Two Student Workshops on Identifying and Resolving Teamwork Conflict

Dr. Rania Al-Hammoud P.Eng., University of Waterloo

Dr. Al-Hammoud is a Faculty lecturer (Graduate Attributes) in the department of civil and environmental engineering at the University of Waterloo. Dr. Al-Hammoud has a passion for teaching where she continuously seeks new technologies to involve students in their learning process. She is actively involved in the Ideas Clinic, a major experiential learning initiative at the University of Waterloo. She is also responsible for developing a process and assessing graduate attributes at the department to target areas for improvement in the curriculum. This resulted in several publications in this educational research areas. Dr. Al-Hammoud won the "Ameet and Meena Chakma award for exceptional teaching by a student" in 2014 and the "Engineering Society Teaching Award" in 2016 and the "Outstanding Performance Award" in 2018 from University of Waterloo. Her students regard her as an innovative teacher who continuously introduces new ideas to the classroom that increases their engagement.

Ms. Maria Barichello, University of Waterloo

Maria Barichello is an Academic Development Specialist in the Student Success Office at the University of Waterloo.

Mr. Christopher Rennick, University of Waterloo

Mr. Christopher Rennick received his B.A.Sc., Honours Electrical Engineering in 2007 and his M.A.Sc. in Electrical Engineering in 2009, both from the University of Windsor, in Windsor, Ontario, Canada. Chris is currently a PhD student in Management Sciences at the University of Waterloo. Since 2010, he has been employed with the University of Waterloo, in Waterloo, Ontario, Canada as teaching staff.

Ms. Erin Jobidon, University of Waterloo

Academic Development Specialist

Richard Li, University of Waterloo

Richard Li works at the Centre for Teaching Excellence (CTE) at the University of Waterloo. As the CTE Liaison for Faculty of Engineering, he works closely with Engineering instructors to support their teaching development.

Two Student Workshops on Identifying and Resolving Teamwork Conflict

1. Introduction

The ability to work in teams, and in particular, the ability to resolve team conflicts effectively, is a highly valued skill both in academics and in the professional setting. In engineering programs, however, teamwork, in particular strategies to mitigate or resolve team conflict, is rarely explicitly taught to students. Instead, students are expected to learn these skills through their project experiences. At the University of Waterloo (UW), team conflict has been identified by instructors as a key factor affecting student teams' performance. Mostafapour and Hurst found that team conflict is highly negatively correlated with team performance and team enjoyment in capstone design courses, with 1 in 4 students reporting that they experienced significant conflict, with the majority of cases consisting of conflict of a personal, or relationship, nature [1].

In 2015, a series of teamwork training modules were developed by the Teamwork Clinic through the collaboration of various departments on campus [2]. Each of the six modules were designed to integrate seamlessly into courses with large or lengthy design projects, with the goal that students apply what they learn directly to their team processes and team projects. This paper continues to expand on work that has been published about the first four teamwork modules in the series: introduction to team processes [3], communication in teams [3], introduction to conflict management [4], and giving and receiving feedback [4], [5]. The integration and applicability of two modules that address team conflict: the previously mentioned "introduction to conflict management" as well as "conflict resolution and management" are explored. This paper describes the modules and their integration into a classroom setting. This paper also examines how various team formations within the sessions influences students' perceptions of value, impact on overall team cohesion, and team effectiveness. Additionally, the overall applicability and value students obtain from participating in these sessions is discussed.

2. Literature review of conflict

While the objective of many teams may be to avoid conflict at all costs, conflict can play a role in improving team performance if it is understood, engaged and managed correctly. Conflict, when paired with increased awareness and skills for effective conflict resolution, can lead to improved problem solving, critical thinking, and decision making [8], [12], [18], creativity [8], increased motivation [18], better interpersonal relationships and tolerance of diversity [11, 18] and improved team performance [8], [18]. However, conflict can play a negative role in teams when it is mismanaged or misunderstood, very often leading to harmful relationship conflicts and increased stress [11], [12]. Tuckman's Stages of Team Development provides a simple conceptual model for students to understand team development and functionality and places conflict as a pivotal phase in team formation. Tuckman's model suggests that teams tend to flow through the stages of forming, storming, norming, performing and adjourning. However, this may not be a linear process and teams may fluctuate forwards and backwards or even bounce between stages throughout a project [15], [17]. During the forming stage, the team will typically establish team norms, gather information, and gain familiarity with their teammates [17]. The storming phase is synonymous with conflict. Here the team may define boundaries, establish leadership or deal with difficult behaviours amongst team members. Team members may feel stress or encounter differences in power or values among other individuals leading to stalled progress [17]. Norming occurs once a team has determined structure and established goals and

targets, or once they have resolved existing conflict. The team will typically have adopted a mindset of 'we' as opposed to 'I' established stable roles and rules, and will typically reflect on their processes and progress. During the performing stage, the team will be driven towards their goals, be task oriented and they may be the most creative during this stage as they are more trusting, open and enabled by their team members [17]. Finally, the adjourning stage represents the end of the team's work together. Depending on how the team functioned, they may celebrate, reflect or reminisce or they may feel anxious or insecure [17].

Despite conflict playing a productive role in teams, as suggested by Tuckman, conflict can also become dysfunctional depending on the nature and type of conflict involved and the strategies implemented. While some types of conflict are believed to influence team performance, most conflicts that are mismanaged can lead to further conflict and eventually dysfunction. Developing the knowledge, skills and attitudes to understand when and why different types of conflict might occur, and training to recognize differences among team members' needs and perspectives is a necessary first step towards team effectiveness [6]. Team conflicts are most commonly classified as either task, process or relationship based. O'Neill, Allen & Hastings describe task conflict as "involving different ideas, perspectives, and viewpoints regarding the work itself" [16]. Examples of task conflict includes differences in opinion about an idea or project content amongst the team [6], [16]. Task conflict can be the most constructive type of conflict for a team as it can promote the critical evaluation of alternatives in order to realize the best possible solution for a problem [16]. Process conflict arises from differences in how tasks should be accomplished and refers to the administrative and logistic details such as who should do what, how often to meet, when things should be done, etc. Examples of process conflict include workload distribution and dysfunctional workflow interdependence [16]. Relationship conflict arises from interpersonal incompatibilities and disagreement at a personal level among team members. Examples of relationship conflict include power or value asymmetry and certain personality differences. Relationship conflict has been noted as the most volatile and performance damaging type of conflict a team can experience. Anderson suggests that energy tends to be drawn away from the project tasks as members become "focused on reducing threats, increasing power, and attempts to build cohesion rather than working on the task" [6].

Effectiveness should be at the top of mind for project teams. Therefore, the ability to recognize not only the different types of conflict but the sources of conflict is essential. Conflict can stem from a variety of sources and take on many forms for student teams including:

- Value asymmetry – differing goals/interest in a project and its outcomes
- Social loafing – unequal contributing to the project (quantity/quality)
- Ego/personality – poor relationships and team culture
- Poor communication – differing expectations or communication channels
- Poor project management – missing meeting notes, action items, timelines [1]

Emphasis should be placed on communication skills as a key component of conflict resolution. Specifically, focusing on improving communication can support effective conflict management, better team performance, and enhanced interpersonal interactions among teammates [21]. The message, the receiver and the sender are key components to consider when addressing conflict and challenging behaviours. Using an assertive communication approach when dealing with difficult behaviours can ensure that the message, the receiver and the sender are addressed in a

constructive dialogue. For example, Hess utilized the D.E.S.C. model to develop leadership skills through active student practice [13]. This model encourages the sender of a message to begin by describing the behaviour using facts and details while remaining calm and supportive in tone and body language. Next, the sender expresses the impact the behaviour has had on the team or on an individual using "I" statements and by encouraging acknowledgement and/or clarification from the receiver. Then, the sender specifies the desired outcome or changes in behaviour, being clear about what actions should stop or start while also inquiring about any challenges the receiver has with the plan and offering an opportunity for them to contribute alternative solutions. Finally, the consequences, as opposed to threats, are stated explicitly but through a supportive tone to clarify what will happen should the agreed upon changes not take place [13]. However, it is essential that this type of communication is grounded in concern for the other person as opposed to approaching it as a personal defense. The goal of this interaction should be focused on achieving self-development for all involved as well as finding the best solution for the team as outcomes [23]. One way to ensure the team culture and individual relationships remain intact and productive once a conflict has been resolved is to depolarize. Essentially, this means taking the time to identify common ground on a different topic to help to repair the relationship and maintain team cohesiveness in the long-term [24].

In order to become skilled in conflict resolution, team members should understand the most common causes of conflict, have the ability to identify these behaviours, and have strategies to help address the conflict [22]. For example, Kenneth Thomas and Ralph Kilmann developed the Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument which identifies five conflict handling styles that are used to respond to conflict [14]. The five styles include accommodating, avoiding, collaborating, competing and compromising. Each represents a different position on graph with the y-axis representing the level of assertiveness and the x-axis representing the level of cooperation that is influencing the style. Avoiding is low assertiveness and low cooperation and can be expressed as "I'll think about it tomorrow" or "I lose, you lose" since the conflict is being avoided altogether. Competing is high assertiveness and low cooperation and can be expressed as "My way or the highway" or "I win, you lose" as this style favours strongly advocating for one's opinion or needs. Accommodating is high cooperation and low assertiveness and can be expressed as "It would be my pleasure" or "I lose, you win" since this style tends to yield to the desires of others, forgoing their own needs. Collaborating is high cooperation and high assertiveness and can be expressed as "Two heads are better than one" or "I win, you win" as this style encourages non-threatening dialogue that aims to merge both parties' needs while considering their concerns. Finally, compromising sits in the middle as moderately cooperative and moderately assertive and can be expressed as "Let's make a deal" and "I win some and you win some" as this style encourages an open dialogue and finding the middle ground and can be used as a temporary solution when time restrains collaboration. No one style is "better" than another and each may be more or less appropriate depending on the nature of the conflict [14], [22].

Individuals tend to have preferences for particular styles which may change depending on the group, the conflict they are a part of, as well as individual differences such as "gender, self-concept, expectations of others, situation, power, practice, ability to determine best mode, communication skills, life experiences" [22]. Understanding more about preferences for conflict handling styles can help develop a better awareness in selecting the most appropriate style for a

conflict rather than resorting to what is comfortable, and which may ultimately lead to greater conflict. Since experiential exercises play an important role in teaching conflict resolution by shifting "the responsibility for learning from the trainer to the participant" [19], this has been selected as the main pedagogical approach for this module. This shifting of responsibility will encourage students to take greater ownership over their teamwork and conflict experiences as they develop the essential knowledge, skills, abilities and values described above.

3. Overview of each module

Two modules previously mentioned, "Introduction to Conflict Management" and "Conflict Resolution and Management" are the third and fifth modules in a series of six Teamwork modules developed for engineering. These modules can be implemented as stand-alone sessions or combined together with each module requiring one hour of class time to implement. In the Civil, Environmental, Geological, and Architectural engineering programs, both modules were delivered together in one session. In all other programs, the modules were implemented individually.

3.1 Introduction to conflict management

In this module students learn basic conflict management skills through a series of in-class activities, which the instructor can choose to run as either a random group activity or with pre-existing project teams. The session starts with students individually brainstorming "conflict" words, which are then used to create a mind map on the board. Typically, negative words are most often associated with "conflict". The instructor (or workshop facilitator) can take this opportunity to focus on the potential positive outcomes that stem from conflict situations, include opportunities to clarify goals, make more informed decisions, and to foster team cohesion.

Students are then introduced to the three types of conflict: task, process, and relationship. The key message here is that relationship conflict is often destructive and should be mitigated when possible, while the other types have the potential to be productive when managed effectively. Tuckman's stages of team development serves as the foundation for this opening exercise to emphasize the natural place of conflict in team development. Students are provided with a list of the most common types of conflict and difficult behaviours experienced by engineering design teams at our institution [1].

Students build on this list by drawing on previous teamwork experiences and conflicts. Each student then selects one of the behaviours or conflicts listed and individually documents their personal strategy for dealing with this situation, which can reflect an approach they have used in the past, or a hypothetical approach. Eight common underlying causes of conflict are then introduced [23]:

- Attitudes
- Perceptions
- Personal goals
- Behaviours
- Communication
- Resources

- Conflict styles
- Values

Referring to this list, students are asked to consider which cause(s) may have underpinned the conflict they described and to reflect on how their knowledge of the underlying cause(s) might affect or change their solution. Finally, students are introduced to the following concepts which serve to establish a positive and supportive interaction [24]:

- Developing an awareness of pre-existing biases, which can inform the way the individual is approached. These biases can stem from previous conflicts or encounters with the individual, any assumptions that are made about why they may be acting this way, or personal hesitations about the confrontation.
- Approaching the individual with concern versus taking a defensive position, which can help both parties to recognize the opportunity for self-development as well as a better solution for the team.
- Depolarizing the situation at the conclusion, which can help both parties find common ground, repair the relationship, and leave the conversation on a good note.

Next, students move into a small group activity. This activity runs slightly differently depending on how the instructor has formed the teams, either by having students work in randomized groups, or having students work in their project teams. If students are working in randomized groups (i.e. not their own project teams), the group can choose a conflict situation that one member might actually be dealing with in their project team. For students working in their current project teams, it is suggested that they choose a hypothetical conflict in order to avoid unintentionally exacerbating their conflict while learning and practicing the strategies.

The facilitator introduces an Assertive Communication Strategy based on the D.E.S.C. model [13], which places support and development of team members at the forefront of a difficult conversation in order to maintain positive relationships for the long term. Once a challenging behaviour has been selected by the group, they are asked to draft a dialogue following the Assertive Communication Strategy following the steps listed:

- Describe the behaviour, in a constructive and supportive tone by using facts, details, and examples, and paying particular attention to avoid focusing on the person
- Explain the impact of the behavior using “I” statements and encouraging the other individual to contribute with clarification, as well as asking for, and acknowledging, the individual’s viewpoints and feelings
- Specify the desired outcomes by providing a preferred solution while also allowing the other individual to contribute with additional solutions, or to challenge the solution provided
- State the consequences in the event that changes are not made while remaining supportive and non-threatening.

The final step of the group activity involves each team partnering with another to present their dialogue and provide feedback to one another. Instructors may choose to collect the work for review or assign end-of-term reflection questions that can help assess the impact of the module on the team’s development and conflict resolution experiences.

3.2 Conflict resolution and management

Through a series of in-class activities, the second module on team conflict reinforces the importance of recognizing how differences among team members' needs and perspectives can contribute to conflicts. This module also provides direction on choosing an appropriate style to help reduce or resolve conflict.

The first part of the module consists of a short presentation introducing conflict handling styles: Accommodating (I lose, you win), Competing (I win, you lose), Avoiding (I lose, you lose), Collaborating (I win, you win), or Compromising (I win some, you win some). Individuals tend to have a preference for a particular style depending on their own personality and the dynamic of the team, among other factors [22]. There is no right or wrong style, rather the correct style is chosen for each new situation, so emphasis is placed on the importance of understanding the strengths and drawbacks of each style. The main goal of the presentation is to help students consider how they can use this model to make more informed and productive decisions when approaching a conflict situation.

The second part of this module consists of a group activity. As with the previous module, instructors can choose to have students form teams randomly, or have them work in their current project teams. Each group should have a minimum of 4 participants in order to run the group activity effectively. If smaller teams exist, they can pair up to form a larger group. For the first activity, each team is given a scenario which includes two perspectives on a conflict: one from an individual team member's perspective, and the other from the remainder of the team.

The scenarios were created using authentic engineering capstone design course conflicts which were collected via a capstone survey in 2016-2017. Using scenarios to teach students conflict handling strategies has two benefits. First, teams that are currently experiencing a significant conflict don't feel pressured to resolve the conflict within a prescribed time frame. Second, it may be difficult for teams to objectively view differing perspectives on their current conflict without taking sides. Second, teams who are not experiencing conflicts within their team can still benefit from learning about, and applying in theory, different conflict handling styles.

Each group then splits up into two subgroups with two to three students per subgroup, and each subgroup takes one perspective. After reading and discussing their scenario, each subgroup identifies and lists the factors that seem to be contributing to or causing the conflict. They then refer to a list of attributes that effective teams exhibit and identify which attributes are lacking. The team attributes they can consider include:

- Communicating effectively
- Addressing task conflict effectively
- Fostering a team culture of openness and trust
- Following a systemic, agreed-upon, decision making process
- Planning for regular team meetings to support the team's progress towards shared goals
- Keeping motivation high through recognition of team members' contributions
- Creating measurable and specific mission and/or goals
- Self-managing effectively
- Adopting appropriate leadership styles [7]

The subgroups then apply each of the five conflict handling styles to their scenario and list the possible positive and negative outcomes of each approach. The subgroups also use a conflict analysis checklist which provides conflict statements for each handling style. Students read each statement as a group and decide if it applies to their scenario. For example, one statement in the "Avoiding" style is: "The issue is small and there are more important issues to deal with." One statement in the "Accommodating" style is: "Maintaining harmony in the relationships is extremely important." Any statement that results in a "true" answer is checked off by the team and each category is summed up. Students then consider the category totals and the positive and negative outcomes listed in the previous activity in order to select the style they believe would produce the best outcome. At this point the subgroups come back together to share their side of the scenario and the outcome of their analysis, including the conflict handling style and strategies that they feel are most appropriate in their situation. Together the team uses all completed handouts to negotiate and formulate a plan that would resolve the conflict. Instructors can choose to collect the conflict resolution plan that is completed at the end of the session. Additionally, a series of reflection questions can be integrated as a stand-alone deliverable, or as part of a final team report.

4. Implementation in courses and changes

The introduction to conflict module was implemented in eight different classes across four different programs (chemical, civil, geological and nanotechnology engineering) ranging from first to third year reaching about 575 students.

The conflict resolution module was implemented in five courses across four different programs (chemical, civil, geological and management engineering) ranging first to fourth year reaching about 300 students.

The combined module was run in three different courses across four different programs (architectural, civil, environmental and geological engineering) for first year students reaching 275 students.

In the qualitative results and observations sections we discuss the feedback received from the students who attended the combined conflict modules. This combined module was offered to three groups of first-year students in Environmental Engineering/Geological Engineering (ENV/GEO), Architectural Engineering (AE), and Civil Engineering (CIVE) respectively. Each workshop was implemented by the same team of facilitators from the Student Success Office using the same content and delivery methods. The only differences across the sections were space and group configurations. The group configurations were as follows:

- ENV/GEO: students worked in their own project teams for both modules
- AE: students were randomized for the first module, and then worked in their own project teams for the second module
- CIVE: students worked in random teams for both modules

The purpose of changing the group configuration was to examine how various team formations within the modules influences students' perceptions of value, impact on overall team cohesion, and team effectiveness.

5. Classroom observations

Observations were conducted by a representative from the Centre for Teaching Excellence in all three sessions with primary focus on factors that fostered and hindered student engagement and interaction, which were the key elements that affected the outcomes of these sessions. Major observations are summarized in the sections below.

First, classroom space had a direct impact on student interaction. This workshop was implemented in three different classroom settings. The first two sessions (ENV/GEO and AE) took place in medium-sized lecture halls with movable furniture and plenty of free space, while the third session (CIVE) was held in a large tiered lecture hall with fixed furniture and limited space at the back and sides of the room. It was obvious that in the first two sessions, students were able to engage in barrier-free learner-to-learner interactions in both activities. Also, the facilitators were able to walk around and do comprehension checks and answer questions throughout the sessions. While in the third session, students were restricted in their seats and were not able to engage in effective discussions due to the physical constraints, especially in the second activity where groups were asked to give feedback to one another. Moreover, it was challenging for the facilitators to check in and address students' questions efficiently. It was evident that flexible classrooms fostered student interactivity to a large extent.

Second, the attendance rates were high in general (65/68 for ENV/GEO, 66/78 for AE, and 101/120 for CIVE), and the majority of students in all three sessions were actively engaged. The ENV/GEO group had very positive dynamics and their level of engagement was the highest among all three groups. All students in the class actively answered questions and participated in group discussions in both activities. In the AE session, however, a few students who were sitting in the back were occasionally distracted and were working on irrelevant tasks during the group activities, although the majority of class were able to stay focused on the session. Engagement of the CIVE group was challenging in particular partly due to the group size and the nature of the classroom space that was discussed in the previous section. Another fact with this group was that since the class was scheduled on a Friday afternoon, there were around 10 students who came to the session late and around 20 that left early, which disrupted the class and group dynamics in general.

Third, group configuration set the tone for team development and dynamics. It was the intention of this study to use different group configurations in different sessions to evaluate its effect on the workshop outcomes. In the ENV/GEO session, all participants stayed in their original project groups for the entire session, which contributed significantly to the high productivity of discussions both within and across teams. Since the students were familiar with their team members, it was obvious that the team leaders were identified quickly and were able to take initiatives and responsibilities to ensure all processes were completed in an efficient manner. In the AE session, the students had their first activity in randomized groups and second one in their project groups. While the randomization provided students with an opportunity to experience the

initial stages of the Tuckman's group development model, it led to a relatively slow start for some groups and a slightly disrupted transition to the second part of the workshop. In the CIVE session, random groups were used for both activities. Similar to the AE session, the groups had to go through the forming stage before they were able to perform effectively. As a result of this, some students claimed that they didn't have enough time to finish the first activity. Also, due to the class size and physical barriers in the room, the facilitators had to ask students to get into groups with those who were sitting close to them, which was a less effective way of randomization compared to that used in the AE session where students were asked to form groups with people sitting in front or behind them. However, one strength in the group configuration in the CIVE session is that, for the second activity, the groups were adjusted to have even numbers to ensure everyone had a partner to work with when analyzing the scenarios, which was a great strategy to enhance engagement.

Fourth, this workshop was very well facilitated. The slides and handouts served as very effective visual aids. All verbal and written instructions were given in a clear and concise way, which helped students understand the concepts and follow along the activities. Also, classroom management was done in a respectful and effective manner to keep inappropriate behaviors at the minimum level. Moreover, as an important element of the facilitation, the instructor of the course shared her personal stories about conflict management including her experiences with difficult situations and the strategies she used to approach conflict resolution. This instructor engagement successfully encouraged the students to reflect on their own past experiences and relate the theoretical concepts to real-world scenarios. One example of this was demonstrated at the end of the ENV/GEO session when a student approached the facilitators to share a previous conflict experience and to ask for feedback and strategies to try in the case of a similar conflict occurring in the future.

6. Qualitative results

Individual students were asked to write a 5-10 page long reflection report at the end of the term, looking back at their course project. These reports were graded to ensure they were taken seriously, with grades focused on completion, insight, and grammar/clarity[1]. As part of this report, there were three specific questions targeting the teamwork modules that students answered individually:

- Consider the activities in part a) and b) below from the teamwork workshop you participated in. In what ways did each activity impact your team's performance throughout this project?
    a) Introduction to Conflict: Types of Conflict, Tuckman's model, Using the D.E.S.C. (Describe the behaviour, Express the impact, Specify desired outcome, State the Consequences) assertive communication model to deal with difficult conflict or difficult behavior
    b) Conflict Resolution: Conflict Handling Styles, Using missing team attributes and conflict handling strategies to create a conflict resolution plan (based on the case study scenario)

[1] Ethics approval: Office of Research Ethics #41447

- Considering that some types of conflict can be productive, how did this influence the decision-making in your team? How might this influence the way you approach future teamwork?
- Consider the nine attributes of effective teams, which of the attributes may have been lacking in your current team? What steps did you take as a team to strengthen and improve these attributes?

A thematic analysis was conducted on these reflection reports to understand where students saw value in the conflict modules that they participated in. Each class of students was analyzed independently to identify if there were any class-wide patterns in their responses. A total of 50 submissions were examined in detail, selected randomly from the full pool of student responses, with an approximately equal number from each section.

Across the three sections under study, the majority of students saw value in the workshop, and were applying the language and concepts learned in the workshop in their reflections. Of the 50 submissions examined in detail, only one individual failed to answer the questions, and only 20% of individuals showed little evidence of knowledge or understanding of module content in their reflections. These students typically commented that they had no conflict in their group, and so had no reason to apply (or possibly even retain) what was taught in these modules. The biggest takeaway across the submissions was students coming to the understanding that conflict can be productive and healthy. This realization seemed to give a lot of groups "permission" to have more open discussions throughout the project. Even with groups who said they experienced little or no conflict in their teams, this was the most commonly mentioned item from the material taught in these modules. In a similar vein, 25% of individuals mentioned that the workshops improved their confidence when working in a team setting. Most commonly this was the confidence to speak up in dissent if they didn't agree with an idea given by the team, but it also included the confidence to resolve any conflict internally if it were to arise.

While there were definitely commonalities between the three sections, a few differences stood out in the analysis. The AE students seemed to get the least value out of the modules. In analyzing their responses, 25% of individuals mentioned explicitly that the workshop came too late, and that they were already working well together in a team. In reading their reflections, there were no examples of the module content being applied to resolve an actual team conflict, and a higher proportion of students showed little knowledge/understanding of module content (approximately 1/3 students). The CIVE students on the other hand gave several good, believable examples of module content being applied to actual group conflict, with an additional student commenting in hindsight that they could have applied the module content to de-escalate a conflict in the group. Of the CIVE students, approximately 20% showed little to no understanding of the module content in their end of term reflections. On the opposite end of the spectrum, the students in ENV/GEO seemed to have extraordinarily few conflicts throughout the project period, there are almost no examples given of any conflicts that needed to be resolved, however every reflection sample showed good understanding of the module content. This could mean that they are a particularly amiable group, or perhaps strong in team environments, or that the modules were particularly effective in helping them avoid conflict, but in any case, it was interesting in how uniformly successful their teams were.

7. Quantitative results

A post survey was conducted at the end of each session. The responses were as follows: 49 from AE, 19 from CIVE, 60 from ENV/GEO. Questions focused around student perception about workshop facilitation and application of concepts and strategies in future teamwork experiences. In general, students were positive in their responses about the workshop. Responses for these sessions are reported in aggregate.

- 80% of the respondents stated that they either somewhat agree, agree, or strongly agree with the following statement: *I will utilize the strategies that I have learned today in my future teamwork experiences.*
- 80% of the respondents stated that they somewhat agree, agree, or strongly agree with the following statement: *Learning about various types of conflicts and the strategies to mitigate them contributed to my professional development as an engineer.*
- 84% of the respondents stated that they somewhat agree, agree, or strongly agree with the following statement: *The strategies I have learned today will help me to mitigate potential conflicts in a work setting.*
- 75% of the respondents stated that they agree or strongly agree with the following statement: *I will apply what I have learned today in my teamwork experiences.*
- 89% of respondents indicated that the quality of the presentation was very or somewhat good.
- 79% of the respondents stated that they agree or strongly agree with the following statement: *The activities in this module helped me to better understand how to resolve conflicts.*

8. Conclusions

Overall, this workshop was very well received and appreciated by most students in all three groups. According to some verbal feedback collected during the sessions, most students found the theoretical framework and interactive activities very valuable. As a result, they were much more confident in their ability to manage conflicts in their current or future teamwork assignments. Lastly, learner-to-learner interaction was encouraged to a very large extent throughout the sessions, which enabled the students to explore conflict management with support from resourceful facilitators, and more importantly, their peers. This collaborative learning approach served as a key element of student engagement and the success of this workshop.
In regard to the group configuration for the modules, no clear conclusions can be made as other factors such as class size and space played a role in the engagement and application of the concepts in the module. However, it is clear from all students' responses that if conflict existed within their teams the module helped them resolve it.

9. Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge the financial support of the University of Waterloo's LITE grant program, and the NSERC Chair in IDEAs.

10. References

[1] M. Mostafapour, and A. Hurst, "An Exploratory Study of Teamwork Processes and Perceived Team Effectiveness in Engineering Capstone Design Teams," *International Journal of Engineering Education*, 36(1B), 436-449.

[2] A. Hurst, M. Mostafapour, R. Al-Hammoud, A. Prier, E. Jobidon, C. Rennick, J. Grove, E. Li, and S. Bedi, "Practicing what we preach: A multi-disciplinary team teaching multi-disciplinary teamwork," in *Proc. ASEE 124th Annual Conference and Exposition* (Columbus, OH; 25-28 June 2017), 16 pp., 2017.

[3] A. Hurst, E. Jobidon, A. Prier, T. Khaniyev, C. Rennick, R. Al-Hammoud, C. Hulls, J. Grove, S. Mohamed, S. Johnson, and S. Bedi, "Towards a multi-disciplinary teamwork training series for undergraduate engineering students: Development and assessment of two first-year workshops," In *Proc. of ASEE's 123rd Annual Conference & Exposition* (New Orleans, LA; 26-29 June 2016), 18 pp., 2016.

[4] R. Al-Hammoud, A. Hurst, A. Prier, M. Mostafapour, C. Rennick, C. Hulls, E. Jobidon, E. Li, J. Grove, and S. Bedi, "Teamwork for engineering students: Improving skills through experiential teaching modules," In *Proc. of the 2017 CEEA Annual Conference* (Toronto, ON; 4-7 June 2017), 8 pp., 2017.

[5] E. Jobidon, M. Barichello, R. Al-Hammoud, M. Mostafapour, C. Rennick, A. Hurst, and J. Grove, "Building engineering professional and teamwork skills: a workshop on giving and receiving feedback," In *Proc. of the 125th ASEE Annual Conference and Exposition* (Salt Lake City, UT; 24-27 June 2018, 15 pp., 2018.

[6] M. Anderson, "The Role of Group Personality Composition in the Emergence of Task and Relationship Conflict Within Groups," *Journal of Management & Organization*, 15(1), 82–96, 2009.

[7] M. Balsom, R. Barrass, J. L. Michela, and A. Zdaniuk, "Processes and attributes of highly effective teams," Distributed in the *iReports Series of the Waterloo Organizational Research and Consulting Group* (WORC Group), Department of Psychology, University of Waterloo, 2009.

[8] S. Brsec Rolih, "Constructive Conflict in Teamwork," *Interdisciplinary Management Research*, 9, 105-113, 2013.

[9] B. Bulleit, "Effectively Managing Team Conflict," *Global Knowledge Training: Expert Reference Series of White Papers*. Accessed from: http://businessman.wikispaces.com/file/view/WP_Bulleit_Conflict.pdf/120080913/WP_Bulleit_Conflict.pdf, 2006.

[10] S. Clinebell and M. Stecher, "Teaching Teams to be Teams: An Exercise Using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator," 2003.

[11] T. Friedman and T. Currall, "What Goes Around Comes around: The impact of personal conflict style on work conflict and stress," *The international journal of conflict management*, 11(1), 32-55, 2000.

[12] S.M. Heathfield, "How to Encourage Meaningful, Needed Conflict at Work," *The Balance*, Accessed from: https://www.thebalance.com/susan-m-heathfield-1916605, 2016.

[13] P.W. Hess, "Enhancing Leadership Skill Development By Creating Practice/Feedback Opportunities in the Classroom," *Journal of Management*, 20(2), 503-530, 2007.

[14] Massachusetts Institute of Technology (n.d.), "The Five Conflict Styles," *The Collaboration Tool Box*, Accessed from: http://web.mit.edu/collaboration/mainsite/modules/module1/1.11.5.html

[15] D. L. Miller, "The Stages of Group Development: A Retrospective Study of Dynamic Team Processes," *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 211(2), 121-134, 2003.
[16] T.A. O'Neill, N.J. Allen, and S.E. Hastings, "Examining the 'Pros' and 'Cons' of Team Conflict: A Team-Level Meta-Analysis of Task, Relationship, and Process Conflict," *Human Performance,* 26(3), 236-260, 2013.
[17] S. Priest and M.A. Gass, "Effective Leadership In Adventure Programming (2nd ed.)," 2005.
[18] Psychometrics Canada Ltd, "Warring Egos, Toxic Individuals, Feeble Leadership: A study of conflict in the Canadian work-place," Accessed from: http://www.psychometrics.com/wp-content/uploads /2015/04/ conflictstudy_09.pdf, 2009.
[19] E. Raider, S. Coleman, and J. Gerson, "Chapter 31: Teaching Conflict Resolution Skills in a Workshop," *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA, 2006
[20] M. Stevens, and M. Campion, "The Knowledge, Skill, and Ability Requirements for Teamwork: implications for Human Resource Management," *Journal of Management,* 20(2), 503-530, 1994.
[21] The Foundation Coalition. (n.d.), "Effective Interpersonal/Intra-team Communication," Accessed from: http://fc.civil.tamu.edu/publications/brochures/communication.pdf
[22] The Foundation Coalition. (n.d.), "Understanding Conflict and Conflict Management," Accessed from:http://www.nrm.wa.gov.au/media/10646/understanding_conflict_and_conflict_management.pdf
[23] University of Waterloo (n.d), "Conflict Management Exploration," *Student Leadership Program.*
[24] University of Waterloo (n.d), "Unit 07: Conflict Resolution," *Professional Development 7 Online: Conflict Resolution.*
[25] R. Williams, "How Teamwork Can Damage Productivity," *Psychology Today,* Accessed from: https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/wired-success/201203/how-teamwork-can-damage-productivity, 2012.