

CROSS-CULTURAL COMMUNICATION IN INTERNATIONAL VIRTUAL TEAMS

Dr. Ananya Mehta

Assistant Professor

Department of Management Studies

School of Business and International Studies

University of Global Studies, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India

Abstract

International virtual teams bring together professionals who work across national boundaries, time zones, languages, and organizational cultures through digital communication platforms. Their effectiveness depends not only on technical coordination but also on the ability of members to interpret messages, build trust, manage disagreement, and make decisions across different cultural expectations. Differences in communication context, hierarchy, directness, relationship orientation, time perception, and language proficiency can influence how team members participate in meetings, respond to feedback, share knowledge, and evaluate leadership. When these differences are ignored, virtual work can produce misunderstanding, silence, unequal influence, and weakened commitment. When they are managed deliberately, cultural diversity can enrich problem solving, learning, and innovation.

This study uses a qualitative, literature-based approach to examine cross-cultural communication in international virtual teams. It reviews foundational work on culture, cultural intelligence, global collaboration, virtuality, language, trust, and distributed coordination. The analysis considers the interaction between cultural diversity and digital work practices, including meeting design, asynchronous communication, shared documentation, conflict management, leadership behaviour, and technology use. Rather than treating culture as a fixed national trait, the study approaches it as one influence among professional identity, organizational norms, task requirements, power relations, and prior experience.

The study finds that effective international virtual collaboration requires communication structures that are explicit, inclusive, and adaptive. Clear team norms, accessible language practices, rotational participation, shared knowledge repositories, deliberate relationship building, culturally sensitive feedback, and transparent decision processes can reduce coordination loss while preserving the benefits of diversity. The paper concludes that cross-cultural communication should be treated as a strategic capability in virtual work rather than as a peripheral interpersonal issue. Organizations that invest in cultural intelligence, inclusive leadership, and communication infrastructure are better positioned to build trust and sustain performance across distance.

Keywords: Cross-Cultural Communication, International Virtual Teams, Cultural Intelligence, Virtual Collaboration, Global Leadership, Trust, Language Diversity, Digital Work, Knowledge Sharing, Inclusive Communication

1. INTRODUCTION

International virtual teams have become a central form of organizing work in multinational enterprises, research partnerships, professional services, technology development, higher education, and cross-border projects. A virtual team may be geographically dispersed, electronically dependent, culturally diverse, and dynamically configured, with members joining from different offices, countries, or employment arrangements. This form of work offers access to distributed expertise and allows

organizations to coordinate activities beyond the constraints of a single location. At the same time, it creates communication conditions in which information is filtered through technology, asynchronous exchanges, unfamiliar language practices, and unequal opportunities to speak or influence decisions. Cross-cultural communication becomes especially important when team members interpret the same message through different expectations about politeness, hierarchy, authority, timing, disagreement, and relationship building. A concise message that

is viewed as efficient in one setting may be read as abrupt in another. Silence may indicate reflection, respect for seniority, hesitation caused by language limitations, or lack of agreement. A quick verbal commitment may be treated as a preliminary indication by one participant but as a binding decision by another. Such differences do not automatically cause failure; however, they can become consequential when virtual teams lack the informal cues and repair opportunities available in face-to-face work [1, 2, 6].

Digital collaboration also changes the nature of cultural interaction. Video meetings can provide visual signals, yet camera use, turn-taking, eye contact, formality, and home-work boundaries may vary significantly across contexts. Text-based communication can create a record and support reflective participation, but it can also amplify ambiguity when people do not share a first language or common professional vocabulary. Time-zone separation makes synchronous conversation difficult and may create a hidden hierarchy in which some members repeatedly work outside normal hours. The communication problem is therefore not merely one of choosing a platform. It concerns how a team designs participation, interprets meaning, creates mutual knowledge, and distributes voice across distance [7, 10, 11].

This paper examines cross-cultural communication as a practical and strategic dimension of international virtual teamwork. It reviews relevant literature, identifies recurring communication challenges, and develops a framework for inclusive virtual collaboration. The objective is not to prescribe a single communication style for all teams. Instead, the study emphasizes reflexive practices that enable team members to make expectations visible, adapt to legitimate differences, and create a shared working culture without erasing individual or local identities.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on culture has long shown that people learn socially patterned ways of interpreting relationships, authority, time, communication, and uncertainty. Hall distinguished between high-context and low-context communication, drawing attention to differences in the extent to which meaning is carried by explicit words or by context,

relationships, and shared assumptions [1]. Hofstede and later GLOBE scholarship examined how values related to hierarchy, individualism, uncertainty avoidance, performance orientation, and interpersonal orientation can shape workplace expectations [2, 3]. These frameworks remain useful for identifying possible sources of difference, but they should not be used to stereotype individuals or predict behaviour mechanically. Contemporary international management research increasingly recognizes that culture interacts with professional expertise, organizational practices, social status, gender, language, and personal experience.

The study of global virtual teams has highlighted the challenges created by geographic dispersion, electronic dependence, and changing team membership. Maznevski and Chudoba showed that successful global teams develop rhythm in their use of communication media, combining periodic richer interaction with more routine electronic coordination [6]. Jarvenpaa and Leidner found that trust in global virtual teams can emerge through timely communication, visible competence, and predictable behaviour even when members have limited prior contact [7]. Cramton described the mutual knowledge problem, in which dispersed collaborators assume that others understand local circumstances or task information that has not actually been shared [8]. These findings suggest that virtual teams need deliberate practices for building common ground.

Cultural diversity can improve team creativity and decision quality when members have mechanisms to exchange perspectives, challenge assumptions, and integrate knowledge. It can also create process losses when subgroup boundaries, communication problems, and unequal influence prevent members from contributing fully. Meta-analytic evidence indicates that diversity outcomes depend on contextual conditions, including task complexity, leadership, communication climate, and the degree to which the team can transform differences into learning [5]. Virtuality can intensify these conditions because communication is mediated and the social cues that support relationship development may be reduced or unevenly available [9, 12].

2.1 CONCEPT AND SCOPE OF CROSS-CULTURAL COMMUNICATION

- Cross-cultural communication refers to the exchange and interpretation of messages among people who bring different cultural frames, languages, social norms, and interaction histories to a shared task.
- In international virtual teams, communication includes spoken meetings, chat messages, email, shared documents, project-management systems, recorded presentations, informal social exchanges, and the silence or delay that accompanies asynchronous work.
- Cultural differences may become visible through preferences for direct or indirect expression, formal or informal address, individual or collective decision making, rapid or reflective response, public or private feedback, and explicit or contextual explanation.
- The aim of effective cross-cultural communication is not to make all team members communicate identically; it is to create enough shared understanding, psychological safety, and procedural clarity for diverse members to collaborate responsibly.

2.2 INTERNATIONAL VIRTUAL TEAMS AND COMMUNICATION CHALLENGES

- Geographic distance reduces access to informal observation and spontaneous clarification, making teams more dependent on intentional information sharing and documented decisions.
- Time-zone differences can slow response cycles, produce meeting fatigue, and create inequity when the same group is repeatedly expected to attend outside normal working hours.
- Language diversity may affect confidence, fluency, perceived expertise, and the distribution of influence, particularly when one language becomes the informal standard for high-status communication [14, 15].
- Cultural faultlines can develop when members align around nationality, language, functional role, location, or employment status, causing the team to divide into subgroups rather than cooperate as an integrated unit [18].

- Digital tools can support inclusion, but only when norms for channel selection, response times, documentation, accessibility, and participation are transparent and consistently applied.

2.3 CULTURAL INTELLIGENCE, TRUST, AND INCLUSIVE LEADERSHIP

- Cultural intelligence involves the capability to function effectively in culturally diverse settings through awareness, motivation, knowledge, and adaptive behaviour [4].
- Trust in virtual teams is strengthened when members demonstrate competence, reliability, responsiveness, respectful communication, and follow-through on agreed actions [7, 12].
- Inclusive virtual leadership makes expectations explicit, protects equitable speaking opportunities, values local knowledge, and addresses communication patterns that marginalize quieter or less linguistically dominant members.
- Leadership should focus on creating a shared team identity while preserving space for members to explain different communication preferences and constraints.

3. OBJECT OF STUDY

The present study examines international virtual teams as communication systems in which cultural diversity, digital media, distributed work routines, and organizational expectations interact. The object of study is not a single firm, industry, or technology platform. Instead, it considers representative international virtual-team settings in which members must coordinate tasks, exchange expertise, make decisions, and maintain relationships without regular co-location. The analysis focuses on the communication practices that enable members to develop shared understanding while respecting cultural and linguistic diversity.

The theoretical basis of the study is grounded in the view that virtual teamwork is both technical and social. Collaboration tools can transmit information, but effective cooperation also requires interpretive work: team members must decide what a message means, whether action is expected, whose perspective has been heard, and how disagreements can be addressed. A team that has access to

sophisticated platforms but lacks inclusive communication norms may reproduce silence, misunderstanding, and unequal influence. Conversely, a team with strong norms for clarification, documentation, and respectful participation can coordinate effectively even when members are widely dispersed.

3.1 INTERNATIONAL VIRTUAL-TEAM CONTEXTS AND COMMUNICATION REQUIREMENTS

The study considers five representative international virtual-team contexts. These contexts illustrate that communication requirements change according to task uncertainty, time pressure, language diversity, decision authority, and the degree of interdependence among members.

Table 1. International virtual-team contexts and cross-cultural communication requirement

S.No.	Virtual Team Context	Communication Challenge	Cultural Consideration	Inclusive Management Response
1	Global project delivery team	Coordinating deadlines, hand-offs, and client expectations across time zones	Different views of urgency, escalation, and accountability	Use a shared delivery calendar, written decision log, rotating meeting times, and clear escalation paths
2	Distributed agile software team	Rapid feedback, technical problem solving, and daily coordination through digital tools	Differences in directness, hierarchy, and willingness to challenge ideas publicly	Create explicit retrospective norms, use structured turn-taking, and separate critique of work from critique of people
3	Cross-border leadership team	Strategic discussion, ambiguity management, and high-stakes decision making	Different expectations about authority, consensus, and dissent	Clarify decision rights, invite pre-meeting input, record alternatives, and ensure dissent is acknowledged
4	Multinational customer-service team	Consistent service communication with customers and internal teams	Variation in politeness, emotional expression, and customer expectations	Develop adaptable service principles, scenario-based training, and local feedback channels
5	International research and innovation team	Integrating specialist knowledge and building shared concepts	Professional jargon, language asymmetry, and different norms of authorship or ownership	Maintain shared glossaries, collaborative workspaces, transparent attribution, and periodic relationship-building sessions

3.2 STUDY OBJECTIVES

- To examine the role of cross-cultural communication in the coordination, trust building, and performance of international virtual teams.
- To identify major communication challenges associated with cultural diversity, language variation, time-zone separation, and digital collaboration.
- To compare communication requirements across representative global project, software, leadership, customer-service, and research-team contexts.
- To evaluate the importance of cultural intelligence, inclusive leadership, communication norms, shared documentation, and technology practices in virtual-team effectiveness.

- To develop a practical framework for cross-cultural communication that supports participation, knowledge sharing, and responsible decision making in international virtual work.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study adopts a qualitative and literature-based research methodology. It synthesizes scholarship on intercultural communication, cultural intelligence, global virtual teams, trust, language diversity, and distributed collaboration. This approach is appropriate because the research question concerns how people interpret and coordinate communication across multiple cultural and technological conditions rather than the measurement of a single numerical outcome. The study does not report primary survey or interview data; its findings are interpretive and intended to provide a structured framework for management practice and further empirical investigation.

The methodological framework follows the communication lifecycle of an international virtual team: team formation, expectation setting, channel selection, daily coordination, knowledge sharing, disagreement management, decision making, relationship maintenance, and periodic learning. This lifecycle approach recognizes that communication quality is not determined by one training session or one virtual meeting. It is reinforced through repeated routines, leadership behaviour, technical design, and the willingness of team members to clarify assumptions and respond constructively to difference.

4.1 RESEARCH DESIGN (QUALITATIVE ANALYTICAL APPROACH)

- The study follows a qualitative and comparative design based on established international management, communication, and virtual-team literature.
- The analysis compares virtual-team settings according to task interdependence, cultural and language diversity, time-zone separation, communication channels, and decision structure.
- The study uses an interactional perspective that links culture with organizational roles, technology practices, team norms, trust, and power relations.

- Findings are interpreted through communication and management principles rather than through a controlled experiment or statistically representative dataset.

4.2 CROSS-CULTURAL VIRTUAL COMMUNICATION FRAMEWORK

- Communication assessment is structured around message clarity, channel fit, language accessibility, response norms, turn-taking, documentation, and opportunities for clarification.
- Cultural assessment considers expectations regarding authority, feedback, time, relationship building, disagreement, uncertainty, and the public expression of ideas.
- Management options include team charters, language guidelines, shared glossaries, asynchronous work protocols, rotating meeting schedules, structured check-ins, cultural intelligence development, and conflict-resolution procedures.
- Governance is assessed through role clarity, decision rights, facilitation quality, access to information, record keeping, privacy expectations, and mechanisms for raising concerns without retaliation.

4.3 TEAM AND ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

- The study considers international teams operating in project delivery, software development, strategic leadership, customer service, research, and innovation settings.
- Team members are considered in relation to functional expertise, national and regional background, first and additional languages, employment location, seniority, digital access, and prior virtual-work experience.
- Technology is considered through video-conferencing platforms, chat systems, shared documents, project dashboards, knowledge repositories, translation support, and asynchronous collaboration tools.
- Organizations are considered through their policies for leadership development, performance assessment, language use, inclusion, travel, working time, data protection, and cross-border collaboration.

4.4 PARAMETERS OF ANALYSIS

The following communication, team, and governance parameters are evaluated:

- Clarity, completeness, and cultural accessibility of written and spoken communication, including the opportunity to request clarification without loss of face.
- Patterns of participation, interruption, silence, response delay, meeting attendance, and visibility of contributions across language and time-zone groups.
- Trust indicators such as reliability, responsiveness, competence recognition, respectful treatment, and the consistent fulfilment of commitments.
- Quality of decision processes, including whether decision authority, consultation requirements, dissent procedures, and documentation are clearly understood.
- Extent of cultural intelligence, inclusive leadership, psychological safety, team learning, and recognition of unequal communication burdens.
- Capacity for adaptive management through retrospective review, communication audits, feedback loops, coaching, and revision of team norms.

4.5 PROCEDURE OF STUDY

- Review foundational and contemporary literature on culture, virtual teamwork, trust, language, and inclusive collaboration.
- Identify recurring communication pressures in international virtual work, including ambiguity, language asymmetry, time-zone inequity, subgroup formation, and conflict avoidance.
- Compare representative team contexts according to task demands, cultural interaction, technology dependence, communication risks, and management requirements.
- Map each context to preventive communication practices, facilitation methods, leadership actions, and review mechanisms.
- Interpret the combined evidence to formulate an integrated framework for cross-cultural virtual communication.
- Develop practical recommendations that can guide team formation, ongoing

coordination, manager training, and future empirical research.

4.6 ANALYTICAL APPROACH

- Qualitative comparison of communication challenges and inclusive practices across representative international virtual-team contexts.
- Interpretation of how culture, language, technology, and organizational power can shape meaning making and participation in distributed work.
- Assessment of the relationship between trust, explicit coordination, psychological safety, and the long-term effectiveness of cross-border virtual collaboration.
- Identification of communication practices that can be adapted for multinational enterprises, global projects, hybrid teams, higher education partnerships, and international research networks.

5. DATA ANALYSIS

The qualitative analysis indicates that communication problems in international virtual teams are rarely caused by culture alone. They usually emerge from the interaction of cultural expectations with time pressure, unclear roles, language inequality, weak facilitation, technology limitations, and insufficient shared context. For example, a participant may appear disengaged in a video meeting because the discussion is conducted in a non-native language, because the meeting occurs late at night, because the team norm rewards rapid interruption, or because the participant believes disagreement should be raised privately. A culturally sensitive analysis therefore asks what conditions make participation difficult rather than assuming that silence or reserve is an inherent personal trait. The analysis also shows that explicitness is particularly valuable in virtual collaboration. In co-located teams, people often repair ambiguous messages through informal conversation, shared observation, and immediate follow-up. In dispersed teams, the same ambiguities can persist across days or become embedded in documents and task assignments. Effective teams make decisions visible, state assumptions, define terms, identify owners, specify deadlines with time zones, and distinguish between information sharing, consultation, and final approval. These practices reduce the mutual knowledge

problem described in the virtual-team literature and make it easier for members from different communication traditions to understand what is expected [8, 10].

Language emerges as a central issue in the analysis. A common working language may be necessary for coordination, yet it can create status differences when fluency is treated as a proxy for competence. Members who speak the dominant language confidently may gain disproportionate influence, while those who communicate more slowly may be interrupted, overlooked, or assigned narrower roles. Research on multinational teams suggests that language barriers can affect trust, information exchange, and perceptions of professional credibility [14, 15]. Teams can reduce this risk by using plain language, sharing agendas in advance, allowing written follow-up, avoiding unexplained idioms, and recognizing that concise speech is not the only sign of expertise.

The comparative assessment highlights the importance of communication architecture. Synchronous meetings are useful for relationship building, complex negotiation, and rapid clarification, but they should not become the only route to participation. Asynchronous channels can support reflection and help members in difficult time zones or with different language-processing needs contribute more fully. Shared documents, project boards, decision logs, and recorded briefings create continuity and reduce dependence on memory or informal networks. The best communication architecture is not the one with the most tools; it is the one in which members understand why a channel is used, what response is expected, where final decisions are recorded, and how uncertainty can be raised.

A further finding is that trust must be designed into routine interaction rather than left to occasional team-building events. Initial trust in a virtual team can develop through dependable behaviour, visible competence, respectful tone, and timely responses [7]. Over time, deeper trust is supported by fairness in task allocation, acknowledgment of local constraints, willingness to repair misunderstandings, and opportunities to know colleagues beyond their formal role. Virtual leaders have a significant role in modelling these behaviours. Leaders

who invite input only after a decision has effectively been made may create procedural compliance but not meaningful inclusion. Leaders who clarify decision boundaries, rotate facilitation, and visibly act on feedback can strengthen both trust and accountability.

The analysis does not support a universal communication formula. Direct feedback may be welcomed in one team, while a more contextual approach may be needed in another. Video-on norms can support connection for some members but create discomfort or unequal privacy burdens for others. The appropriate response is not to avoid standards; it is to co-create standards that are purposeful, revisable, and transparent. Team norms should be tested against observable outcomes such as response quality, decision clarity, participation balance, conflict resolution, and member confidence. Practices that reduce misunderstanding for one group while excluding another should be reconsidered.

6. DISCUSSION

The analysis confirms that cross-cultural communication is a core capability for international virtual work. Organizations often invest in collaboration platforms, project dashboards, and workflow automation, yet technology cannot by itself create shared meaning. A platform may make communication faster while also making uneven participation more visible. A chat channel may increase access to information while encouraging rapid exchanges that privilege native speakers or those working in the most convenient time zone. The managerial question is therefore not whether digital tools are useful, but how they are embedded in a communication system that recognizes cultural and human variation.

A useful starting point is the development of a team charter. A charter should define the team purpose, membership, roles, communication channels, response-time expectations, decision rules, escalation procedures, meeting etiquette, documentation locations, and working-time principles. It should also include a conversation about cultural and language preferences. This does not require members to disclose private identity information or speak for an entire country. Rather, it creates an invitation for individuals to explain practical preferences, such as whether they need time to

reflect before deciding, how they prefer feedback to be delivered, or what constraints affect meeting availability. The value of the charter lies in its ability to turn hidden assumptions into topics for negotiation.

Inclusive leadership is equally important. Managers of international virtual teams should monitor who speaks, who is interrupted, whose ideas are incorporated, and whose working hours are repeatedly compromised. They should distinguish between consensus and silence, and between agreement and lack of confidence in challenging a senior colleague. Structured facilitation can help: agendas circulated in advance, written pre-work, round-robin input, anonymous idea collection when appropriate, smaller breakout discussions, and post-meeting reflection can broaden participation. Such practices should not be rigidly imposed in every situation, but they can counter the tendency for virtual meetings to reproduce hierarchy and language advantage.

The relationship between diversity and performance should also be understood in developmental terms. Diverse teams may experience early friction because members lack shared routines or interpretive shortcuts. This friction is not necessarily evidence that diversity is harmful. It can be the initial cost of integrating different perspectives. The outcome depends on whether the team has time, leadership, and communication practices to transform difference into learning. Teams that rush to premature agreement may appear efficient while failing to identify important risks. Teams that allow well-managed disagreement can produce more robust decisions, particularly when tasks are complex and information is distributed across locations [5, 16].

Equity is central to this discussion. Global virtual work can shift costs onto some members through late-night meetings, unpaid availability, language adaptation, unreliable connectivity, or expectations to act as informal cultural translators. These burdens are often invisible in performance systems that measure only final output. Responsible organizations should monitor how communication demands are distributed and provide practical support, including scheduling rotation, translation or writing assistance, accessible technology,

training, and recognition of collaborative labour. Such measures are not merely welfare initiatives; they protect the quality and sustainability of global coordination.

Finally, cross-cultural virtual communication should be adaptive. Teams change as projects evolve, new members arrive, technologies are updated, and organizational priorities shift. Communication norms that work during early coordination may not be sufficient during conflict, crisis, innovation, or handover. Periodic reviews should ask whether decisions are clear, whether all members can access essential information, whether time-zone burdens are fair, whether disagreement is handled constructively, and whether the team is learning from communication failures. This integrated review allows a virtual team to function not only as a collection of remote workers but as a shared, evolving community of practice.

7. CONCLUSION

This study examined cross-cultural communication in international virtual teams as an interconnected issue of meaning making, trust, technology, leadership, and organizational design. It showed that virtual teams can access diverse expertise and operate across national boundaries, but that their effectiveness is shaped by how communication practices accommodate differences in language, hierarchy, directness, time orientation, relationship building, and participation. Cultural diversity should not be treated as a problem to be eliminated or as a simple source of innovation. Its contribution depends on whether the team has inclusive structures for interpreting difference and integrating knowledge.

The analysis found that global project teams, distributed software teams, cross-border leadership groups, customer-service teams, and international research teams require different combinations of communication support. Team charters, plain-language practices, shared documentation, asynchronous collaboration, rotating schedules, structured facilitation, cultural intelligence development, respectful feedback, and transparent decision processes can improve collaboration when they are coordinated. No single communication practice is sufficient in isolation, and its effectiveness should be

reviewed in relation to participation, trust, task performance, and member experience.

International virtual teams can become more resilient, innovative, and equitable when communication is designed as a shared responsibility. Their long-term value depends on the relationship between cultural awareness, language inclusion, reliable digital infrastructure, leadership accountability, and

willingness to revise unhelpful routines. When organizations treat cross-cultural communication as a strategic capability from the beginning of team formation, they are better able to reduce avoidable misunderstanding and build collaborative environments in which geographically dispersed professionals can contribute with confidence and respect.

8. REFERENCES

1. Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond Culture*. New York, NY: Anchor Books.
2. Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
3. House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., and Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
4. Earley, P. C., and Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural Intelligence: Individual Interactions Across Cultures*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
5. Stahl, G. K., Maznevski, M. L., Voigt, A., and Jonsen, K. (2010). Unraveling the effects of cultural diversity in teams: A meta-analysis of research on multicultural work groups. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 41(4), 690-709.
6. Maznevski, M. L., and Chudoba, K. M. (2000). Bridging space over time: Global virtual team dynamics and effectiveness. *Organization Science*, 11(5), 473-492.
7. Jarvenpaa, S. L., and Leidner, D. E. (1999). Communication and trust in global virtual teams. *Organization Science*, 10(6), 791-815.
8. Cramton, C. D. (2001). The mutual knowledge problem and its consequences for dispersed collaboration. *Organization Science*, 12(3), 346-371.
9. Gibson, C. B., and 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.
10. O'Leary, M. B., and Cummings, J. N. (2007). The spatial, temporal, and configurational characteristics of geographic dispersion in teams. *MIS Quarterly*, 31(3), 433-452.
11. Olson, G. M., and Olson, J. S. (2000). Distance matters. *Human-Computer Interaction*, 15(2-3), 139-178.
12. Hertel, G., Geister, S., and Konradt, U. (2005). Managing virtual teams: A review of current empirical research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 15(1), 69-95.
13. Kirkman, B. L., Rosen, B., Gibson, C. B., Tesluk, P. E., and McPherson, S. O. (2002). Five challenges to virtual team success: Lessons from Sabre, Inc. *Academy of Management Executive*, 16(3), 67-79.
14. Neeley, T. B. (2013). Language matters: Status loss and achieved status distinctions in global organizations. *Organization Science*, 24(2), 476-497.
15. Tenzer, H., Pudelko, M., and Harzing, A. W. (2014). The impact of language barriers on trust formation in multinational teams. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 45(5), 508-535.
16. Brett, J., Behfar, K., and Kern, M. C. (2006). Managing multicultural teams. *Harvard Business Review*, 84(11), 84-91.
17. Hinds, P. J., Liu, L., and Lyon, J. (2011). Putting the global in global work: An intercultural lens on the practice of cross-national collaboration. *Academy of Management Annals*, 5(1), 135-188.
18. Lau, D. C., and Murnighan, J. K. (1998). Demographic diversity and faultlines: The compositional dynamics of organizational groups. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(2), 325-340.
19. Watson, W. E., Kumar, K., and Michaelsen, L. K. (1993). Cultural diversity's impact on interaction process and performance: Comparing homogeneous and diverse task groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 590-602.

20. Gluesing, J. C., and Gibson, C. B. (2004). Designing and forming global teams: The evolution of the management of global virtual teams. *Human Resource Management*, 43(2-3), 229-253.
21. Zakaria, N., Amelinckx, A., and Wilemon, D. (2004). Working together apart? Building a knowledge-sharing culture for global virtual teams. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 13(1), 15-29.
22. Munkvold, B. E., and Zigurs, I. (2007). Process and technology challenges in swift-starting virtual teams. *Information and Management*, 44(3), 287-299.
23. Hinds, P. J., Neeley, T. B., and Cramton, C. D. (2014). Language as a lightning rod: Power contests, emotion regulation, and subgroup dynamics in global teams. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 45(5), 536-561.
24. Thomas, D. C., Liao, Y., Aycan, Z., Cerdin, J.-L., Pekerti, A. A., Ravlin, E. C., Stahl, G. K., Lazarova, M. B., Fock, H., Arli, D., Moeller, M., Okimoto, T. G., and van de Vijver, F. (2015). Cultural intelligence: A theory-based, short form measure. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 46(9), 1099-1118.
25. Sarker, S., Ahuja, M., Sarker, S., and Kirkeby, S. (2011). The role of communication and trust in global virtual teams: A social network perspective. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 28(1), 273-310.