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Walk into any office today, and you know that things are not as they were a decade ago. Ask employees about their co-workers, and many will say they are working on projects with colleagues in a different building, a different city, or even a different country. The business landscape has changed, as globalization and technology have reshaped the way we conceptualize team work and conduct business. There are substantial changes in how teams are structured across the globe, and therefore organizations must identify challenges inherent in leading a virtual workforce, and then devise appropriate strategies to meet them.

AIM Strategies® CEO Yael Zofi, explores these challenges and techniques in her new book *A Manager's Guide to Virtual Teams*. In preparation for writing this book, Zofi and AIM colleagues collected and analyzed data from interviews with 150 virtual team (VT) managers, members, CEOs, leaders and clients from diverse industries and countries. Although the book is not scheduled to be released until the Fall/Winter of 2010, this report will preview the trends uncovered in these interviews.

Interview questions identified four key areas common to VTs: communication, trust, conflict and deliverables. While interviews were conducted to determine commonalities around these four areas (which the upcoming book explores in depth), we also found several notable trends, such as (1) the frequency of team ‘check-ins’ as a determinant of success and (2) the need for tight coordination of work schedules across a wide span of time zones (and the repercussions of these efforts). In addition, we found a curious lack of a universally accepted definition for the term ‘virtual team’.

We are pleased to present the findings of our research, which would not have been possible without the participants who graciously consented to be interviewed. Their contributions are greatly appreciated; their thoughtful responses helped us reach several interesting conclusions, which follow. These trends should spark healthy conversations about how today’s global leaders and senior business management teams can develop new strategies to lead virtual teams.

Lastly, we want to personally thank our dedicated VT researchers, Galit Ronen and Emily Linder, who spent many hours reviewing field research data, organizing responses and uncovering trends. Together with AIM’s Office Manager, Jenna Thornton, Senior Research Editor, Susan Meltzer, and Intern Yangyang Xiao, we were able to write this report and provide you with the results in anticipation of Yael Zofi’s upcoming book on virtual teams.

Your thoughts or questions are welcome. Please feel free to contact AIM Strategies®.

Very truly yours,

The AIM Strategies® VT Data Analysis Team

Yael Sara Zofi, Chief Executive Officer
Susan Victor, Senior Research Writing Editor
Galit Ronen, Organizational Development Intern
Emily Linder, Organizational Development Intern
Yangyang Xiao, Organizational Development Intern
Jenna Thornton, Office Manager and Book Campaign Leader
Virtual Teams (VTs) have transformed the workplace. Today, the VT is an increasingly common alternative to the traditional work group. While VTs offer many advantages, the lack of face-to-face interaction creates new challenges. Perhaps the most critical one is the difficulty in maintaining clear communication. Connection is the lifeblood of organizations, and without a ‘human connection’ facilitating communication, VTs cannot achieve optimum performance. In this report we share highlights from our field research data, collected from interviews with 150 VT leaders, and our conclusions, which will be addressed to a greater degree in Yael Zofi’s upcoming book on managing VTs, which explores the four key VT challenges: Communication, Creating Trust and Accountability, Handling Misunderstandings and Getting Deliverables Out the Door, with a special focus on Cross Cultural Communications in a virtual environment.

**KEY FINDINGS SUMMARY**

- **52%** of VT members work beyond the hours associated with a typical work day. Not only do members work outside normal business hours to fulfill their own responsibilities given the many phone calls and/or meetings that occur during the workday, they also participate in conference calls with teammates across the globe during early mornings and late evenings.

- **31%** of VT members participate in multiple meetings throughout the day.

- **65%** prefer face-to-face communication to virtual communication as a way to improve relationships.

- **18%** consider multi-tasking a deterrent to focused communication.

- **33%** believe that conflict was caused by a lack of information sharing.

- **40%** prefer to resolve conflicts via the phone, while **18%** explicitly said to avoid using email.

- **21%** feel that conflict is caused by a lack of shared expectations.

- **45%** see obstacles in understanding different cultures.

- **47%** feel that lack of competence in the English language and the subjectivity of interpretations is an obstacle to working with teammates across the globe.

- **90%** have team-wide meetings at least once a week.

- **47%** feel that new technologies will improve virtual team interaction.

- **70%** see virtual teams as becoming increasingly prevalent in the near future.
Technological advances have made it possible, in fact necessary, for organizations to rethink how best to structure the work environment to meet the many challenges inherent in achieving business success. For over a decade AIM Strategies has researched VTs and led workshops on this subject with various organizations, including Fortune 100 global firms. When CEO Yael Zofi was approached about writing a book about effective VTs, her experiences and research led her to conclude that managers needed to master four key virtual challenges – establishing communications, building trust/accountability in the virtual environment, handling misunderstandings, and getting deliverables out the door to produce results.

The lessons learned from past clients and the stories collected from interviews with VT members and leaders started our journey. It is worth noting that these stories confirmed our experiences and findings from past client work. After completing these interviews, we analyzed the trends summarized in this report. We found some surprising new trends around how VTs communicate and the conflicts and challenges they face.

Hand in hand with the challenges faced by VTs are opportunities to: improve the setup of new teams; create communication norms and add a human connection to strengthen working relationships through sound training and techniques. This report highlights areas in which focused strategies can optimize performance. Below are key statistics that are expanded upon in the section that details five featured trends.

**PURPOSE OF FIELD RESEARCH**

Interviews were conducted to enhance our knowledge of VTs and their challenges in preparation for writing our upcoming book *A Manager’s Guide to Virtual Teams*. Interview stories provided insight into VT’s day-to-day operations, challenges and successes. Although the data was qualitative, we were able to calculate statistics around commonalities. Our data analysis approach is described below.

**DATA GATHERING**

We chose qualitative data because it provides rich information and impactful quotes for the book. Each interview was limited to a maximum of two hours; most lasted approximately forty five minutes to an hour. Nineteen open-ended interview questions were asked in a semi-structured format that allowed for a natural flow of conversation. VT managers answered questions about these topics: communication, conflict, trust, accountability, cross-cultural communications, team set up, lessons learned, and the future of VTs. Clients also shared their experiences, highlighting specific challenges regarding these topics. Due to time constraints, not all nineteen questions were asked in each interview.

**DATA ANALYSIS**

In order to hone in on trends we labeled the 150 interviews with a set of common key words and concepts such as “misunderstanding”, “language”, “workload awareness” and “team norms” in an electronic format. The data was automatically categorized, based on labels and combinations of labels, through a custom computer program developed onsite utilizing Extensible Markup Language (XML). From this information, we were able to calculate statistics about the frequency of a particular issue or concept. (It is important to note that when calculating percentages, we took into account only the interviewees who answered the particular question at hand.)
At the inception of this project we believed that the term ‘virtual team’ had a universal meaning. As the interviews progressed, we realized that a consistent definition of the term ‘virtual team’ did not exist. Interviewees agreed that VTs are important, yet a unanimous understanding of what a VT is did not surface.

Some individuals focused on the elements related to “VIRTUAL” (physical locations, time zones, boundaries), while others focused on “TEAM” structure (number of people, how they operate - temporary projects or ongoing and intact, reporting relationship). Still others focused on a third theme of TECHNOLOGY as an enabler of communication. The challenge is to come up with a definition that captures all three themes.

**Physical Elements**

Although we expected physical distance between members to be mentioned as a pre-requisite for a VT, only 75% specifically included this element (Figure 1). Some definitions noted that members can work in different countries or on different floors of a building. Regardless of location, 13% noted the infrequency of face-to-face meetings as a factor in working virtually.

**Team Elements**

The next dimension was the structure of teams. 13% believed cross-functional elements are sufficient to consider a team virtual, as its members work together in different roles. 8% reported that their team lacked a formal reporting structure; in some cases there were no team leaders, or team leaders were not responsible for directly writing performance reviews. In contrast, 4% specifically mentioned having to report to an assigned leader. Lastly, 8% noted that their team was assembled for a limited time period in order to complete a specific short term project.

**Technology Elements**

Technology as a communication vehicle across these distances emerged as another theme. Although all teams interviewed used some form of technology, it was noted as a core element by a fifth of participants (21% in Figure 1), while the remaining 79% did not highlight their implicit use of technology.

We did find a unifying thread in our interviews. Each individual noted that some physical distance existed between colleagues, regardless whether or not this factor was included in their definition.

**Our Definition**

At AIM Strategies®, we opted for a simple definition of the term virtual team, as follows:

“A virtual team - whether its members work across the street or across the world – is a team whose members simultaneously work together to achieve a common purpose, while physically apart.”

Yael S. Zofi, CEO AIM Strategies®
key trends emerged from our interviews. We found that specific challenges faced by virtual teams include: communication modes, conflict sources and resolution styles, cultural obstacles and strategies for deliverables as outlined below. These trends will be discussed in detail later in this report.

**Trend 1: Communicating When Every Time Zone Is Your Time Zone**

With teammates dispersed throughout the globe, members observed fewer established time boundaries and often worked around the clock (52%). Coordinating across time zones caused communication problems (44%), and excessive multitasking (18%) during conversations caused further obstacles. Strikingly, isolation (13%) was not a significant concern even for those working from a home office.

**Trend 2: Building a Human Connection While Replacing Hallway Chats**

Even in the virtual environment, occasional face-to-face communication was considered vital for certain aspects of team interaction, such as team set-up (24%) and conflict resolution (27%). Some teams highlighted bi-annual or quarterly face-to-face meetings as significantly improving performance - yet other well functioning teams never met at all. On the other hand, building relationships through trust did not require face-to-face communication as trust was reportedly enhanced through regular contact (e.g., phone/email, etc.) with other team members (63%). Despite the need for building a human connection, teams did not uniformly utilize the alternative form of “virtual face-to-face” or visual technologies, which remains an open opportunity for improved virtual techniques.

**Trend 3: Conflict – When Conflict Arises, Virtual Team Members Do Not Hide Behind Their Screen**

The sources of conflicts differ from on-site teams, as the lack of visual cues causes an increase in miscommunication (33%) or inconsistent expectations (21%). VT members used a variety of resolution styles, such as phone calls (40%) and mediation (18%). Language barriers (13%) and written misunderstandings, such as email (8%) were also considered sources of conflict. Although it is easy to hide behind a computer screen and to ignore phone calls and emails when a conflict arises, only 7% of respondents used avoidance techniques.
TREND HIGHLIGHTS

TREND 4: CROSS CULTURAL COMMUNICATION – LOST IN TRANSLATION

Cross cultural elements play a role in the effectiveness of VTs. The most common communication barrier found stemmed from misunderstandings related to the use of English (47%), which included both varying interpretations of the same words in different cultures as well as differences in overall competency levels. Meanwhile, accents did not play a significant role, as only 10% indicated they were a challenge.

TREND 5: SPEED OF VIRTUAL TEAM DELIVERY – SLOW AND STEADY DOES NOT WIN THE RACE

The speed of communication and timelines of deliverables vary significantly as compared to on-site teams. VTs experience shorter deadlines (17%), often on a weekly or even daily basis, as well as more frequent checkpoints between deadlines. 90% of teams held meetings each week, while some met team-wide three or more times per week (8%).
TOP CHALLENGE: COMMUNICATING WHEN EVERY TIME ZONE IS YOUR TIME ZONE

Two themes emerged as we analyzed top challenges faced by VTs: **Globalization** and **Information Sharing**.

**Globalization** challenges included working around the clock (52%) with teammates in various time zones around the globe (Figure 2). With heightened expectations around availability, team members find themselves scheduling phone calls at all hours of the evening or early morning. Not only do they work around the clock, but the added difficulties of meeting face-to-face and differing time-zones led to increased coordination and scheduling efforts. This can create work-life balance challenges and lead to burnout if not managed carefully.

With reference to **Information Sharing**, specific communication concerns (44%) included language barriers, misinterpretation, complexity of technology and keeping colleagues informed. Inefficient communication led to increased overhead (costs) and conflict.

Since teammates could not see each other coming to and from meetings, nor could they observe desks stacked with paperwork as they would in a face-to-face environment, communication became a challenge. In the VT environment, it is necessary to make colleagues aware of one’s availability and workload (31%), the type of cues that may be implicitly or informally understood in an on-site team. Balancing the right amount of information sharing without reaching information overload was tricky, as some members found themselves in constant meetings (31%) or swamped with hundreds of emails a day. Some members reported spending their entire day on the phone, leaving only evening hours for catching up on individual contributions. Relentless obligations also led to multitasking on conference calls (18%) which caused verbal response delays as well as a lack of focused conversation.

A lack of information sharing left 13% of VT members feeling “in the dark” or isolated from the rest of their team. The fact that isolation was the least significant finding contradicts our initial perception that people feel more disconnected from their team in a virtual environment. However, our findings indicate that high performing VTs with open communication experienced less isolation and increased cohesion as they built virtual relationships.

Essentially each of these top challenges can be improved with targeted communication techniques which strike the right balance between information overload and an information void across the global team.

---

**Figure 2. Challenges on a Virtual Team**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Around the Clock</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload Awareness</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant Meetings</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multitasking</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As members worked to build good relationships with teammates in the virtual environment, a common thread was that a minimal amount of face-to-face time went a long way, and its lack strained many areas (Figure 3), specifically relationships (65%), communication (37%), conflict (27%), and team set-up (24%).

A lack of face-to-face interaction affected the team in several ways, most notably by impeding relationship building between team members (65%). Some felt that the lack of opportunity for informal interaction, like hallway chats, made it harder for them to develop close relationships. The formality of email, the dominant mode of communication, left some feeling that they did not know their teammates well.

When possible, just one in-person meeting drastically improved all areas of interaction, more than recovering the cost of travel through the subsequent increase in efficiency and performance. Thus, teams were more cohesive when members knew each other’s individual work styles, personalities and preferences, and therefore were able to reach a common understanding of expectations.

As a result, many teams found it valuable to meet in person at least once or twice a year, to once a quarter, particularly during the forming phase of a new team. Some respondents said that meeting colleagues for the first time helped to resolve pre-existing conflicts, indicating that the human connection, which can be lost in VTs, is a strong bond.

Despite the demonstrated need for some direct human communication, most expressed hesitation in using video technology to replace visual cues, instead relying most heavily on phone communication. The roadblocks that prevented many from using video (time lag, audio quality) can be overcome with newer technologies, though very few teams opted to do so. The teams that did use video technologies enjoyed celebrating various occasions, such as birthdays, with each other. It provided an opportunity to build relationships and improve communication.

Another important aspect of building relationships is trust, which our study shows did not require face-to-face communication (Figure 4). Instead, trust could be fostered through regular contact (63%), establishing commitment (36%) and demonstrating honesty (28%), which VT members accomplished over virtual mediums such as email and phone calls.
When conflict arises, virtual team members do not hide behind the screen. When conflict surfaced, it was easier to avoid on a VT since members could not drop by a colleague's desk; however an overwhelming 93% stipulated that confronting conflict was not only important but key for successful performance (Figure 5). Although rare, we found instances of avoidance (7%), such as teammates who stopped responding to emails and phone calls.

The most common sources of conflict were miscommunication of information (33%) and inconsistent expectations (21%) of quality or team norms. VTs can prevent differences in expectations by investing time during team set-up to clarify team norms, goals and work codes. As shown in Figure 6 below, an additional source of conflict was the varying interpretations of language (13%). Conveying complex messages in written format such as email (8%) increased the amount of conflict in a VT as important subtleties were difficult to portray. Conflict also occurred due to lack of face-to-face communication (6%), lack of trust (4%), lack of cultural understanding (4%) and phone communication (4%).

Unexpectedly, the preferred technique for handling conflict was a phone call (40%), as opposed to video (22%), even in extreme conflicts (Figure 7). Based on our data, we believe that phone conversations were utilized more often for several reasons. First, it was the easiest to use and most readily available without concern for technical obstacles, although we do believe that with the right Team Set-Up a reliable visual medium is an option. Some VT members noted that they did not want to be seen while they are working from home. However, phone use still misses an element of human connection, namely facial expressions. As webcams become more readily available, video conferencing is another tool to handle conflict, adding the human connection to the VT.

While using the phone was the most common technique, 18% of respondents highlighted that email should not be used to defuse conflict, as opposed to 2% who advocated email use. (Interestingly, this 2% were born and work outside of the U.S.) When English is not the first language, written communication may provide a greater comfort factor as it allows for more time to construct the message. Lastly, 18% of respondents (mostly VT leaders and managers) suggest the use of mediation as a tool for resolving conflicts. Consistent with Trend 2, there was a demonstrated need for face-to-face (22%) or an alternative visual medium when handling conflict virtually.
The mix of cultures in international collaboration can cause various obstacles for VT members if they lack the tools to manage it (Figure 8). The most common difficulty pertains to differences in the understanding of the English language (47%). This includes different levels of competency as well as different interpretations. For example, words such as “yes” or “done” often have different meanings, depending on the culture. Surprisingly, we found that content is more important than verbal styles, as only 10% of members have concerns with understanding accents.

Another big challenge stems from cultural differences (45%), which included diversity of conversation and relationship building styles. Some teammates may seek to build relationships early on, such as certain Asian countries (Korea for one), while others are more task-focused, including countries like the US.

Understanding and being aware of cultural differences can alleviate conflict and improve relationships.

An additional challenge facing virtual members who collaborate across the globe is being mindful of teammates’ time zones (40%). Showing respect when scheduling meetings is important, but can be difficult when colleagues’ business hours do not overlap. In these situations it is likely that team members will be on call late at night or early in the morning. Many teams alternate meeting times in order to distribute the strain of working outside regular office hours.

Once team members began learning about their colleagues’ cultures and became comfortable communicating across time zones, they reported improved performance.


Feedback loops were reported to be faster on a VT than on a co-located team, both with members and senior managers. Agile VTs can identify early on whether a project scope is too complicated or if the team is not performing at an acceptable level; this enables managers to reform the team within a reasonable time frame.

Adjusting to the speed of VTs can make the difference in reaching high performance - team members should be ready for “hyper-communication”, as one respondent called this trend.

The speed of communication and deliverables timelines on VTs differed from on-site teams. Many VT members reported spending a great deal of their day on the phone. Along with the fast pace, respondents also reported receiving an overwhelming number of emails, sometimes requiring an email management system. 90% of respondents met team-wide once per week, 8% met three or more times per week, while 2% met less than once per week (Figure 9).

More importantly, 17% of respondents found that setting short-term deliverables and frequent status updates were key to their virtual team’s success. Without this strategy several respondents reported wasting months producing the wrong deliverable or allowing underperforming members to continue in their current jobs. Many members discussed having to perform additional verification steps and share work samples earlier on in a VT to confirm that members are on the same page regarding expectations and quality objectives. Members, for example, had to triple check their assumptions. In an environment where performance management is a challenge, shorter timelines and frequent check-ins were essential. Frequent deliverables also helped to keep team members informed; they were able to see their virtual teammates’ results and keep accountability high.
RECOMMENDATIONS

**TOP CHALLENGES: Communicating across time zones**

- Avoid burnout by alternating early morning and late night calls across team members.
- Be respectful of teammates’ time zones during scheduling.
- Communicate workload and availability to establish a common “context” of your work environment.
- Avoid multi-tasking on conference calls.
- Find a balance between information overload and leaving members “in the dark” and isolated.

**Building Relationships and Trust**

- Meet face-to-face at least once per year and the cost of travel will be recovered.
- Utilize “virtual face-to-face” or visual technologies to add visual cues, such as facial expressions.
- Provide an informal opportunity to chat and network to replace the hallway chat.
- Be authentic and consistent in your dealings with people.

**Conflict**

- When a conflict arises, pick up the phone - do not use email to resolve it.
- Clarify team goals, norms and quality expectations, especially during the forming phase to avoid conflict later.
- Meeting face-to-face at least once can quickly resolve or prevent conflict.
- Take a step back and try to understand the other person’s responsibilities and pressures.

**Cross Cultural Communication**

- Clarify early on the meaning of certain words such as “done” and “yes” to avoid conflict later.
- Learn about your teammates cultures, including work styles and relationship building approaches.
- Ask for frequent feedback to ensure you are ‘on the same page’.
- Make every effort to respect differences.

**Deliverables**

- Plan for weekly deliverables and even more frequent check-ins regarding status and expectations.
- Meet team-wide at least once per week.
- Provide quicker feedback loops with senior management as well as direct reports.
- Break down deliverables into smaller, more manageable segments (sub-projects).
The following demographics represent our sample. Recall that respondents were interviewed via field research. Most interviews took place via the telephone (95%). A handful of interviews took place through videoconferencing or face-to-face discussions. Two were done through e-mail due to language and time difference constraints. Below, we list the breakdown of our demographic data.

### Origin Country - By Region
- North America - 65%
- Asia - 13%
- Europe - 12%
- Middle East - 7%
- South America - 2%
- Other - 1%

### Current Country of Operation
- USA - 72%
- India - 7%
- Israel - 5%
- Finland - 4%
- UK - 3%
- Ireland - 2.5%
- Japan - 2%
- Canada - 2%
- Other - 2%

### Gender
- Male - 65%
- Female - 35%

### Industries
- Health Care/Pharma - 40%
- Technology - 23%
- Manufacturing - 13%
- Consulting - 9%
- Financial Services - 7%
- Retail/Consumer Products - 3%
- Other - 5%

### VT Role
- Member - 37%
- Leader - 37%
- Senior Leadership - 13%
- Executive/CEO - 8%
- Consultant - 5%
Looking toward the future, the global economy is fundamentally transforming the way business is conducted (Figure 10). According to 70% of respondents, VTs will increase in prevalence and will be considered the norm in conducting business. This trend will occur partly due to increased cost effectiveness and the pressure of globalization. As this shift occurs, new technologies will improve the performance of VTs (47%). In addition, new techniques will be developed to overcome the unique challenges encountered (11%), as more business leaders become exposed to this type of environment.

Increased flexibility for employees was highlighted by 9% of those interviewed, making VTs an attractive work option. In our research, we found that 4% of respondents believe that workers in countries such as India, Russia, and China will contribute a greater share of the global workforce. Only 2% of our interviewees believe that the quality of work will decrease in the virtual environment. This low statistic is reassuring as the above graph shows that this trend will increase rather than stabilize or disappear.

Our respondents agree that VTs are here to stay, pointing to the need for a greater understanding of this work arrangement and the development of new strategies to optimize business results. As our report shows, there are key areas that require close attention, such as communication, conflict, trust & accountability and getting deliverables out the door. We hope that the insights provided by those who have experienced life on a VT first hand will guide your own exciting journey in the virtual world.

**PLEASE NOTE:**

Our upcoming book, *A Manager's Guide to Virtual Teams*, will provide practical tips and techniques, based on our research and ongoing work with clients, to guide virtual leaders in handling the unique challenges faced by virtual teams.
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