Students' perceptions of long-functioning cooperative teams in accelerated adult degree programs

Judy K. Favor

How to cite this manuscript

If you make reference to this version of the manuscript, use the following information:

Favor, J. K. (2012). Students' perceptions of long-functioning cooperative teams in accelerated adult degree programs. Retrieved from http://krex.ksu.edu

Published Version Information

Running Head: STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF LONG-FUNCTIONING TEAMS

Students' Perceptions of Long-functioning Cooperative Teams in Accelerated

Adult Degree Programs

Judy K. Favor, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Educational Leadership
Kansas State University Olathe
22201 Innovation Drive
Olathe, KS 66061

Ph. 913-307-7362
Email: jfavor@k-state.edu

Abstract

This study examined 718 adult students' perceptions of long-functioning cooperative study teams in accelerated associate's, bachelors, and master's business degree programs. Six factors were examined: attraction toward team, alignment of performance expectations, intra-team conflict, workload sharing, preference for teamwork, and impact on learning. Across degree programs, 66 - 71% of students reported equal work load sharing in their teams; 51 - 61% preferred teamwork; and 56 - 62% believed being on a team enhanced their learning. Significant statistical differences were found between associate degree and master's degree students in performance expectation alignment, intra-team conflict, and teamwork preference.

Key Words: adult education, cooperative teams, cooperative learning, work load distribution, accelerated programs.

Students' Perceptions of Long-functioning Cooperative Teams in Accelerated

Adult Degree Programs

Cooperative learning strategies have permeated college classrooms in response to employers' expectations that graduates possess the ability to work effectively in teams. Institutional responses range from including more team and group activities into courses to creating new courses designed specifically to teach teamwork skills employers desire (Chen, Donahue, & Klimoski, 2004; Kapp, 2009; Volet & Mansfield, 2006). Some institutions have even made cooperative learning strategies a central component of their curricula at the undergraduate and graduate level (Johnson, Johnson and Smith, 1998, Morgan, 2003).

Arguments for the use of cooperative learning strategies are abundant. Cooperative learning can enhance learning and teamwork skills, teach students how to work with others and consider issues from different perspectives, foster relationships with classmates, and promote higher individual academic achievement and more positive attitudes toward learning (Chen et.al., 2004; Gottschall & Garcia-Bayonas, 2008; Johnson et al., 1998; McCorkle et al., 1999; Phipps, Phipps, Kask, & Higgins, 2001; Sweeney, Weaven, & Herington, 2008). On the other hand, however, numerous roadblocks and challenges can inhibit positive outcomes and may prevent students from mastering the very skills that cooperative learning is designed to promote. Free-riders, unequal distribution of the workload, conflicting grade aspirations, and students' negative attitudes toward team work, in particular, often inhibit the acquisition of intended teamwork skills (Gottschall & Garcia-Bayonas, 2008; Kapp, 2009; Pfaff & Huddleston, 2003; Phipps et al., 2001, Sweeney et al., 2008).

Free riding and unequal work load distribution are two of the most frequently cited challenges of group work (Davies, 2009; Gottschall & Garcia-Bayonas, 2008; Joyce, 1999;

Kapp, 2009; Pfaff & Huddleston, 2003). Akin to social loafing, free riders contribute little to the team task, yet reap the reward of other team members' efforts (Davies, 2009). Free riding usually leads directly to perceptions of unequal workload distribution in teams because other team members generally pick up the slack of the free rider to prevent a poor grade on the task.

A misalignment of performance expectations within teams can also cause problems (Gottschall & Garcia-Bayonas, 2008; Phipps et al., 2001). Having different grade expectations within teams can influence perceptions of free riding and unequal workload distribution as conscientious students who aspire to earn "As" on group projects are typically inclined to pick up the slack for students who are content with "Bs" or even "Cs." Some studies have suggested that high achieving students have worse attitudes toward group work than do lower achieving students, perhaps due to prior experience with misalignment of grade expectations or free riders within previous groups. For example, Volet and Mansfield (2006) interviewed business students and found that those who were highly motivated primarily by performance goals (grades) had worse attitudes toward group assignments than did students who were motivated by multiple goals including performance, learning, social well-being, and friendship. Likewise, Baldwin and colleagues (1997) found that first-year Master of Business Administration (MBA) students who scored highest on the Graduate Management Admissions Test (GMAT) were less satisfied with a program that utilized semester-long cooperative teams than were students who scored lower on the GMAT and hypothesized that more capable students may get tired of carrying less capable students in their groups.

Experiencing free riders, unequal workload distribution, and misalignment of grade aspirations in groups likely influences students' attitudes toward teamwork, in general. Sweeney and colleagues' (2008) found that the majority of undergraduate and graduate marketing students

already had pre-conceived negative attitudes toward group work based on their previous experiences and Gottschall and Garcia-Bayonas' (2008) found that nearly 55% of undergraduate students majoring in business had a negative attitude toward group projects.

Pre-conceived, negative notions toward cooperative learning may inhibit student learning and motivation. Phipps and colleagues (2001) found that only 18% of undergraduate students from four different majors that utilized cooperative learning believed the strategies positively affected their learning. Moreover, cooperative learning strategies did not motivate students to study more as only 11% reported an increase in study time. Vreven and McFadden (2007) arrived at a similar conclusion when they examined student knowledge and motivation in a 3-week course for traditional undergraduate students and found that cooperative learning techniques not increase student learning and actually decreased student motivation to learn.

Learning may also be impeded when teams divide up the work and only learn their part of the assigned project. McCorkle and colleagues (1999) found that upper-level undergraduate marketing students were inclined to do only what was necessary to achieve the grade, only learned their portion of the group project, and often distributed the workload in ways that prevented the development of essential skills by all team members.

While many studies have examined cooperative learning and reported both benefits and challenges, fewer have examined student perceptions toward group work (Gottschall & Garcia-Bayonas, 2008), especially in non-traditional learning environments that serve working adult students. Degree programs designed for working adults often feature accelerated course schedules and rely upon cooperative learning experiences with the assumption that these experiences enhance student learning. However, empirical documentation of adult students'

perceptions of cooperative learning experiences, in general, and more importantly, their perceptions of whether these experiences help them learn is limited.

The purpose of this study was to examine adult students' perceptions of long-functioning, cooperative learning teams in accelerated business degree programs. In particular, the study sought to answer the following questions: 1) How do adult students feel about long-functioning, cooperative teams? 2) Do adult students share the same academic performance expectations? 3) Are teams distributing the workload evenly? 4) Do students perceive conflict within their teams? 5) Do students prefer to work alone? 6) Do cooperative learning teams positively impact student learning? 7) Do student perceptions of cooperative teams vary by degree program?

Methods

Program Design and Data Collection Procedures

This study utilized a convenience sample of adult students enrolled in accelerated business degree programs at a small, private, non-profit Midwestern university serving approximately 1,300 undergraduate and graduate business students at five regional campuses and online. Degree programs are designed for working adults and feature accelerated courses requiring students to attend class one night each week for 5 - 8 weeks. All business degree programs utilize a lock-step, cohort curriculum and long-functioning, cooperative learning teams comprised of between three and six members.

Students self-select their teams during the first course of their programs. As a self-governing unit designed to work together for the entire degree program, each team develops a written document outlining policies, expectations, and procedures for the team. While students may elect to move to a different team during the program, all students are required to be on a

team. Teams work as a unit in class and are expected to meet outside of class to complete various graded team projects and assignments.

To ensure that students participating in this study had completed several projects with their teams, only students from cohort groups that were in at least their third course of the program were invited to participate. Seventy-six adjunct instructors scheduled to teach courses in the Associate of Arts in Business (AAB), Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA), Bachelor of Science in Management (BSM), Master of Science in Management (MSM), and Master of Business Administration (MBA) programs during a five-week period were contacted via email and requested to encourage student participation in one of three ways: 1) provide in-class time for students to complete the online survey; 2) write the online link on the board and encourage students to complete the survey before the next class period; 3) embed the survey link into their weekly online curriculum. Sixty-five instructors participated with some electing to award bonus points to participating students. However, participation by both instructors and students was voluntary, and all students read a voluntary consent statement as required by the institutional review board prior to completing the survey.

Instrument Development

The work of several group and organizational researchers (Carron, Widmeyer, & Brawley, 1985; Campion, Medsker, & Higgs, 1993; Evans & Jarvis, 1986; and Rahim, 1983) served as the basis for development of an instrument to measure students' perceptions of their teams in five areas: attraction toward team; performance expectation alignment; teamwork preference; workload sharing; and intra-team conflict. Additionally, the author developed four items to measure students' perceptions of the degree to which being a member of a team contributed to their learning. Students used a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly

disagree" to "strongly agree" to respond. Initial construct validity and internal reliability was established through a pilot study with 115 business students who did not participate in this study.

The final 32-item instrument included 7 modified items from the Group Attitude Scale (Evans & Jarvis, 1986) measuring general attraction toward the team, 6 modified items from the Group Environment Questionnaire (Carron et al., 1985) measuring the degree to which students perceived cohesion and alignment of performance expectations, 3 modified items from Campion et al.'s (1993) Work Group Characteristics Measure measuring preference for teamwork, and 3 items measuring workload sharing, 7 modified items from Rahim's (1983) Organizational Conflict Scale measuring perceptions of conflict within teams, 4 items measuring impact on learning, and 2 general items.

Prior to data analysis, an internal reliability analysis was conducted with each primary factor on the instrument. Cronbach's correlation coefficients ranged from .86 to .93 as follows: Team Attraction .92; Cohesion and Performance Expectation Alignment.86; Preference for Teamwork .90; Workload Sharing .93; Intra-team Conflict .90; and Contribution to Learning .91.

Participant Demographics

The sample included 718 students (319 male, 394 female) representing 66 cohort groups and 180 teams. Respondents were primarily white (77%) and ranged in age from 22 to over 56 with 39% between the ages of 22 - 30 and 39% in the 31 - 40 age range. Respondents represented all 5 of the institution's adult campuses ($N = 509$), online programs ($N = 197$), and 6 business programs: AAB ($N = 169$); BBA ($N = 208$); BSM ($N = 61$); BBIS ($N = 5$), MSM ($N = 19$); and MBA ($N = 261$). Responses from the BBIS and MSM were excluded from analyses resulting in a final sample of 694.

Data Analysis

Item responses were tabulated by degree program according to the percent of students who agreed or strongly agreed, disagreed or strongly disagreed, or chose a neutral response. Agree, disagree, and neutral responses for items within each of the six factors were than summed to create an overall response percentage for each factor by degree program.

At the individual student level, a mean score was calculated for each of the six factors for each respondent. Mean scores were then recoded as 1 = negative (scores of 1.0 - 2.99), 2 = neutral (scores of 3.0 - 3.99), or 3 = positive (scores of 4.0 - 5.0). Additionally, responses were grouped into three degree levels: associates, bachelors, or masters. To evaluate differences in student perceptions by degree levels, several one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests were conducted at the .05 significance level using Dunnett C post hoc procedures to control for Type I errors.

<div align="center">Results</div>

Attraction to Team

Attraction toward students' existing teams was measured with seven items including *I like my learning team, I am dissatisfied with my learning team,* and *If I could drop out of my learning team now, I would*. Overall, 74 - 85% of students reported a generally positive attraction toward their teams. Students in the associate's program had lower levels of attraction toward their teams than did bachelor's and master's degree students, as demonstrated by several individual items that were nearly 10% lower than in other programs. Overall percentages indicated that 74% of AAB students had generally positive feelings toward their teams compared to 84% of bachelor's and 81% of master's level students.

One way analysis of variance indicated significant differences in Attraction to Team by degree level, $F (2, 714) = 3.65$, $p = .03$, $\eta^2 = .01$. However, Dunnett C post hoc tests found no

significant differences between associate's, bachelors, or master's degree students indicating that differences between degree programs were not statistically significant.

Performance Expectation Alignment

Six items including *I'm unhappy with my team's desire to perform at a high level, Our team is united in trying to meet our performance goals,* and *Our team members have conflicting aspirations for our team's performance* evaluated the degree to which team performance expectations within teams aligned. In general, approximately 75% of students perceived team alignment of performance expectations. However, 5 - 19% of students perceived a misalignment of performance expectations.

More AAB students perceived misalignment in performance expectations than did students in other degree programs as 70% agreed that performance expectations within their teams were aligned compared to 79% in the BBA, 78% in the BSM, and 77% in the MBA. Additionally, 19% of AAB students indicated they will not miss members of their team when their program ends compared to 10 - 13% in bachelor's and master's programs.

The ANOVA confirmed significant differences in Performance Expectation Alignment by degree level, $F (2, 715) = 4.33, p = .01, \eta^2 = .01$. Dunnett C post hoc tests showed significant differences between associates-level and bachelor-level and associates-level and masters-level students indicating that students in the associate program perceived more differences in performance expectations between team members in their teams than did students in other programs.

Workload Sharing

Three items measured the degree to which students perceived their team shares the workload evenly: *Everyone on my team does their fair share of the work; No one on my team*

depends on others to do the work for them; and *All members of my learning team contribute equally to the work.* Across degree programs, 66% of associate's, 68% of bachelor's, and 71% of master's degree students believe their teams share the workload. ANOVA tests confirmed that there were no significant statistical differences in perceptions of work load sharing across degree programs.

Intra-team Conflict

Items like *There is harmony within our team*, *There is a "we" feeling among members of my team,* and *There is a difference of opinion among members of my team* evaluated students' perceptions of intra-team conflict. Combined 7-item responses indicated that 70% of AAB, 81% of BBA, 77% of BSM, and 81% of MBA students perceived low levels of conflict in their teams. This appears to suggest that 20 - 30% perceived higher degrees of conflict within their teams. However, only 11% of associate's, 8% of bachelor's, and 8% of master's degree students perceived high levels of conflict on their teams. Interestingly, 11-19% of students chose neutral responses to conflict items. These neutral responses may reflect adult students' beliefs that it is socially undesirable to report adversarial relationships (Baldwin, Bedell, and Johnson, 1997), or it might reflect students' inability to accurately judge the level of conflict within their teams.

Conflict items yielded more variance between individual item responses than did other scales, depending on the specific item. In particular, 19 - 36% of students agreed *There is a difference in opinion among team membe*rs. However, it appears that this difference in opinion may not be distracting the team or causing negative perceptions as only 5 - 8% of students disagreed with the statement *There is a "we" feeling among members of my team.* It is possible that the different opinions held by team members may be translating into a diversity of ideas that

positively influence the team's project and overall performance, which is a noted benefit of group work (Baldwin et al., 1997).

ANOVA tests confirmed significant differences between perceptions of intra-team conflict by degree programs, $F (2, 714) = 3.43$, $p = .03$, $\eta^2 = .01$. Dunnett C post hoc tests found those differences were between associate's and master's degree students. Thus, AAB students perceived higher degrees of conflict in their teams than did students in pursuing master's degrees.

Preference for Teamwork

While 70 - 80% of students across programs perceived little conflict in their teams and had a generally positive attraction toward their teams, items measuring preference for teamwork yielded much different results. Overall, 51% of AAB and BBA, 58% of BSM, and 61% of MBA students indicated a preference for teamwork, a finding similar to other researchers' findings (Gottschall & Garcia-Bayonas, 2008).

Like conflict, this scale demonstrated a larger variance between individual items. For example, only 40% of AAB, 43% of BBA, 48% of BSM and 52% of MBA students agreed with the statement *If given the choice, I would prefer to work as part of a team rather than work alone.* However, a much higher percentage (57 - 65%) of students across programs agreed they *generally prefer to work as part of a team.* Similarly, 53 - 68% agreed that *Working as a team member increases my ability to perform effectively.* This item also yielded exceptionally different levels of agreement between degree programs as 53% of students at the AAB level perceived that being on a team enhanced their performance compared to 68% of MBA students.

The ANOVA confirmed differences in preference for teamwork by degree program, $F (2, 715) = 4.00$, $p = .02$, $\eta^2 = .01$. Dunnett C post hoc tests showed these differences were between

associates and master's degree students. Students in associates programs were significantly less likely to prefer teamwork than were master's degree students.

Contribution to Learning

Student' perceptions of the impact their teams have on their individual learning is most clearly demonstrated with the item *I learn more with my learning team than I would learn on my own* where 43% of associate's, 45% of bachelor's, and 50% of master's degree students agreed. *Being on a learning team increases the amount I learn* yielded slightly better results where at the AAB level, just over half (53%) agreed while 29% disagreed. In the bachelor's programs 56-60% agreed and 18 - 19% disagreed. At the master's level, 59% agreed and 20% disagreed. Notably more associate's (24%) students than bachelor's (13%) or master's (12%) students perceived that teams detract from their individual learning.

Combined results of the 4 items indicate that 56% of AAB students believe teams contribute positively to their learning, and 26% believe teams detract from their learning. Students in bachelor's and master's programs reported slightly better perceptions regarding their teams' contribution to learning at 61% and 62%, respectively, while 17% reported teams do not increase their learning. However, ANOVA tests found no significant differences in students' perceptions of the impact learning teams have on their learning across programs.

<div align="center">Discussion</div>

Results of this study indicate that many of the same challenges that occur when using cooperative teams with traditional college-aged students also exist within teams of adult learners in accelerated programs. While over 70% of working adult students in this study had generally positive feelings toward their teams and teammates and perceived generally low levels of intra-team conflict, results in other areas were less positive. In some cases, results challenge

fundamental assumptions of cooperative learning and may suggest unique differences between adult students' abilities to function effectively in cooperative academic learning teams based on stages of academic and personal development.

Across degree programs, 66 - 71% of students perceived that their team shared the work load equally; 19 - 23% perceived unequal workload distribution in their groups. Even though this is much lower than the 65% of undergraduate marketing students who reported free riding as a problem in their groups (McCorkle et al., 1999), it indicates that free riding is also a significant problem in long-functioning teams comprised of working adults.

Perceptions of unequal work load sharing may be linked to a misalignment of performance expectations between group members. When working on group projects, adult students who have high performance and achievement goals are likely to pick up the slack for group members who may be content with lower levels of academic achievement. Overall, approximately 70% of adult students reported that performance expectations within their teams were aligned, a finding that is vastly different than Gottschall and Garcia-Bayonas' report that 49% undergraduate business majors reported differences in grade expectations within their groups. This difference between adult and traditional college students likely reflects motivational differences between these two groups.

Even though many accelerated adult programs regularly utilize projects and assignments that require teamwork, few have evaluated students' preferences for teamwork. In this study, less than half the adult students in the associate's and bachelor's programs would choose to work on a team if they could work alone instead. This preference for individual work rather than group work is similar to what other researchers have found with traditional-aged students enrolled in traditional academic programs (Gottschall & Garcia-Bayonas, 2008). Students who have a strong

preference for individual work may enter a team with a worse attitude and more negative perceptions about conflict, workload sharing, and performance expectations than students who are more open toward group work.

One commonly held assumption in adult accelerated programs is that cooperative teams enhance learning. Interestingly, in this study only 56 - 62% of students across degree programs believed that being on a team contributed positively to their learning. However, it is important to note that this study measured student *perceptions* of learning; it did not measure *actual learning*. It is possible that adult students may have learned more with their teams than they perceived. Nonetheless, because student perceptions impact continued effort, motivation, and satisfaction, they are valid indicators that should be considered when evaluating the effectiveness of any instructional strategy or program.

The fact that adult students enrolled in the associate's program had less favorable perceptions toward teams in all areas than did students in bachelor or master's programs is intriguing and may highlight developmental and professional differences between these adult students and those who already have some college experience. In particular, there were significant differences between associate-level and master's-level students in the areas of performance expectation alignment, intra-team conflict, and teamwork preference. Thus, it appears that long-functioning cooperative teams do not serve all adult students equally well.

There are at least two possible reasons for these differences. First, working adult students who enroll in an accelerated associate's program typically have no prior experience in college or have had limited, and often unsuccessful, prior experience. Working adults who enroll in accelerated bachelor's programs, on the other hand, have generally completed a significant number of college credit hours but never finished a degree. Thus, the apprehension and stress

level of adult students in an accelerated associate's program may already be heightened as

compared with adult bachelor's and master's level students who have already gained some

experience, confidence, and success in college.

Prior work experience may be a second factor. Students who have not attained a college

degree are often restricted occupationally. In many cases, the impetus for returning to or starting

college as a working adult student is the desire to expand career options. While many positions

in the business world today require working in teams, it seems reasonable to suspect that adult

students who enter an associate's program may have minimal experience functioning in highly

interactive and dependent team environments because their jobs do not require it. Thus, some of

these students may not have acquired the social and emotional skills necessary to work

effectively in a long-term, high-stakes, team situation.

<div align="center">Recommendations and Future Research</div>

Even though this study is limited in that it represents the perceptions of adult students

from only one institution that utilizes rather unique long-term team requirements, it provides

some interesting insights that may be useful to adult educators and administrators who oversee

programs that utilize teams and team learning. The most prevalent issues among adult students in

this study were unequal workload sharing, a preference for individual work, and perceptions that

teamwork did not enhance learning. Thus, it appears that educators who utilize team work would

be wise to spend more time clearly articulating why working in a team is important and detailing

the learning outcomes and purposes associated with completing academic work in teams.

Educators often assume that team assignments and projects automatically help students learn

how to work with others more effectively yet typically assess only the final outcome and fail to

evaluate how well the group worked together. Evaluating only the end product rather than the

process can encourage unequal workload distribution as the most studious students will do more than their share to ensure a good grade. Implementing assessment methods that provide opportunities for students to discuss and evaluate their individual contributions as well as the contributions of other group members may help ensure more equal work load distribution. Further, implementing procedures to assess the group *process* and each member's role in that process rather than only the tangible outcome may help students value the team learning environment and actually learn to function more effectively with different types of people.

Additionally, educators should not assume that all adult students are equally prepared to work effectively in academic teams. Significant differences between associate and master's students' perceptions of performance expectation alignment, intra-team conflict, and preference for teamwork suggest that less experienced college students may be less well equipped to function effectively in long-functioning teams, regardless of age. This is an interesting area for future research and may suggest programmatic changes in the way team learning is introduced in the curriculum and the amount of team learning utilized within various degrees.

While this study provides insights into adult students' perceptions of long-functioning cooperative teams in accelerated business programs, there are some important limitations. Some instructors awarded bonus points for students who completed the online survey; others allowed students to complete the surveys in class where teams often sit together. These two strategies may have influenced some students to respond in socially desirable ways. Yet the large number of responses from various campuses and degree programs suggests that the data adequately represent overall student perceptions at this institution. Results may not be generalizable to other institutions. Future research with non-traditional adult students in accelerated learning formats

that utilize alternate models of cooperative learning activities and methods will enhance the adult cooperative learning literature.

It is also important to note that data was collected at one point in time. Attitudes and perceptions can be influenced by a variety of contextual situations and can change over time. Future research designs would benefit from sampling the same adults at different time periods to examine if and why perceptions about cooperative learning experiences change.

References

Baldwin, T. T., Bedell, M. D., & Johnson, J. L. (1997). The social fabric of a team-based M.B.A. program: Network effects on student satisfaction and performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 40,* 1369-1397.

Campion, M. A., Medsker, G. J., & Higgs, A. C. (1993). Relations between work group characteristics and effectiveness: Implications for designing effective work groups. *Personnel Psychology, 46*, 823 - 850.

Carron, A. V., Widmeyer, W. N., & Brawley, L. R. (1985). The development of an instrument to assess cohesion in sport teams: The group environment questionnaire. *Journal of Sport Psychology, 7,* 244-266.

Davies, W. M. (2009). Group work as a form of assessment: Common problems and recommended solutions. *Higher Education, 58,* 563-584.

Evans, N. J., & Jarvis, P. A. (1986). The group attitude scale. *Small Group Behavior, 17,* 203-216.

Gottschall, H., & Garcia-Bayonas, M. (2008). Student attitudes toward group work among undergraduates in business administration, education, and mathematics. *Educational Research Quarterly, 32,* 3-28.

Joyce, W. B. (1999). On the free-rider problem in cooperative learning. *Journal of Education for Business, 74,* 271-274.

Kapp, E. (2009). Improving student teamwork in a collaborative project-based course. *College Teaching, 57,* 139-143.

McCorkle, D. E., Reardon, J., Alexander, J. F., Kling, N. D., Harris, R. C., & Iyer, R.

(1999). Undergraduate marketing students, group projects, and teamwork: The good, the bad, and the ugly? *Journal of Marketing Education, 21,* 106-117.

Morgan, B. (2003). Cooperative learning in higher education: Undergraduate student reflections on group examinations for group grades. *College Student Journal*, 37, 40-49.

Pfaff, E., & Huddleston, P. (2003). Does it matter if I hate teamwork? What impacts student attitudes toward teamwork. *Journal of Marketing Education, 25,* 37-45.

Phipps, M., Phipps, C., Kask, S., & Higgins, S. (2001). University students' perceptions of cooperative learning: Implications for administrators and instructors. *The Journal of Experiential Education*, 24, 14-21.

Rahim, M. A. (1983). Measurement of organizational conflict. *The Journal of General Psychology, 109,* 189-199.

Sweeney, A., Weaven, S., & Herington, C. (2008). Multicultural influences on group learning: A qualitative higher education study. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 33,* 119-132.

Volet, S., & Mansfield, C. (2006). Group work at university: Significance of personal goals and regulation strategies of students with positive and negative appraisals. *Higher Education Research & Development, 25,* 341-356.

Vreven, D., & McFadden, S. (2007). An empirical assessment of cooperative groups in large, time-compressed, introductory courses. *Innovative Higher Education, 32,* 85-92.

Figure 1. *Student Perceptions of Cooperative Teams by Program*