Jackson and Schuler (1985) found that conflict was significantly related to job satisfaction and other types of work-related satisfaction (e.g., supervision, pay, advancement), as well as commitment, involvement and turnover. Overall, they concluded that conflict has a substantial and significant influence on affective reactions. That Jackson and Schuler (1985) found job satisfaction to be the most commonly studied outcome further highlights how the literature fails to account for its influence beyond the workplace, despite calls for greater exploration (Chung-Yan & Moeller, 2010). Similarly, in their meta-analysis of team task conflict, De Dreu and Weingart (2003) found team task conflict negatively related to team member satisfaction. However, the destructive effects of conflict in the workplace are not experienced only in situ, but can spillover into team members’ personal and family lives as previous research has highlighted the time and energy that the resolution and handling of conflict demands (Baron, 1991; Jehn, 1995).

The present study seeks to explore this gap in the literature by testing the effects of team task conflict on the life satisfaction of individual team members. While there is strong meta-analytical evidence for the influence of conflict on job satisfaction (Jackson & Schuler, 1985), the links between task conflict and life satisfaction are likely to be similar due to the similarities between job and life satisfaction (Iverson & Maguire, 2000). Judge and Colquitt (2004) noted that conflict is a commonly examined variable in the stressor domain. As such, employees who feel their team is experiencing
disagreements on work content due to different understandings of their particular tasks are likely to create pressure that ultimately creates a stressor than impacts satisfaction with life. This is because such pressures spillover beyond the workplace (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998) and thus can have a detrimental influence on life satisfaction. Meta-analysis from the conflict literature shows that such role spillover can be detrimental to life satisfaction (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998), and indeed Mesmer-Magnus and Viswesvaran (2005) meta-analysis findings suggest work-family conflict is the dominant predictor of life satisfaction, accounting for greater variance than family-work conflict, leading to:

Hypothesis 3: Team task conflict will be negatively related to life satisfaction.

2.4. Team Communication

In addition to a detrimental team task conflict, we also explore a potentially positive team factor via communication. Goris (2007) noted that organizations are social systems, and, as such, operate through processes of communication. Indeed, Frone and Major (1988) asserted that communication is perhaps the fundamental process of most organizations. Research suggests that communication is linked to organizational success (Quirke, 1992) as well as employee satisfaction (Goris, 2007). There is also a general consensus that communication plays a significant role in employees’ job performance and job satisfaction (Pettit et al., 1997; Goris, 2007) and efficient communication can enable group members to keep relationships going, providing solutions to conflict arising out of incompatibilities (Arslan, Hamarta & Uslu, 2010). Overall, communication can aid group performance (Campion, Medsker, & Higgs, 1993) and good group relations (Lester et al., 2002).

2.4.1. Team Communication and Outcomes

Various communication factors have been found to positively relate with both organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Chen, Silverthorne & Hung, 2006; Goris, 2007). Orpen (1997) found that the quality of communication influenced both work motivation and job satisfaction, while Chen et al. (2006) found communication was positively linked to job performance. The benefits towards performance have also held when tested at the team-level (Stewart & Barrick, 2000). Scott, Connaughton, Diaz-Saenz, Maguire, Ramirez, Richardson, et al. (1999) found that communication factors were significantly related to turnover intentions, stating “communication variables are
important contributors to one’s intent to leave” (p. 423). Finally, Leiter (1988) found communication was negatively related to job burnout, highlighting an influence on non-work outcomes.

Multiple studies have also demonstrated the effectiveness of communications in increasing team cooperation and reducing conflict (Langbein & Jorstad, 2004). For example, Stewart and Barrick (2000) found team communication was significantly and positively related to performance, accounting for 13 percent of variance. In summation, there is strong evidence indicating that communication within organizations and teams can have a favourable impact on job satisfaction (Goris, 2007), and as noted earlier, a number of scholars have found that job satisfaction is significantly related to life satisfaction (Rode, 2004). This ‘spillover effect’ from work to home life has been attributed to the fact that work is a central activity in a number of employees’ lives (Rode, 2004). As such, extending the literature to determine the influence that communication has on life satisfaction has some indirect support. The present study hypothesizes that team communication will directly influence two outcomes: (1) team task conflict and (2) individual employee life satisfaction. We suggest that employees who experience a team environment where ideas are shared and members are understood are less likely to experience work content disagreements with team members having better understandings of their particular tasks, and thus having less team task conflict. This has some empirical support (e.g., Langbein & Jorstad, 2004). Furthermore, building on the findings of Leiter (1988), we argue that better team communication may also spillover beyond the workplace, leaving employees more satisfied with life. This leads to the following hypotheses.

**Hypothesis 4: Team communication will be negatively related to team task conflict.**

**Hypothesis 5: Team communication will be positively related to life satisfaction.**

In addition to the direct effects of team communication on team task conflict and individual life satisfaction, we also draw back into the literature discussed above to suggest that individual team members with issues at work (WFC) and at home (FWC) might also influence their ability to communicate with their team members. So, team members with workplace problems intruding into the home may feel withdrawn and resentful of their teams, thus leading to reduced efficiency in their communications. Similarly, home issues entering the workplace may leave team members distracted and less likely to engage in effective communication. This leads to our last hypothesized direct effect.
Hypothesis 6: Work-family conflict will be negatively related to team communication.

Figure 1 shows the overall hypothesized model: << Insert Figure 1 about here >>

3. Method

3.1. Sample and Procedure

A total of 200 New Zealand organizations were approached for the present study and managers were invited to participate, which required access a random team in their organization. A total of 80 teams with usable data were ultimately received (a 53.3% response rate). Overall, team compositions ranged from three to five employees, with the majority having three team members (80.5%), and a total of 298 employees completed surveys. On average, the gender composition of respondents was evenly spread (53% male), with the slight majority being single (53%) and non-parents (54%). By education, 49.4% held a bachelor’s degree qualification or higher, and worked 36.3 hours per week (SD=11.8). Average tenure in respondents teams were 3.6 years (SD=6.2), and respondents came from a wide range of ethnicities: 38% white, 17% Asian, 15.5% Indian, 11.5% Maori, 7% Pacifica peoples, and 11% other.

3.2 Measures

All measures were coded 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree. Life Satisfaction was measured using the 5-item scale by Diener, Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin (1985), e.g., “In most ways my life is close to ideal” (α= .86). Work-family conflict was measured using six items by Carlson, Kacmar and Williams (2000): WFC e.g., “I am often so emotionally drained when I get home from work that it prevents me from contributing to my family” (α= .87), and FWC e.g., “Tension and anxiety from my family life often weakens my ability to do my job” (α= .88). Team Task Conflict was measured using four items adapted from Jehn (1995), e.g., “Members in my team fight about task matters” (α= .88).

The construct items were situated in relation to the team, thus we used the average score of team members to generate a team-level construct. This implies a direct consensus aggregation model (Chan, 1998) and as such, we calculated inter-rated agreement to determine if aggregating team members’ ratings of their teams’ role conflict was appropriate. This was supported, with a mean $r_{WG}$ of .87, which indicates good inter-rater agreement (LeBreton & Senter, 2008). Team Communication was measured using four items taken from Lester, Meglino, and Korsgaard (2002), e.g., “My team
members are willing to share information with other team members about our work” (α= .88) and had a mean $r_{WG}$ of .92, indicating good inter-rater agreement.

**Control variables.** A variety of control variables were including in the analyses that are typically included in the conflict field (e.g., Carlson, Ferguson, Kacmar, Grzywacz, & Whitten, 2011) including gender (1=female, 0=male), marital status (1=married/de facto, 0=single), parental status (1=parent, 0= non-parent), education (1=university degree or higher, 0=no university education), hours worked (per week), and team tenure (in years).

### 3.3 Measurement Model

The current study variables were confirmed with structural equation modeling (SEM) using AMOS v. 20. Three goodness-of-fit indexes recommended by Williams, Vandenberg and Edwards (2009) were used to assess the measurement models with a superior model is reflected in scores of CFI ≥0.95, RMSEA ≤ 0.08 and SRMR ≤ 0.10. The hypothesized measurement model and two alternative models are shown in Table 1, showing good fit.

<<<Insert Table 1 about here>>>

### 3.4 Analyses

Multi-level analysis was conducted using the MLwiN program (Rashbash, Browne, Healy, Cameron, & Charlton, 2000), because data had individuals nested in teams. Various models were run and all models included control variables which were centered to the grand mean. WFC and FWC are at the individual level (Level 1), and the team-level constructs of team task conflict and team communication, where individual employee responses were nested within their teams (Level 2).

### 4. Results

Table 2 presents the means, standard deviations, and correlations among the study variables:

<<<Insert Table 2 about here>>>

Table 2 shows that at the individual level all variables were significantly related as expected. Furthermore, analysis shows that a significant amount of the variance could be attributed to group-level differences towards team communication (27%), team task conflict (43%) and individual life satisfaction (29%). These significant amounts of variance justifying the multi-level approach.
Tables 3 and 4 show the results of the multilevel analyses for each hypothesized step of the relationships between outcomes of team communication and team task conflict (Table 3) and life satisfaction (Table 4). The analyses for the other direct effects are not shown but are detailed below.

<<Insert Tables 3 and 4 about here>>

Hypothesis 1 was partially supported, with WFC being significantly related to life satisfaction ($\beta = .258, p < .001$) although FWC was not (see Table 4). Hypothesis 2 was partially supported, with WFC being significantly related to team task conflict ($\beta = .154, p < .05$), although FWC was not (see Table 3). Hypothesis 3 is supported (analysis not shown), with team task conflict being significantly and negatively related to individual life satisfaction ($\beta = .200, p < .01$). Hypothesis 4 suggested team communication would be negatively related to team task conflict (see Table 3), and this was supported ($\beta = .426, p < .001$), as was hypothesis 5, with team communication being significantly related to life satisfaction ($\beta = .305, p < .01$). Hypothesis 6 related to work-family conflict being negative related to team communication and this was supported from both dimensions: WFC ($\beta = -.108, p < .05$) and FWC ($\beta = -.149, p < .05$).

Addressing these findings towards Figure 1 (our hypothesized model), we find that only WFC is a significant predictor of life satisfaction and team task conflict, although both WFC and FWC are significantly related to team communication. Furthermore, as expected, both team task conflict and team communication were both significantly related to life satisfaction, in the expected directions (negatively and positively respectively). Overall, this shows that while only WFC is directly related to all constructs, it also has an additional effect working through its influences on team task conflict and team communication, which both related to our outcome. Similarly, FWC indirectly influences life satisfaction via team communication, further encouraging the use of non-work constructs in team models.

5. Discussion

The present study made unique contributions through bringing together theories relating to individuals (work-family conflict) and teams (task conflict and team communication) towards a seldom tested outcome in teams’ research (life satisfaction), using multi-level analysis. In addition, testing the direct influence work-family conflict had on team constructs and then how they in turn influenced life
satisfaction, created new understanding of how these relationships form and influence each other. Our findings support the meta-analytical findings where work-family conflict was negatively related to life satisfaction (e.g., Kossek & Ozeki, 1998), and in particular the analysis of Mesmer-Magnus and Viswesvaran (2005), which found WFC to be the dominant predictor. In the present study, both directions of conflict (WFC and FWC) were significantly correlated with life satisfaction, although the analysis showed that WFC was the dominant predictor.

The present study also tested some unique effects, including the relationship between individual work-family conflict and team-based outcomes. We argued that employees dealing with conflicts between their work and family roles would create greater conflict at the team level and this was supported, with WFC again predicting team task conflict. Our finding supports Shockley and Singla (2011) who found support for the source attribution perspective, where domain based conflict is likely to more strongly influence outcomes in the same domain. Thus, individual work conflict that interferes with home life is more likely to be destructive to work outcomes like the way a team discusses ideas and task matters. We also found support for both WFC and FWC influencing team communication, indicating that interference between work and family roles does erode a team’s ability to communicate effectively. Perhaps employees are distracted by home issues (FWC) or react negatively to work issues (WFC), and this makes them less engaged and interested in discussing issues and events with team members. Interestingly, this is somewhat counter to the source attribution perspective (Shockley & Singla, 2011) and may suggest that team communication – while a workplace construct – is universally able to be influenced by conflict from both work and family domains. Further replication is needed to better understand these effects.

In addition, by responding to calls for non-workplace outcomes to be tested (Chung-Yan & Moeller, 2010) including at the multi-level (Jones et al., 2004), we found support for team-based factors influencing individual-level life satisfaction. Teams that reported higher levels of task conflict was found to be negatively linked to life satisfaction, while conversely, teams that reported greater communication were positively related. We argued that given employee life satisfaction is strongly predicated on job satisfaction (Iverson & Maguire, 2000), that teams-based factors could spillover beyond the workplace and influence an employee’s overall satisfaction with life. While we found
team task conflict was negatively related and team communication was positively related, in the overall model where both these variables were included, we found team communication was the dominant predictor amongst the two team-based factors, with communication mediating the influence of task conflict. This shows that while team task conflict and communication are important, team communication may have an additional benefit in being able to mitigate the effects of task conflict, at least towards life satisfaction. This further encourages the examination of team-based constructs like communication towards non-work outcomes. Finally, our analysis also showed that team communication was directly and negatively related to team task conflict, which supported the literature (e.g., Langbein & Jorstad, 2004). As such, teams that are better able to communicate and share issues are less likely to be distracted and conflicted towards their work tasks.

Limitations
Like all self-reported cross-sectional designed employee studies, the present study has some limitations. However, while self-reported, the team constructs do provide greater confidence because these constructs supported a consensus aggregation model (Chan, 1998), and as such, these constructs reflect the combined team members, rather than individual responses. Kenny (2008) notes that the use of SEM also alleviates issues around common method variance (CMV). Finally, given the large number of teams (80), the multi-level analysis, and the broad range of organizational sectors and firm sizes the data was drawn from, that the findings are likely not be due to issues of CMV.

Conclusion
The present study sought to make a number of contributions, specifically extending the work-family conflict literature and its influence to life satisfaction by including team constructs associated with task conflict and communication. By bringing these related, but typically untapped lines of research together, this study helps us better understand the influence that team factors can have on life satisfaction, and the influence conflict from work and family roles have. Overall, a number of direct effects were found that show the complexity and interrelationship between these variables and team communication was highlighted as being especially important, in the way it influenced all other variables including mediating influence on the individual and team conflict factors.
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Table 1. Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Study Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta$ df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>230.755</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>522.946</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>.891</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>292.191</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Model 2 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>782.944</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>552.189</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Model 3 to 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Model 1** = Hypothesized 5-factor model: WFC, FWC, team task conflict, team communication, and life satisfaction.  
**Model 2** = Alternative 4-factor model: WFC and FWC combined, team task conflict, team communication, and life satisfaction.  
**Model 3** = Alternative 4-factor model: WFC, FWC, team task conflict and team communication combined, and life satisfaction.
### Table 2. Correlations and Means of Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hours Worked</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. WFC</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. FWC</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Team Tenure</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Team Task Conflict</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Team Communication</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teams N=80, Employees N=298. *p<.05, **p<.01.
Table 3. Multilevel Results of the Relationships to Team Communications and Team Task Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Team Communication</th>
<th>Team Role Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1: Controls</td>
<td>Model 2: Predictors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.925‡ .084</td>
<td>3.890‡ .081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.007 .005</td>
<td>-.009* .005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.008 .091</td>
<td>.026 .087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>.068 .120</td>
<td>.038 .115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Status</td>
<td>.072 .134</td>
<td>.158 .132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.007 .088</td>
<td>-.005 .084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work hours</td>
<td>.001 .005</td>
<td>-.000 .005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Tenure</td>
<td>-.011 .008</td>
<td>-.006 .008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFC</td>
<td>-.108* .055</td>
<td>.154* .080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWC</td>
<td>-.149* .068</td>
<td>.057 .097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Communication</td>
<td>0.422 .282</td>
<td>0.351‡ .096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.313‡ .038</td>
<td>.508‡ .063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 -Log Likelihood</td>
<td>352.457</td>
<td>333.240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*p < .05, **p < .01, ‡p < .001
Table 4. Multilevel Results of the Relationships to Life Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1: Controls</th>
<th>Model 2: Predictors</th>
<th>Model 3: Mediators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.056‡</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>3.052‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>-.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>.434**</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.465‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Status</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>-.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.207*</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>-.222*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work hours</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Tenure</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFC</td>
<td>-.258‡</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>-.226‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWC</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.305**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Task Conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance level 2 (team)</td>
<td>.189‡</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.221‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance level 1 (employee)</td>
<td>.438‡</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.384‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 Log Likelihood</td>
<td>450.185</td>
<td></td>
<td>435.303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ‡p < .001
Figure 1. Study Model: Mediation and Moderation (Both Individual and Team Level)