Erratum

Correction to Klostermann, Ontrup, Thomaschewski, and Kluge (2021)

Something Old or Something New?

With regard to the article “Marina Klostermann, Greta Ontrup, Lisa Thomaschewski, and Annette Kluge, Something Old or Something New? An Empirical Study on the Instant Adjustment to Virtual Teamwork During COVID-19” in Issue 4/2021 of the German Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, <https://doi.org/10.1026/0932-4089/a000368> the authors have notified the journal that a transformation error occurred for the scale “performance”. In the tables on following pages, the corrected values are reported (in **bold**).

The inferential conclusions do not change. The authors deeply regret the error.

Reference

M. Klostermann, G. Ontrup, L. Thomaschewski, & A. Kluge (2021). Something old or something new? An empirical study on the instant adjustment to virtual teamwork during COVID-19. *Zeitschrift für Arbeits- und Organisationspsychologie*, 65(4), 215–230. <https://doi.org/10.1026/0932-4089/a000368>

Published online November 8, 2021

<https://doi.org/10.1026/0932-4089/a000383>

Table 1. Control variables, predictors (T1) and outcomes (T2) (Note for clarity: The only change in this table concerns the second decimal of Cronbach's Alpha for the scale "Performance")

	Example item	No. items	Range	Cronbach's α	Author
Individual-related control variables (T1)					
Acceptance with WFH ¹	Working from the home office has more disadvantages than advantages.	4	5-point Likert-scale 1 = do not agree, 5 = agree	.72	Self-developed
Experience with WFH	How often did you work from home before the current situation?	1	never (1), sometimes/ on special occasions (e.g. delivery, craftsmen) (2), regularly (3), always (4)		Self-developed
Collective orientation	I find the work on team projects very satisfying.	16	5-point Likert-scale 1 = do not agree, 5 = agree	.86	Hagemann (2017)
Team-related (T1)					
Team cohesion (subscale of the F-A-T)	We feel like a team.	8	6-point Likert-scale 1 = do not agree, 6 = agree	.87	Kauffeld & Frieling (2001)
Team trust	In our team we trust each other very much.	7	7-point Likert-scale 1 = not true at all, 7 = entirely true	.92	Eisenbeiß (2008) originally reported by Langfred (2004)
Processes (T1)					
Communication ² (subscale Teamwork Quality Scale)	There is frequent communication in our team.	10	5-point Likert-scale 1 = do not agree, 5 = agree	.80	Hoegl & Gemuenden (2001)
Coordination ² (subscale Teamwork Quality Scale)	There are clear and understandable goals for subtasks within the teamwork process.	4	5-point Likert-scale 1 = do not agree, 5 = agree	.70	Hoegl & Gemuenden (2001)
Cooperative conflict management (items of subscales collaboration and compromise)	When my team experiences conflict... ..I give in to the wishes of my team colleagues.	5	5-point Likert-scale 1 = almost never, 5 = almost ever	.78	Montoya-Weiss et al. (2001)
Technology (T1)					
Team-technology-fit ³	The technology available to our team meets the requirements of the team well.	6 + 2	5-point Likert-scale 1 = do not agree, 5 = agree	.90	Self-developed + Staples & Seddon (2004)
Task-technology-fit ²	The technology enables us to process our team tasks faster.	8	5-point Likert-scale 1 = do not agree, 5 = agree	.94	Staples & Seddon (2004)
Outcomes (T2)					
Performance	How much did your team succeed in adhering to the schedule?	6	5-point scale 1 = very low, 5 = very high	.82	Robey et al. (1993) (shortened and adapted to context)
Satisfaction	How satisfied are you with the team's solution processes?	4	5-point Likert-scale 1 = not satisfied, 5 = very satisfied	.83	Melchior (2008)

Note. ¹item "My job is not suitable for working from home." was removed as it rather assessed practicability than acceptance, which increased internal consistency from $\alpha = 0.69$ to 0.72 . ²items were translated to German by the authors and scale was shortened from 10 to 8 items based on study context. ³2 items from Staples and Seddon (2004) were additionally integrated and translated to German by the authors.

Table 2. Correlation matrix and descriptive statistics

	Scale	M (SD)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Outcome	1-5	3.93 (0.60)	1											
Individual	1-5	4.15 (0.64)	.67**	1										
	1-5	3.69 (0.85)	.05	.17	1									
	1-4	2.03 (0.74)	.22*	.34**	.22*	1								
Team	1-5	3.29 (0.51)	.13	.34**	.00	.39**	1							
	1-6	4.89 (0.79)	.21*	.40**	.08	.17	.24*	1						
	1-7	5.85 (0.94)	.34**	.45**	.01	.22*	.32**	.85**	1					
Process	1-5	3.85 (0.60)	.36**	.32**	.04	.11	.19*	.40**	.44**	1				
	1-5	3.90 (0.52)	.37**	.42**	.09	.11	.28**	.60**	.65**	.59**	1			
Technology	1-5	4.30 (0.52)	.20*	.34**	-.02	.11	.31**	.40**	.33**	.25**	.28**	1		
	1-5	3.91 (0.69)	.34**	.43**	.31**	.40**	.20*	.17	.18	.28**	.23*	.13	1	
	1-5	3.50 (0.88)	.38**	.44**	.31**	.23*	.11	.29**	.23*	.34**	.26**	.09	.63**	1

Notes. WFH = Working from home; CO = Collective Orientation; CCM = Cooperative Conflict Management; * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$.

Table 3. Regression coefficients of individual and team factors on outcomes

	Effects on performance				
	<i>B</i>	β	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i> -value	<i>RW</i>
Intercept	2.67	0	0.50	5.29**	
Acceptance WFH	0.06	0.09	0.06	0.96	2.91
Experience WFH	0.08	0.10	0.08	1.03	10.91
CO	-0.09	-0.08	0.12	-0.79	4.44
Cohesion	-0.27	-0.34	0.12	-2.25	18.03
Trust	0.46	0.72	0.10	4.60**	63.70
$F(5, 94) = 6.08, p < .001; R^2 = .24; f^2 = 0.26$					
	Effects on satisfaction				
	<i>B</i>	β	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i> -value	<i>RW</i>
Intercept	1.56	0	0.50	3.14*	
Acceptance WFH	0.11	0.14	0.07	1.62	9.04
Experience WFH	0.14	0.16	0.08	1.68	13.96
CO	0.10	0.08	0.12	0.77	12.56
Cohesion	-0.06	-0.07	0.13	-0.45	19.07
Trust	0.32	0.47	0.10	3.09*	45.37
$F(5, 94) = 7.77, p < .001; R^2 = .25; f^2 = 0.33$					

Note. *B* = unstandardized regression coefficient; β = standardized regression coefficient; *SE* = standard error; *RW* = rescaled relative weight; WFH = Working from home; CO = collective orientation * = $p < .01$; ** = $p < .001$.

New effect size conditioned by correction: $f^2 = 0.26$ for the regression on performance on p. 220.

Table 4. Moderation models for process factors

	Moderation model for predicting performance					Moderation model for predicting satisfaction				
	<i>B</i>	β	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i> -value	<i>RW</i>	<i>B</i>	β	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i> -value	<i>RW</i>
Intercept	0.05	0	0.06	0.84		0.05	0	0.06	0.81	
Acceptance WFH	0.04	0.06	0.05	0.73	1.79	0.11	0.17	0.06	2.27	7.61
Experience WFH	0.15	0.19	0.08	2.00	7.09	0.19	0.22	0.08	2.27	13.66
CO	-0.25	-0.22	0.12	-2.10	2.00	-0.01	-0.01	0.13	-0.08	12.70
Cohesion	-0.39	-0.49	0.13	-2.99*	9.96	-0.05	-0.06	0.14	-0.38	9.71
Trust	0.29	0.46	0.11	2.67*	28.28	0.13	0.18	0.12	1.03	24.22
Communication (COM)	0.41	0.36	0.15	2.75*	31.36	0.25	0.20	0.17	1.52	13.95
Coordination (COOR)	0.08	0.08	0.10	0.80	17.70	0.08	0.07	0.11	0.70	10.37
CCM	0.13	0.12	0.10	1.32	1.81	0.20	0.16	0.11	1.74	7.79
Cohesion * COM	-0.01	-0.01	0.22	-0.04		0.41	0.43	0.24	1.68	
Trust * COM	-0.27	-0.33	0.20	-1.37		-0.49	-0.55	0.22	-2.25	
Cohesion * COOR	0.33	0.23	0.31	1.05		0.32	0.20	0.35	0.92	
Trust * COOR	-0.07	-0.06	0.23	-0.32		-0.20	-0.16	0.26	-0.78	
Cohesion * CCM	-0.13	-0.08	0.28	-0.49		-0.13	-0.07	0.31	-0.43	
Trust * CCM	0.38	0.27	0.21	1.82		0.18	0.12	0.23	0.77	
$F(14, 85) = 4.66, p < .001; R^2 = .43; f^2 = 0.52$						$F(14, 85) = 4.09, p < .001; R^2 = .30; f^2 = 0.43$				

Note. *B* = unstandardized regression coefficient; β = standardized regression coefficient; *SE* = standard error; *RW* = rescaled relative weight; WFH = Working from home; CO = collective orientation; CCM = Cooperative Conflict Management * = $p < .01$; ** = $p < .001$.

New effect size conditioned by correction: $f^2 = 0.52$ for the predicting performance model on p. 221.

Table 5. Moderation models for the technology factors

	Moderation model for predicting performance					Moderation model for predicting satisfaction				
	<i>B</i>	β	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i> -value	<i>RW</i>	<i>B</i>	β	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i> -value	<i>RW</i>
Intercept	0.002	0	0.05	0.03		-0.03	0	0.06	-0.49	
Acceptance WFH	-0.02	-0.04	0.06	-0.39	1.26	0.03	0.04	0.06	0.47	2.90
Experience WFH	0.07	0.09	0.08	0.85	4.38	0.10	0.12	0.08	1.21	8.21
CO	-0.12	-0.10	0.12	-0.98	2.64	0.11	0.09	0.13	0.87	12.86
Cohesion	-0.23	-0.29	0.13	-1.77	10.98	0.04	0.05	0.13	0.32	12.04
Trust	0.35	0.56	0.10	3.40**	39.11	0.19	0.28	0.11	1.78	25.64
Team-Fit	0.08	0.09	0.11	0.75	18.72	0.08	0.09	0.11	0.75	17.10
Task-Fit	0.22	0.30	0.08	2.56*	22.91	0.22	0.28	0.09	2.47	21.25
Cohesion * Team-Fit	-0.22	-0.20	0.22	-1.01		-0.47	-0.39	0.23	-2.07	
Trust * Team-Fit	0.31	0.39	0.18	1.72		0.42	0.50	0.19	2.24	
Cohesion * Task-Fit	0.18	0.18	0.17	1.06		0.27	0.25	0.18	1.52	
Trust * Task-Fit	-0.27	-0.41	0.14	-1.91		-0.28	-0.38	0.15	-1.85	
	$F(11, 88) = 4.53, p < .001; R^2 = .28; f^2 = 0.39$					$F(11, 88) = 5.37, p < .001; R^2 = .33; f^2 = 0.49$				

Note. *B* = unstandardized regression coefficient; β = standardized regression coefficient; *SE* = standard error; WFH = Working from home; Team-Fit = Team-Technology-Fit; Task-Fit = Task-Technology-Fit; * = $p < .01$; ** = $p < .001$