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**Pilot Study**

I investigated how debate/disagreement versus agreement would be associated with collaboration, which offered empirical evidence for lay beliefs regarding the mutually exclusive nature of conflict and collaboration.

**Participants and Measures**

I recruited 1241 adults (56.73% female; *M age* = 40.06 years, *SD age* = 12.67 years; *M work experience* = 17.80 years, *SD**work experience* = 12.68 years) who completed an online survey for monetary compensation (i.e., $0.8) via the Turkprime website (Litman et al., 2017).

Participants completed two forced-choice tasks. The instructions of the first and second tasks were: “Of the following two choices, who do you think is more likely to elicit your collaboration for a specific task?” The options of the first task were: “A person who debates about your different viewpoints” and “A person who agrees with your viewpoints.” The options of the second task were: “A person who disagrees with your different viewpoints” and “A person who agrees with your viewpoints.” Participants also indicated their demographics at the end of the study.

**Results**

I used chi-squared tests with the goodness of fit to examine whether the observed proportions of the tasks with the two choices would be evenly distributed (i.e., 50% for each choice). The results demonstrated that the observed proportions of the two choices were significantly different from an even distribution of the two choices (first task: χ2[1] = 659.97, *p* < .001; second task: χ2[1] = 683.51, *p* < .001). Specifically, most of the participants (1073, 86.46%) answered that a person who debates about their different viewpoints was less likely to elicit their collaboration than was a person who agrees with their viewpoints. Furthermore, most of the participants (1081, 87.11%) indicated that a person who disagrees with their viewpoints was less likely to elicit their collaboration than was a person who agrees with their viewpoints. I also used mixed-effects logistic regression with participant identification numbers as a random effect intercept to test whether the numbers of the participants who selected the options of “debate” and “disagreement” were statistically different. The results demonstrated a non-significant difference in the numbers of those who selected the options of “debate” and “disagreement” (*B* = .10, *p* = .526). Conjointly, the results confirmed lay beliefs on the negative association between conflict and collaboration.

**Full Items for the Focal Measures and Task Scenarios**

**Study 1: perceived counterpart openness**

Good ideas get serious consideration from my counterpart.

My counterpart is interested in ideas and suggestions from me.

If suggestions were made to my counterpart, they would receive fair evaluation.

**Study 1: emotions**

[positive emotions]

Attentive

Active

Energetic

Interested

[negative emotions]

Frustrated

Angry

Annoyed

Tense

**Study 1: collaboration with a counterpart**

I discussed the issues with my counterpart to work out a mutually acceptable idea.

I cooperated with my counterpart to better understand each other’s views and positions.

I settled issues with my counterpart through mutual concessions.

**Study 1 Scenario:**

Many people who have tried to find a place to park their car around the central area of a city know that it is often difficult due to limited parking spaces.

**Study 2: task conflict expressions**

[Debate]

How often do you and your coworker have debates about your different opinions and ideas?

How often do you and your coworker debate about your differing viewpoints regarding the issues involved in your work?

How often do you and your coworker debate about the pluses and minuses of different ideas?

How often do you and your coworker debate about the most appropriate solution to choose for your work?

How often do you and your coworker debate about opposing views for the final course of action for your work?

[Disagreement]

How often do you and your coworker disagree about opinions regarding the work being done?

How frequently are there disagreements about ideas between you and your coworker?

To what extent are the levels of disagreement between you and your coworker?

How much disagreement about the work you do is there between you and your coworker?

**Study 2: emotions**

[positive emotions]

Attentive

Active

Energetic

Interested

[negative emotions]

Frustrated

Angry

Annoyed

Tense

**Study 2: perceived coworker openness**

Good ideas get serious consideration from my coworker.

My coworker is interested in ideas and suggestions from me.

If suggestions were made to my coworker, they would receive fair evaluation.

**Study 2: collaboration with a coworker**

I discussed the issues with my coworker to work out a mutually acceptable idea.

I cooperated with my coworker to better understand each other’s views and positions.

I settled issues with my coworker through mutual concessions.

**Study 2: affectivity**

[positive affectivity at work]

Attentive

Active

Energetic

Interested

[negative affectivity at work]

Frustrated

Angry

Annoyed

Tense

**Study 2: task interdependency**

What I do in my job has an impact on my coworker's work.

My job activities go on to affect my coworker's work.

My coworker's work depends directly on me doing my job.

Unless my job gets done, my coworker cannot do her/his work.

Unsatisfactory performance of my job would delay my coworker's work performance.

My job requires me to spend a great deal of time giving help or advice my coworker needs.

**Study 2: relationship conflict**

We constantly bicker.

We do not respect each other.

We have feelings which tend to pull us apart.

**Study 3: perceived counterpart openness**

Good ideas get serious consideration from my counterpart.

My counterpart is interested in ideas and suggestions from me.

If suggestions were made to my counterpart, they would receive fair evaluation.

**Study 3: emotions**

[positive emotions]

Attentive

Active

Energetic

Interested

[negative emotions]

Frustrated

Angry

Annoyed

Tense

**Study 3 Scenario:**

Water pollution has detrimental effects on our drinking water and marine life. On the average, our water is polluted by two million tons of domestic and municipal wastewater, industrial and agricultural waste each day.

**Data Screening in Study 2**

In the first wave survey, I recruited 990 participants and used screening questions to invite 767 participants who were employed, had at least one coworker, and answered a comprehension question correctly (i.e., selecting the option “indicate your observations regarding people's behavior in the workplace” rather than “evaluate the quality of different ideas.” for the purpose of the study) for the following surveys. Although 335 participants completed the three-wave survey, I removed 15 participants from the sample due to the inconsistencies in their reported coworkers’ initials or gender among the three surveys. The final sample consisted of 320 working adults. I also examined the differences in demographics between the invited sample (*N* = 767) and final sample (*N* = 320) and did not find any significant difference (i.e., gender:*F*[1, 765] = 2.66, *p* = .103, age: *F*[1, 765] = 0.72, *p* = .398; organizational tenure: *F*[1, 765] = 2.95, *p* = .086), which suggested that the representativeness of the final sample was not significantly affected by the data removal and participants who did not complete all the surveys.

**Assessments of the Data Quality in Study 2**

To assess and enhance the data quality in the final sample, I examined duplicate IP addresses based on Porter, Outlaw, Gale, and Cho’s (2019) recommendation, and all the IP addresses were unique, which addressed the issue of repeated participation. I also utilized the motivational filter question from Tsai et al. (2019), and all the participants were committed to providing their best responses to each wave of the survey, which suggested the high quality of the data. A meta-analysis report also indicated consistent patterns between the data from online panel platforms and convenience sampling methods (Walter et al., 2016), which corroborated the method of Study 2.
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