

Virtual Team Dynamics: How Distance Affects Employee Trust and Engagement

Mrs. A.Amala

Assistant Professor, Department of MBA
CARE College of Engineering, Trichirappalli, Tamil Nadu, India
amala.21.mgt@gmail.com

Dr. Chakkaravarthy Kumaresan R

Assistant Professor, Department of MBA
CARE College of Engineering, Trichirappalli, Tamil Nadu, India
professorchakkaravarthy@gmail.com

Abstract

The proliferation of geographically dispersed work arrangements has transformed the nature of collaboration, communication, and leadership within contemporary organizations. While virtual teams offer clear advantages in flexibility, talent access, and operational cost, they also introduce distinctive relational challenges that are not fully explained by traditional models of team functioning. This manuscript develops a conceptual framework examining how multiple dimensions of distance—geographic, temporal, cultural, and configurational—influence employee trust, and how trust in turn shapes employee engagement in virtual work settings. Drawing on trust theory, social exchange theory, media richness theory, and the job demands-resources model, the paper proposes that distance exerts both direct and indirect effects on trust formation, and that this relationship is moderated by communication technology richness, leadership behavior, cultural intelligence, and team tenure. Nine testable propositions are advanced to guide future empirical inquiry. The manuscript concludes with theoretical and practical implications for organizations seeking to sustain trust and engagement in distributed workforces, along with a discussion of limitations and directions for future research.

Keywords: *virtual teams, distance, trust, employee engagement, remote work, communication technology, leadership, cultural intelligence*

1. Introduction

Organizations across nearly every industry have accelerated their adoption of virtual and hybrid team structures over the past decade, a shift that has only intensified since large-scale remote work became normalized. Virtual teams, commonly defined as groups of individuals who collaborate across geographic, temporal, or organizational boundaries primarily through electronic communication technologies, now represent a dominant mode of organizing knowledge work. This shift has been driven by a combination of globalization, advances in collaborative technology, cost pressures, and changing employee expectations regarding flexibility and work-life integration.

Despite the operational benefits associated with virtual work—including access to global talent pools, reduced overhead, and continuous around-the-clock productivity—researchers and practitioners alike have raised concerns about the relational costs of distance. Chief among these concerns is the erosion of interpersonal trust and the corresponding decline in employee engagement, both of which are widely recognized as critical antecedents of team performance, retention, and organizational commitment. Unlike co-located teams, virtual teams often lack the informal, spontaneous interactions that build familiarity and psychological safety over time. The absence of nonverbal cues, reduced spontaneity of communication, and asynchronous work patterns can create ambiguity that undermines the interpersonal foundations upon which trust is built.

At the same time, the relationship between distance and trust is not straightforward. Some empirical and theoretical work suggests that well-designed virtual teams can achieve levels of trust and engagement comparable to, or even exceeding, those of co-located teams, provided that certain structural and leadership conditions are met. This apparent contradiction suggests that distance itself is not a singular, monolithic construct, but rather a multidimensional phenomenon whose effects on trust and engagement depend on the specific type of distance involved and the presence of moderating organizational conditions.

This manuscript addresses this gap by proposing an integrated conceptual framework that disaggregates distance into its constituent dimensions, examines the mechanisms through which each dimension influences trust, and traces the downstream consequences for employee engagement. In doing so, the paper contributes to the literature in three ways. First, it synthesizes fragmented streams of research on virtual teams, trust, and engagement into a unified conceptual model. Second, it identifies key boundary conditions—communication technology richness, leadership behavior, cultural intelligence, and team tenure—that shape the strength and direction of the distance-trust-engagement relationship. Third, it advances a set of testable propositions intended to guide future empirical research and inform managerial practice in distributed work environments.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Virtual Teams and the Multidimensional Nature of Distance

Early conceptualizations of virtual teams tended to treat distance as a binary condition—teams were either co-located or dispersed. More recent scholarship has argued for a more nuanced, multidimensional understanding of distance that captures the varied ways in which separation manifests in distributed work. At least four distinct dimensions are commonly identified in the literature: geographic distance, temporal distance, cultural distance, and configurational distance.

Geographic distance refers to the physical separation between team members and is often associated with reduced opportunities for face-to-face interaction. Temporal distance captures the degree to which team members operate across different time zones, which constrains the availability of synchronous communication and can slow the pace of collaborative decision-making. Cultural distance reflects differences in national, organizational, or professional culture among team members, which can produce divergent communication norms, expectations regarding hierarchy, and interpretations of trustworthy behavior. Configurational distance describes the structural arrangement of a team, including the proportion of members who are co-located versus dispersed, and the degree to which subgroups or "faultlines" exist within the team.

Each of these dimensions carries distinct implications for interpersonal dynamics. For example, temporal distance may primarily affect the frequency and immediacy of communication, whereas cultural distance may affect the interpretation and meaning attributed to communication that does occur. Treating distance as a unidimensional construct therefore risks obscuring important differences in how virtual teams experience and respond to separation.

2.2 Trust in Organizational and Virtual Contexts

Trust has long been recognized as a foundational element of effective collaboration. Classic organizational trust theory conceptualizes trust as a willingness to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on expectations regarding that party's ability, benevolence, and integrity. This tripartite conceptualization remains influential and provides a useful lens for examining how trust forms and erodes in virtual settings.

In virtual teams, trust formation is complicated by the reduced availability of the informational cues that typically inform trust judgments. Ability, benevolence, and integrity are traditionally inferred through repeated

observation of behavior over time, often supplemented by informal social interaction. Because virtual team members interact primarily through mediated channels, and often meet infrequently or never in person, the informational basis for trust judgments is inherently thinner. Some scholars have proposed the concept of "swift trust," describing a form of trust that virtual team members extend to one another at the outset of a collaboration based on role expectations and institutional cues rather than accumulated personal experience. Swift trust is thought to be fragile, however, and requires reinforcement through consistent, reliable behavior over time if it is to mature into more durable, knowledge-based trust.

A related distinction in the literature separates cognitive trust, which is based on rational assessment of another's competence and reliability, from affective trust, which is grounded in emotional bonds and genuine care for one another's wellbeing. Virtual communication channels, particularly text-based and asynchronous ones, tend to support the development of cognitive trust more readily than affective trust, since the latter typically depends on the richer emotional cues available in face-to-face interaction. This distinction is important for understanding why virtual teams may achieve adequate levels of task-based cooperation while still struggling to develop the deeper relational bonds associated with sustained engagement.

2.3 Employee Engagement: Conceptual Foundations

Employee engagement is commonly defined as the degree to which individuals invest their physical, cognitive, and emotional energies into their work roles. Foundational engagement theory frames engagement as contingent upon the availability of psychological meaningfulness, psychological safety, and psychological availability—conditions under which employees feel that their work is worthwhile, that they can express themselves without fear of negative consequences, and that they possess the personal resources necessary to engage fully.

The job demands-resources model offers a complementary perspective, proposing that engagement is sustained when job resources—such as social support, autonomy, and feedback—are sufficient to offset job demands. Within this framework, interpersonal trust functions as a critical relational resource. Trust reduces the cognitive burden associated with monitoring and verifying others' intentions, freeing psychological resources that can instead be directed toward substantive engagement with work tasks and team goals. Conversely, low trust environments impose a form of relational demand, as employees must expend additional effort managing uncertainty, protecting themselves from potential opportunism, and seeking reassurance regarding others' intentions.

In virtual contexts, engagement is further shaped by the degree to which employees feel visible, valued, and connected to their organization despite physical separation. Reduced visibility can create engagement risks such as feelings of professional isolation, diminished sense of belonging, and uncertainty regarding recognition and advancement opportunities—all of which may be mitigated or exacerbated by the quality of trust within the team.

3. Conceptual Framework Development

Building on the literature reviewed above, this section develops an integrated conceptual framework linking distance, trust, and engagement. The framework is organized around three core relationships: the direct effect of distance dimensions on trust, the effect of trust on engagement, and a set of moderating mechanisms that shape the strength of these relationships.

3.1 The Distance-Trust Relationship

Geographic distance is proposed to reduce trust primarily by limiting opportunities for informal, spontaneous interaction—the kind of unplanned hallway conversation or shared meal through which relational familiarity is built. Without these opportunities, team members must rely more heavily on scheduled, task-focused communication, which tends to convey information relevant to cognitive trust but offers fewer openings for the relational disclosure that supports affective trust.

Temporal distance is proposed to affect trust through a distinct mechanism: the erosion of responsiveness. When team members operate across significantly different time zones, requests and messages often go unanswered for extended periods, which can be misinterpreted as disengagement, indifference, or unreliability, even when delays are simply a function of time-zone misalignment. Over time, repeated experiences of delayed responsiveness may erode confidence in a colleague's reliability, a core component of cognitive trust.

Cultural distance is proposed to influence trust by introducing divergent norms regarding what constitutes trustworthy behavior. Members from different cultural backgrounds may hold different expectations regarding communication directness, deference to hierarchy, and appropriate displays of commitment, such that behavior intended as trustworthy in one cultural frame may be misread as evasive or disrespectful in another. This dynamic can generate misattribution errors that undermine trust even in the absence of any actual violation of trust.

Configurational distance is proposed to affect trust through subgroup dynamics. Teams with uneven distributions of co-located and dispersed members are prone to the formation of informational and relational faultlines, wherein co-located subgroups develop denser trust networks among themselves while dispersed members remain relatively peripheral. This can produce within-team trust asymmetries that undermine overall team cohesion even when aggregate trust levels appear adequate.

3.2 The Trust-Engagement Relationship

Trust is proposed to influence engagement through both a psychological safety pathway and a resource-conservation pathway. Through the psychological safety pathway, higher trust enables employees to express ideas, voice concerns, and take interpersonal risks without fear of embarrassment or retribution, thereby increasing the meaningfulness and psychological availability dimensions of engagement. Through the resource-conservation pathway, higher trust reduces the cognitive and emotional resources that must otherwise be allocated to monitoring, verifying, and managing uncertainty about colleagues' intentions, freeing those resources for investment in substantive work engagement.

Because trust in virtual settings is often initially cognitive rather than affective, the framework further proposes that the trust-engagement relationship is strongest when cognitive trust is allowed to mature into affective trust over time. Teams that remain at the level of cognitive, task-based trust may sustain adequate short-term performance but are more vulnerable to engagement decline over longer project durations, as the absence of affective bonds limits the emotional investment employees bring to their work.

3.3 Moderating and Mediating Mechanisms

The framework identifies four boundary conditions that shape the strength and direction of the distance-trust-engagement relationship.

3.3.1 Communication Technology Richness

Media richness theory suggests that communication channels vary in their capacity to convey multiple cues, provide immediate feedback, and support natural language and personalization. Channels higher in richness, such as video conferencing, are theorized to buffer the negative effects of geographic and temporal distance on trust by partially restoring access to nonverbal cues and enabling more personalized exchange. Conversely, overreliance on lean, text-based channels for relationally sensitive communication may amplify the trust-eroding effects of distance, even when such channels are efficient for routine coordination tasks. The framework therefore proposes that the appropriate matching of communication richness to task and relational demands functions as a critical moderator of the distance-trust relationship.

3.3.2 Leadership Behavior

Leadership behavior is proposed to play a central moderating role, particularly through practices associated with relational and transformational leadership styles. Leaders who proactively structure regular check-ins, model vulnerability and transparency, distribute recognition equitably across co-located and dispersed members, and create deliberate opportunities for informal interaction are theorized to substantially attenuate the negative effects of distance on trust. In the absence of such deliberate leadership practices, the natural tendency of distance to erode trust is expected to proceed largely unchecked.

3.3.3 Cultural Intelligence

Cultural intelligence, defined as an individual's capability to function effectively in culturally diverse settings, is proposed to moderate the relationship between cultural distance and trust. Team members with higher cultural intelligence are better equipped to correctly interpret behavior that might otherwise be misread through an ethnocentric lens, reducing the likelihood of misattribution errors and enabling more accurate, and therefore more stable, trust judgments. Organizations that invest in cultural intelligence development among virtual team members are therefore expected to experience a weaker negative relationship between cultural distance and trust.

3.3.4 Team Tenure and Shared History

Finally, team tenure—the length of time a team has worked together—is proposed to moderate the distance-trust relationship by providing an accumulating base of shared experience that gradually substitutes for the informal interaction opportunities foreclosed by distance. As teams accumulate shared history, trust becomes increasingly grounded in demonstrated reliability rather than initial swift-trust cues, rendering it more resilient to the ongoing effects of geographic, temporal, and cultural separation. Newly formed virtual teams, lacking this accumulated history, are therefore proposed to be particularly vulnerable to distance-related trust erosion.

3.4 Integrated Conceptual Model

Taken together, the framework proposes that the four dimensions of distance exert direct negative effects on trust, that trust in turn exerts a positive effect on employee engagement, and that this overall relationship is moderated by communication technology richness, leadership behavior, cultural intelligence, and team tenure. The model further distinguishes between cognitive and affective trust as sequential stages in trust development, with implications for the durability of engagement outcomes over time. This integrated model is summarized visually in Figure 1 and provides the conceptual basis for the propositions advanced in the following section.

4. Propositions

Based on the conceptual framework developed above, a series of propositions can be advanced to guide future empirical investigation. Taken together, they translate the framework's core relationships—the distinct effects of distance dimensions on trust, the trust-engagement link, and the moderating role of technology, leadership, culture, and tenure—into a coherent set of claims that empirical researchers can test individually or in combination.

With respect to the direct effects of distance on trust, the framework suggests that geographic distance is negatively associated with affective trust among virtual team members, though it is likely to show a weaker association with cognitive trust, since cognitive trust judgments can still be supported through mediated, task-focused interaction even in the absence of physical proximity. Temporal distance, by contrast, is expected to be negatively associated primarily with cognitive trust, and this relationship is likely mediated by the perceived responsiveness of team members, as delayed replies across time zones can be misread as unreliability rather than a simple artifact of scheduling. Cultural distance is similarly expected to be negatively associated with trust formation overall, with this effect mediated by the frequency of behavioral misattribution errors, in which actions that are intended as trustworthy are misinterpreted through a differing cultural lens. Finally, configurational distance is expected to be negatively associated with team-level trust cohesion, such that teams with uneven ratios of co-located to dispersed members exhibit greater within-team trust asymmetry than either fully co-located or fully dispersed teams, reflecting the tendency of unevenly configured teams to fracture into more and less trusted subgroups.

Turning to the consequences of trust for engagement, the framework proposes that trust is positively associated with employee engagement, and that this relationship is stronger for affective trust than for cognitive trust, consistent with the idea that sustained emotional investment in work depends on relational bonds that go beyond task-based reliability.

The framework also proposes several moderating relationships that shape the strength of these direct effects. Communication technology richness is expected to moderate the relationship between geographic and temporal distance and trust, such that the negative effects of distance on trust are weaker when richer communication channels are deliberately used for relationally significant interactions rather than reserved solely for routine coordination. Leadership behavior is expected to play a similarly important moderating role: leadership characterized by structured relational practices—such as regular check-ins, transparent communication, and equitable recognition—is proposed to attenuate the negative effects of distance on trust relative to leadership that lacks these deliberate practices. Cultural intelligence is expected to moderate the relationship between cultural distance and trust specifically, such that team members with higher cultural intelligence experience a weaker negative effect of cultural distance on trust, owing to their greater capacity to interpret cross-cultural behavior accurately. Finally, team tenure is expected to moderate the overall distance-trust-engagement relationship, such that the negative effects of distance on both trust and engagement diminish as a team accumulates shared history, since accumulated experience gradually substitutes for the informal interaction opportunities that distance forecloses.

4.1 Further Scope for Research

Beyond direct empirical tests of the propositions above, several additional avenues merit sustained scholarly attention. One avenue concerns the temporal dynamics of trust development itself: longitudinal designs that track teams from formation through maturity would help clarify not only whether cognitive trust matures into affective trust over time, as the framework suggests, but also how quickly this transition occurs, whether it

follows a linear or threshold-based trajectory, and whether certain distance configurations foreclose the transition altogether rather than merely slowing it.

A second avenue concerns cross-level and multi-team dynamics. The propositions advanced here are pitched primarily at the individual and team level, yet many organizations operate networks of interdependent virtual teams. Future research could examine whether the trust and engagement dynamics identified within a single team aggregate, amplify, or attenuate across a broader organizational network, and whether inter-team trust operates through similar or distinct mechanisms relative to intra-team trust.

A third avenue involves the role of emerging collaborative technologies, including asynchronous video messaging, shared virtual workspaces, and artificial intelligence-mediated communication tools. As these technologies continue to evolve, their capacity to convey the relational cues associated with affective trust—historically the domain of face-to-face interaction—remains an open empirical question with direct implications for the communication richness moderator proposed in this framework.

A fourth avenue concerns boundary conditions related to task type and interdependence. The strength of the proposed relationships may vary considerably between teams engaged in highly interdependent, creative work and those engaged in more modular, independently executed tasks, suggesting that task characteristics may function as an additional moderator worth incorporating into future refinements of the model.

Finally, there is considerable scope for research examining reciprocal and dynamic feedback loops rather than the largely unidirectional relationships proposed here. It is plausible that low engagement itself feeds back to further erode trust, creating a reinforcing cycle of disengagement that compounds over time, or conversely that early engagement gains help teams weather subsequent increases in distance-related strain. Empirical designs capable of capturing such reciprocal dynamics, including cross-lagged panel models and agent-based simulations, would meaningfully extend the largely cross-sectional and unidirectional assumptions embedded in the current framework.

5. Discussion

The conceptual framework advanced in this manuscript reframes the relationship between distance and virtual team outcomes as contingent rather than deterministic. Rather than treating distance as an inevitable barrier to trust and engagement, the framework positions distance as a set of distinct challenges that organizations can substantially mitigate through deliberate design choices regarding communication technology, leadership practice, cultural capability building, and team continuity.

This reframing carries important implications for how the mixed findings in prior empirical literature might be reconciled. Studies reporting that virtual teams can achieve trust and engagement levels comparable to co-located teams may reflect contexts in which the moderating conditions identified here—rich communication channels, strong relational leadership, high cultural intelligence, and established team tenure—were present. Conversely, studies reporting substantial trust and engagement deficits in virtual teams may reflect contexts in which these moderating conditions were largely absent. Future empirical work that explicitly measures these boundary conditions may therefore help resolve apparent inconsistencies in the existing literature.

The distinction between cognitive and affective trust, and the proposition that virtual settings differentially support the former over the latter, also offers a potential explanation for why some virtual teams sustain adequate task performance while nonetheless reporting lower levels of engagement and belonging. Organizations focused narrowly on task-based coordination metrics may overlook the slower-developing relational dimension of trust that is more strongly linked to sustained engagement.

6. Theoretical Implications

This manuscript contributes to theory in several ways. First, by disaggregating distance into geographic, temporal, cultural, and configurational dimensions, the framework offers a more precise vocabulary for future research than the often-undifferentiated treatment of "virtuality" found in earlier literature. Second, by explicitly integrating trust theory, media richness theory, cultural intelligence theory, and the job demands-resources model, the framework bridges literatures that have largely developed in parallel rather than in conversation with one another. Third, the distinction between cognitive and affective trust as sequential, differentially-supported stages of trust development in virtual settings offers a more dynamic, temporally-sensitive account of trust than static models typically provide.

7. Practical Implications

For practitioners, the framework suggests several actionable priorities. Organizations should avoid a one-size-fits-all approach to virtual team support, and instead assess which specific dimensions of distance are most salient within a given team—whether geographic, temporal, cultural, or configurational—in order to target interventions appropriately. For teams facing significant temporal distance, investment in asynchronous communication norms and realistic responsiveness expectations may be more valuable than investment in synchronous meeting technology. For teams facing significant cultural distance, structured cultural intelligence training may yield greater returns than generic team-building exercises.

Leaders of virtual teams should also recognize that trust-building in distributed settings requires deliberate structuring rather than reliance on organic, informal processes that may naturally occur in co-located settings. Regularly scheduled one-on-one check-ins, explicit norms around communication responsiveness, equitable distribution of visibility and recognition across co-located and dispersed members, and intentional creation of informal social interaction opportunities represent concrete practices consistent with the framework's proposed moderating role of leadership behavior.

Finally, organizations should recognize that newly formed virtual teams are particularly vulnerable to the trust-eroding effects of distance, and may benefit from front-loaded investment in relationship-building activities during early team formation, when swift trust is most fragile and has not yet had the opportunity to mature into more durable, knowledge-based trust.

8. Limitations and Future Research Directions

As a conceptual manuscript, this paper's primary limitation is the absence of empirical testing of the proposed relationships. While the propositions advanced here are grounded in established theory and prior empirical findings from related literatures, they have not been tested as an integrated model, and future research employing longitudinal survey designs, social network analysis, or experimental manipulation of communication richness would be valuable in validating or refining the framework.

A second limitation concerns the framework's treatment of distance dimensions as conceptually distinct, when in practice they are often correlated and may interact in ways not fully captured here. For instance, geographic distance and temporal distance frequently co-occur, and cultural distance often overlaps with both. Future research should examine potential interaction effects among distance dimensions rather than treating them purely as additive, independent predictors.

Third, the framework does not fully address individual difference variables, such as employees' general propensity to trust or their personal preference for autonomous versus collaborative work, which may

condition how strongly distance affects trust and engagement for any given individual. Incorporating such individual difference variables represents a promising direction for future theoretical refinement.

Finally, this manuscript focuses primarily on trust and engagement as outcomes, but future work might productively extend the framework to additional outcomes such as innovation, knowledge sharing, and turnover intentions, which are likely to be similarly shaped by the distance dimensions and moderating mechanisms identified here.

9. Conclusion

As organizations continue to embrace distributed work arrangements, understanding the mechanisms through which distance shapes trust and engagement becomes increasingly important for both theory and practice. This manuscript has argued that distance is best understood as a multidimensional construct whose effects on trust and engagement are contingent upon communication technology choices, leadership behavior, cultural intelligence, and team tenure, rather than as an inevitable barrier to relational quality in virtual work. By disaggregating distance into its constituent dimensions and specifying the mechanisms and boundary conditions linking distance, trust, and engagement, the conceptual framework developed here offers both a research agenda for scholars and a set of practical priorities for organizations seeking to sustain trust and engagement in an increasingly distributed world of work.

References

- Bell, B. S., & Kozlowski, S. W. J. (2002). A typology of virtual teams: Implications for effective leadership. *Group & Organization Management*, 27(1), 14–49.
- Earley, P. C., & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures*. Stanford University Press.
- Gibson, C. B., & Gibbs, J. L. (2006). Unpacking the concept of virtuality: The effects of geographic dispersion, electronic dependence, dynamic structure, and national diversity on team innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51(3), 451–495.
- Gibson, C. B., & Manuel, J. A. (2003). Building trust: Effective multicultural communication processes in virtual teams. In C. B. Gibson & S. G. Cohen (Eds.), *Virtual teams that work: Creating conditions for virtual team effectiveness* (pp. 59–86). Jossey-Bass.
- Golden, T. D., & Raghuram, S. (2010). Teleworker knowledge sharing and the role of altered relational and technological interactions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31(8), 1061–1085.
- Hertel, G., Geister, S., & Konradt, U. (2005). Managing virtual teams: A review of current empirical research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 15(1), 69–95.
- Jarvenpaa, S. L., & Leidner, D. E. (1999). Communication and trust in global virtual teams. *Organization Science*, 10(6), 791–815.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692–724.
- Kirkman, B. L., Rosen, B., Tesluk, P. E., & Gibson, C. B. (2004). The impact of team empowerment on virtual team performance: The moderating role of face-to-face interaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(2), 175–192.

- Maynard, M. T., Mathieu, J. E., Rapp, T. L., & Gilson, L. L. (2012). Something(s) old and something(s) new: Modeling drivers of global virtual team effectiveness. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33(3), 342–365.
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709–734.
- McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1), 24–59.
- Meyerson, D., Weick, K. E., & Kramer, R. M. (1996). Swift trust and temporary groups. In R. M. Kramer & T. R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (pp. 166–195). Sage Publications.
- O'Leary, M. B., & Cummings, J. N. (2007). The spatial, temporal, and configurational characteristics of geographic dispersion in teams. *MIS Quarterly*, 31(3), 433–452.
- Polzer, J. T., Crisp, C. B., Jarvenpaa, S. L., & Kim, J. W. (2006). Extending the faultline model to geographically dispersed teams: How colocated subgroups can impair group functioning. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(4), 679–692.
- Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3), 617–635.
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600–619.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293–315.
- Wilson, J. M., Straus, S. G., & McEvily, B. (2006). All in due time: The development of trust in computer-mediated and face-to-face teams. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 99(1), 16–33.