Experimental or Team Functioning

					Experimental or											Team Functioning			
No	Authors	Year	N Ind	N Groups	Correlational?	Country	Sample description	r rxx ryy	X Experimentalel	Predictor category	Predictor sub-category	Source of X	X scale	Y Experimentalel	Outcome category	Category	Source of Y	Yscale	Same source?
1	Alavi & McCormick	2008	145	40	Correlational	Australia	University students	0.60	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Collective efficacy	Emergent State	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
1	Alavi & McCormick	2008	145	40	Correlational	Australia	University students	0.55	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Integrating	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
1	Alavi & McCormick	2008	145	40	Correlational	Australia	University students	0.42	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Evaluating	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
1	Alavi & McCormick	2008	145	40	Correlational	Australia	University students	0.00	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Average avoiding arguments 2	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	for this study	Yes
1	Alavi & McCormick	2008	145	40	Correlational	Australia	University students	0.46	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Horizontal allocentrism	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
2	Allen, Sargent, & Bradley	2003	171	57	Experimental	Unsure	University students	0.27 1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Manipulation	Manipulation	Helping behavior	Action process	Task	Team members	Van Dyne & Lepine (1998)	No
2	Allen, Sargent, & Bradley	2003	171	57	Experimental	Unsure	University students	-0.13 1 1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Manipulation	Manipulation	Group performance	Objective performance		Other	for this study	No
3	Antoni	2005	171	21	Correlational	Unsure	Construction supply manufacturing plant	0.15	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Group process	Transition process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
3	Antoni	2005	171	21	Correlational	Unsure	Construction supply manufacturing plant	0.32	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Goal commitment	Emergent State	Relational	Team members	for this study	Yes
3	Antoni	2005	171	21	Correlational	Unsure	Construction supply manufacturing plant	0.12 1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Group goal	Transition process	Task	Other	for this study	No
3	Antoni	2005	171	21	Correlational	Unsure	Construction supply manufacturing plant	-0.13 1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Productivity	Objective performance		Other	for this study	No
4	Aritzeta & Balluerka	2006	232	26	Correlational	Spain	Automotive plant	0.23 0.2	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Cooperation/Competition	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	Thomas & Kilmann, 1974	Yes
5	Ashworth	2007	1456	118	Correlational	US	4 electric companies	0.29	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	for this study	Outcome interdependence	Outcome interdependence		Team members	for this study	Yes
5	Ashworth	2007	1456	118	Correlational	US	4 electric companies	0.18 0.88	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	for this study	Group performance	Subjective performance		Supervisor	for this study	No
5	Ashworth	2007	1456	118	Correlational	US	4 electric companies	0.36 0.88	Outcome interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Mixed OI	Team members	for this study	Group performance	Subjective performance		Supervisor	for this study	No
6	Aube & Rousseau	2005	392	74	Correlational	Canada	13 organizations in different industries	0.25	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Team goal commitment	Emergent State	Relational	Team members	Klein et al., 2001	Yes
6	Aube & Rousseau	2005	392	74	Correlational	Canada	13 organizations in different industries	0.40	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Supportive behaviors	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
6	Aube & Rousseau	2005	392	74	Correlational	Canada	13 organizations in different industries		Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI		Campion et al., 1993	Team performance	Subjective performance		Supervisor	for this study	No
6	Aube & Rousseau	2005	392	74	Correlational	Canada	13 organizations in different industries		Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI		Campion et al., 1993	Quality of group experience	Interpersonal process	Relational		for this study	Yes
6	Aube & Rousseau	2005	392	74	Correlational	Canada	13 organizations in different industries	0.01	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI		Campion et al., 1993	Team viability	Emergent State	Task	Supervisor	for this study	No
7	Bachrach, Powell, Collins, & Richey	2006	186	62	Experimental	US	University students	0.15 1 1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI		Manipulation	Group performance	Objective performance		Other		No
7	Bachrach, Powell, Collins, & Richey	2006	186	62	Experimental	US	University students		Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI		Manipulation	Helping behavior	Action process	Task	Other	Podsakoff et al., 1997	No
8	Bartel & Saavedra	2000	357	70	Correlational	Unsure	Various work groups from a variety of orgs		•	Task interdependence	Mixed TI		Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Social interdependence	Interpersonal process	Relational		Koys & DeCotiis, 1991	Yes
8	Bartel & Saavedra	2000	357	70	Correlational	Unsure	Various work groups from a variety of orgs	0.34 0.58 0.56	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Mood-regulation norms	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	adapted from Doherty, 1997	Yes
0	Beersma, Hollenbeck, Humphrey, Moon,	2002	300	75	Evporimental	HS	University students	016 1 1	Poward structure	Outcome interder d	Poward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Average performance	Objective performance			for this study	No
9	Conlon, & Ilgen	2003	300	75	Experimental	US	University students	0.16 1 1	Reward structure	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Average performance	Objective performance			for this study	No
Q	Beersma, Hollenbeck, Humphrey, Moon, Conlon, & Ilgen	2003	300	75	Experimental	US	University students	-0.26 1 1	Reward structure	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Speed	Objective performance				
,		2003	300	,,	Experimental	03	Oniversity students	0.20 1 1	wara saucture	Succome interdependence		wampaladon		эрсси	objective performance				
Q	Beersma, Hollenbeck, Humphrey, Moon, Conlon, & Ilgen	2003	300	75	Experimental	US	University students	0.47 1 1	Reward structure	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Accuracy	Objective performance				
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	Financial services company		Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI		Campion et al., 1993	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence		Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Yes
10	campion, i appei, a incustei	1990	331	00	Correlational	03	Information system, insurance, and	J.JU U.JU U.J/	. aak interdependente	. aak interdependence	MACCI II	ream members	Campion Cedl., 1333	Coar interdependence	Sattome interdependence		ream members	comploir ct al., 1993	
							administrative jobs at financial services												
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	company	0.27 0.36 0.52	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team memhers	Campion et al., 1993	Reward/Feedback interdependence	Outcome interdependence		Team memhers	Campion et al., 1993	Yes
10	campion, rapper, a measier	1330	55,	00	Correlational	05	Information system, insurance, and	0.27 0.50 0.52	rusk interdependence	rusk inter dependence	THINCO TI	ream members	campion et any 1999	newaray, ecaback interacependence	outcome interdependence		ream members	campion ecan, 1999	103
							administrative jobs at financial services												
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	company	0.16 0.36 0.66	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Flexibility	Action process	Task	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Yes
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,						Information system, insurance, and						, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	•				, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
							administrative jobs at financial services												
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	company	0.18 0.36 0.55	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Potency	Emergent State	Task	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Yes
							Information system, insurance, and												
							administrative jobs at financial services												
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	company	0.35 0.36 0.51	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Social support	Action process	Task	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Yes
							Information system, insurance, and												
							administrative jobs at financial services												
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	company	0.23 0.36 0.63	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Workload sharing	Action process	Task	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Yes
							Information system, insurance, and												
							administrative jobs at financial services												
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	company	0.29 0.36 0.57	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Communication/cooperation within the	\ Action process	Task	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Yes
							Information system, insurance, and												
							administrative jobs at financial services					_							
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	company	0.63 0.57 0.52	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Reward/Feedback interdependence	Outcome interdependence		Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Yes
							Information system, insurance, and												
40	Constant Paris Charles	4006	257		Constational		administrative jobs at financial services	004 057 066	Continuedos en de con	0.1	61	T	Constructed 4000	et a di dia	A - 12	T	T	C	
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	company	0.34 0.57 0.66	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	leam members	Campion et al., 1993	Flexibility	Action process	Task	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Yes
							Information system, insurance, and												
10	Campion Banner & Madeline	1000	257	60	Corrolational	HE	administrative jobs at financial services	0.42 0.57 0.55	Coal interdence deser	Outcomo intorderenden	Cool	Toom marches	Compion et al. 1003	Potongy	Emorgont State	Tack	Toom receive	Campion et al. 1003	Voc
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	company Information system, insurance, and	0.42 0.57 0.55	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	ream members	Campion et al., 1993	Potency	Emergent State	Task	rearn members	Campion et al., 1993	Yes
							Information system, insurance, and												
10	Campion Panner & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	administrative jobs at financial services	0.44 0.57 0.51	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Social support	Action process	Task	Team members	Campion et al 1002	Voc
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1330	331	00	Correlational	UJ	company Information system, insurance, and	U.44 U.37 U.51	Goal interdependence	outcome interdependence	Guai	ream members	Campion et di., 1333	Social support	Action process	1001	ream members	Campion et al., 1993	Yes
							administrative jobs at financial services												
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	company	0.37 0.57 0.63	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Workload sharing	Action process	Task	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Yes
	h - A - Man A						Information system, insurance, and			aspendence	• •			<b>-</b>				,	
							administrative jobs at financial services												
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	company	0.45 0.57 0.57	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Communication/cooperation within the	\ Action process	Task	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Yes
							Information system, insurance, and		•				-	•	•			•	
							administrative jobs at financial services		Feedback/Reward										
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	company	0.39 0.52 0.66	interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Flexibility	Action process	Task	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Yes
							Information system, insurance, and												
							administrative jobs at financial services		Feedback/Reward										
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	company	0.49 0.52 0.55	interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Potency	Emergent State	Task	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Yes
							Information system, insurance, and		- " '- '										
	Country Brown Cart 11	400-	25-	60		110	administrative jobs at financial services	0.40 0.70	Feedback/Reward	0.1	D	<b>-</b>	6	Cartellande	Authorities	T	<b>-</b>	6t	V
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	company	U.48 U.52 0.51	interdependence	Outcome interdependence	кеward	ream members	Campion et al., 1993	Social support	Action process	Task	ream members	Campion et al., 1993	Yes
							Information system, insurance, and		Foodback/Rougest										
10	Campion Banner 9 Modeline	1000	257	60	Correlational	US	administrative jobs at financial services	0.44 0.53 0.63	Feedback/Reward	Outcome interder d	Poward	Team morehess	Campion et al. 1003	Workload sharing	Action process	Tack	Team morehair	Campion et al. 1002	Voc
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	55/	OU	correlational	US	company Information system, insurance, and	0.44 0.52 0.63	плегиерепиенсе	Outcome interdependence	newaru	ream members	Campion et al., 1993	Workload sharing	Action process	Task	ream members	Campion et al., 1993	Yes
							Information system, insurance, and administrative jobs at financial services		Feedback/Reward										
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	company	0.47 0.52 0.57		Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Communication/cooperation within the	Action process	Task	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Yes
10					223.00.01101		Information system, insurance, and	0.52 0.57		microependence		c.iibci3		within the	, p. 30000				
							administrative jobs at financial services												
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	59	Correlational	US	company	0.19 0.36 0.89	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Team effectiveness	Subjective performance		Supervisor	Campion et al., 1993	No
							Information system, insurance, and							•					
							administrative jobs at financial services												
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	59	Correlational	US	company	0.30 0.57 0.89	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Team effectiveness	Subjective performance		Supervisor	Campion et al., 1993	No

						Information system, insurance, and administrative jobs at financial services	Feedback/Reward										
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996 35	7 59	Correlational	US	company 0.41 0.52 0.5	89 interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Team effectiveness	Subjective performance		Supervisor	Campion et al., 1993	No
11	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993 39	1 80	Correlational	US	Clerical workers at a large financial services company 0.12 0.04 0.1	03 Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	for this study	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence		Team members	for this study	Yes
	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993 39		Correlational	US	Clerical workers at a large financial services	16 Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	,	Reward/Feedback interdependence	Outcome interdependence		Team members	•	Yes
11	Campion, Medsker, & riiggs			Correlational		Clerical workers at a large financial services	·	rask interdependence			•		Outcome interdependence			•	
11	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993 39	1 80	Correlational	US	company 0.10 0.04 0.0 Clerical workers at a large financial services	33 Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	for this study	Flexibility	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
11	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993 39	1 80	Correlational	US		66 Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	for this study	Potency	Emergent State	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
11	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993 39	1 80	Correlational	US	company 0.20 0.04 0.	44 Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	for this study	Social support	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
11	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993 39	1 80	Correlational	US		58 Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	for this study	Workload sharing	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
11	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993 39	1 80	Correlational	US	Clerical workers at a large financial services company 0.16 0.04 0.	57 Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	for this study	Communication/cooperation within the	\ Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
11	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993 39	1 75	Correlational	US	Clerical workers at a large financial services company 0.14 0.04	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	for this study	Productivity	Objective performance		Other	for this study	No
	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993 39		Correlational	US	Clerical workers at a large financial services	82 Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	·	Team effectiveness	Subjective performance		Supervisor	for this study	No
						Clerical workers at a large financial services	·				•					•	
11	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993 39	1 80	Correlational	US	company 0.29 0.03 0.0 Clerical workers at a large financial services	82 Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	for this study	Reward/Feedback interdependence	Outcome interdependence		Team members	for this study	Yes
11	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993 39	1 80	Correlational	US	company 0.14 0.03 0.1 Clerical workers at a large financial services	33 Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	for this study	Flexibility	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
11	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993 39	1 80	Correlational	US		66 Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	for this study	Potency	Emergent State	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
11	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993 39	1 80	Correlational	US	company 0.25 0.03 0.	44 Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	for this study	Social support	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
11	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993 39	1 80	Correlational	US		58 Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	for this study	Workload sharing	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
11	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993 39	1 80	Correlational	US	Clerical workers at a large financial services company 0.28 0.03 0.	57 Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	for this study	Communication/cooperation within the	\ Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
11	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993 39	1 75	Correlational	US	Clerical workers at a large financial services company 0.09 0.03	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	for this study	Productivity	Objective performance		Other	for this study	No
						Clerical workers at a large financial services	82 Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence			·	Team effectiveness				•	No
	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993 39		Correlational	US	Clerical workers at a large financial services	Feedback/Reward	·		Team members	•		Subjective performance		Supervisor	for this study	
11	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993 39	1 80	Correlational	US	company 0.16 0.16 0.16 0.16 0.16 0.16 0.16 0.16	33 interdependence Feedback/Reward	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	for this study	Flexibility	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
11	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993 39	1 80	Correlational	US	company 0.18 0.16 0.1   Clerical workers at a large financial services	66 interdependence Feedback/Reward	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	for this study	Potency	Emergent State	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
11	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993 39	1 80	Correlational	US	company 0.14 0.16 0.  Clerical workers at a large financial services	44 interdependence Feedback/Reward	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	for this study	Social support	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
11	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993 39	1 80	Correlational	US	company 0.17 0.16 0.1	58 interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	for this study	Workload sharing	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
11	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993 39	1 80	Correlational	US	Clerical workers at a large financial services company 0.15 0.16 0.16	•	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	for this study	Communication/cooperation within the	\ Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
11	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993 39	1 75	Correlational	US	Clerical workers at a large financial services company 0.14 0.16	Feedback/Reward interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	for this study	Productivity	Objective performance		Other	for this study	No
11	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993 39	1 76	Correlational	US	Clerical workers at a large financial services company 0.13 0.16 0.1	Feedback/Reward 82 interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	for this study	Team effectiveness	Subjective performance		Supervisor	for this study	No
	Chen, Kirkman, Kanfer, Allen, & Rosen	2007 44		Correlational	US	Home improvement company -0.04 1 0.0	•	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Other	Comparison of high (freight) and low		Emergent State	Task		Kirkman & Rosen, 1999	No
12	Chen, Kirkman, Kanfer, Allen, & Rosen	2007 44	5 62	Correlational	US		97 Team interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Other	Comparison of high (freight) and low	( Team performance	Subjective performance		Supervisor	Welbourne, Johnson, & Erez, 1998	No
13	Chen, Tang, & Wang	2009 27	0 53	Correlational	Taiwan	R&D departments of 53 companies in Taiwan 0.45 0.39 0.	46 Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Van der Vegt et al., 2001	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence		Team members	Van der Vegt et al., 2003	Yes
13	Chen, Tang, & Wang	2009 27	0 53	Correlational	Taiwan	R&D departments of 53 companies in Taiwan 0.54 0.39 0.4	65 Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Van der Vegt et al., 2001	Group cohesion	Emergent State	Relational	Team members	Dobbins & Zaccaro, 1986	Yes
13	Chen, Tang, & Wang	2009 27	0 53	Correlational	Taiwan	R&D departments of 53 companies in Taiwan 0.27 0.39	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team memhers	Van der Vegt et al., 2001	Organizational citizenship behavior (tea	r Action process	Task	Team members	Farh, Earley, & Lin, 1997	Yes
						R&D departments of 53 companies in	·						•				
	Chen, Tang, & Wang	2009 27		Correlational	Taiwan	R&D departments of 53 companies in	65 Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Mixed OI		Van der Vegt et al., 2003	Group cohesion	Emergent State	Relational			Yes
13	Chen, Tang, & Wang	2009 27	0 53	Correlational	Taiwan	Taiwan 0.29 0.46 Research units from 33 Belguim	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Mixed OI	Team members	Van der Vegt et al., 2003	Organizational citizenship behavior (tea	r Action process	Task	Team members	Farh, Earley, & Lin, 1997	Yes
15	Cheng	1983	127	Correlational	Belgium	organizations 0.31 Research units from 33 Belguim	Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Mohr (1971)	Coordination	Action process	Task	Team members	Georgeopoulos & Mann, 1962	Yes
15	Cheng	1983	127	Correlational	Belgium		87 Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Mohr (1971)	Unit performance output quality	Subjective performance		Supervisor	Pelz & Andrews, 1966	No
15	Cheng	1983	127	Correlational	Belgium	organizations 0.11	Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Mohr (1971)	Unit performance output quantity	Objective performance		Other		No
	David, Pearce, & Randolph David, Pearce, & Randolph	1989 22 1989 22		Correlational Correlational	US US	Five banks in southeastern U.S0.07 Five banks in southeastern U.S0.33 0.	Interdependence 96 Interdependence	Task interdependence Task interdependence	Process Process	Team members Team members	·	Connectedness Performance	Interpersonal process Subjective performance	Relational	Team members Supervisor	social network measure for this study	Yes No
	•					Private recruiting, selection, and assessment	Cooperative outcome				•			T		•	
	De Dreu	2007 36		Correlational	Netherlands	Private recruiting, selection, and assessment	Cooperative outcome	Outcome interdependence	Mixed OI		Janssen, Van de Vliert, & Veenstra, 20	•	Transition process	Task			Yes
17	De Dreu	2007 36	8 46	Correlational	Netherlands	company 0.08 0.66 0.7 Private recruiting, selection, and assessment	7 interdependence Cooperative outcome	Outcome interdependence	Mixed OI	Team members	Janssen, Van de Vliert, & Veenstra, 20	0 Information sharing	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
17	De Dreu	2007 36	8 46	Correlational	Netherlands	company 0.26 0.66 0.9  Private recruiting, selection, and assessment	5 interdependence Cooperative outcome	Outcome interdependence	Mixed OI	Team members	Janssen, Van de Vliert, & Veenstra, 20	O Learning	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
17	De Dreu	2007 36	8 46	Correlational	Netherlands		69 interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Mixed OI	Team members	Janssen, Van de Vliert, & Veenstra, 20	0 Team effectiveness	Subjective performance		Supervisor	Hackman (1987)	No
18	De Dreu	2002 21	5 32	Correlational	Netherlands	Private selection and assessment company 0.13	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence		Team members	De Dreu & West, 2001	Yes
18	De Dreu	2002 21	5 32	Correlational	Netherlands	Private selection and assessment company 0.46	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Team reflexivity	Action process	Task	Team members	Carter & West, 1998	Yes
18	De Dreu	2002 21	5 32	Correlational	Netherlands	Private selection and assessment company -0.34	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Minority dissent	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	De Dreu & West, 2001	Yes
	De Dreu	2002 21		Correlational	Netherlands		79 Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI		Campion et al., 1993	Team effectiveness	Subjective performance		Supervisor	Hackman (1983)	No
							·							Tack			
	De Dreu	2002 21		Correlational	Netherlands	Private selection and assessment company 0.15	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Mixed OI		Van der Vegt et al. (2000)	Team reflexivity	Transition process	Task		Carter & West, 1998	Yes
18	De Dreu	2002 21	5 32	Correlational	Netherlands	Private selection and assessment company -0.11	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Mixed OI	Team members	Van der Vegt et al. (2000)	Minority dissent	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	De Dreu & West, 2001	Yes

Information system, insurance, and

18	De Dreu	2002 21	32	Correlational	Netherlands	Private selection and assessment company	0.08	0.79	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Mixed OI	Team members	Van der Vegt et al. (2000)	Team effectiveness	Subjective performance		Supervisor	Hackman (1983)	No
			<del>-</del>			,			Cooperative goal									(,	
19	De Dreu & West	2001 10	21	Correlational	Netherlands	International postal service in Netherlands	0.14		interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Mixed OI	Team members	Janssen, Van de Vliert, & Veenstra, 2	0 Task conflict	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	Jehn (1995)	Yes
19	De Dreu & West	2001 10	) 21	Correlational	Netherlands	International postal service in Netherlands	-0.13		Cooperative goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Mixed OI	Team memhers	Janssen, Van de Vliert, & Veenstra, 2	O Minority dissent	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	for this study	Yes
-13	be break a west	2001 10		Correlational	recircination	Private recruiting, selection, and assessment			meraepenaence	outcome interdependence	THINCE OF	ream members	sunssen, van de viiere, di veensta, z	or minority dissert	interpersonal process	reactional.	ream members	Janssen, Van de Vliert, &	
20	De Dreu & West	2001 20	28	Correlational	Netherlands		0.07		Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence		Team members	Veenstra, 2000	Yes
20	De Dreu & West	2001 20	28	Correlational	Netherlands	Private recruiting, selection, and assessment company	t -0.38		Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Minority dissent	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	for this study	Yes
20	De Dieu & West	2001 20	20	Correlational	Netherlands	Private recruiting, selection, and assessment			rask interdependence	rask interdependence	Wilked 11	ream members	Campion et al., 1993	Willionty dissent	interpersonal process	Relational	ream members	Tor this study	163
20	De Dreu & West	2001 20		Correlational	Netherlands	company	-0.14		Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Mixed OI		Janssen, Van de Vliert, & Veenstra, 2	·	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members		Yes
21	Fan & Gruenfeld	1998 16		Experimental	US		0.20 1	1	Reward Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation		Time to solution	Objective performance				No No
21 21	Fan & Gruenfeld Fan & Gruenfeld	1998 16 1998 16		Experimental Experimental	US US	University students University students	0.18 1 0.20 1	1	Reward Interdependence Reward Interdependence	Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence	Reward Reward	Manipulation Manipulation		Rounds completed Points earned	Objective performance Objective performance				No
21	Fan & Gruenfeld	1998 16		Experimental	US		0.23 1	1	Reward Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation		Points per round	Objective performance				No
21	Fan & Gruenfeld	1998 16		Experimental	US	The state of the s	0.32 1	1	Resource interdependence	Task interdependence	Resource	Manipulation		Time to solution	Objective performance				No
21		1998 16		Experimental	US	University students	0.25 1	1	Resource interdependence	Task interdependence	Resource	Manipulation		Rounds completed	Objective performance				No
21 21	Fan & Gruenfeld Fan & Gruenfeld	1998 16: 1998 16:		Experimental Experimental	US US	University students University students	0.28 1 0.26 1	1	Resource interdependence Resource interdependence	Task interdependence Task interdependence	Resource Resource	Manipulation Manipulation		Points earned Points per round	Objective performance Objective performance				No No
23	Goldman, Stockbauer & McAuliffe	1977 12		Experimental	US	University students	0.52 1	1	means-interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Manipulation		Performance	Objective performance				No
23	Goldman, Stockbauer & McAuliffe	1977 12	64	Experimental	US	University students	0.37 1	1	Intergroup Reward Structure	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation		Performance	Objective performance				No
24	Cordon Wolch Offrings & Katz	2000 24	) #REF!	Evnorimental	US	recruited by neuropaper add in Rocton MA	0.54 1	1	Roward Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation		Total Boints Farned	Objective performance				No
24	Gordon, Welch, Offringa & Katz	2000 24	) #NEF!	Experimental	03	recruited by newspaper ads in Boston, MA	0.54 1	1	Reward Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Rewaru	Manipulation		Total Points Earned	Objective performance				NO
24	Gordon, Welch, Offringa & Katz	2000 24	#REF!	Experimental	US	recruited by newspaper ads in Boston, MA	0.64 1		Reward Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation		Number of Goon Cars Used	Action process	Task	Other	objective	No
24 25	Gordon, Welch, Offringa & Katz Guymon	2000 24 2006 54	) #REF! 27	Experimental Experimental	US US	recruited by newspaper ads in Boston, MA U lowa Students	0.19 1 -0.13 1	1	Reward Interdependence Task interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward Process	Manipulation Manipulation		Number of Loaners Used Performance	Action process Objective performance	Task	Other		No No
25	The state of the s	2006 54	27	Experimental	US	U Iowa Students	0.09 1	-	Task interdependence	Task interdependence Task interdependence	Process	Manipulation		Group commitment	Emergent State	Relational	team members		No
26	•	2002 56	144	Correlational	US	University students	0.07	1	Team reward contingency	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	coded for this study	Team performance	Objective performance			,	No
																		draws from Hambrick, 1994;	
26	Harrison, Price, Gavin & Florey	2002 56	144	Correlational	US	University students	0.38		Team reward contingency	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	coded for this study	ColExperimentaloration	Action process	Task	team members	Campion et al., 1993; and Wageman, 1995	No
20	namson, Price, Gavin & Piorey	2002 30.	. 144	Correlational	03	University students	0.56		Team reward contingency	Outcome interdependence	Rewaru	ivianipulation	coded for this study	Colexperimentaloration	Action process	IdSK	team members	wageman, 1995	NO
27	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004 10	31	Correlational	Germany	2 large businesses in Germany	0.47		Quality of Goal Setting Processes	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Konradt et al, 2003	Valence	Emergent State	Task	Team members	Hertel, 2002	No
27	Hartal Canada & Odilania	2004 10	21	Canalational	C	3 large having seems in Correction	0.20		Ovelity of Coal Catting December	. O. too are intended and allow	Cool	T	Kannada at al. 2002	La characa de libra	Foregraph Chate	Teels	T	Hartal 2002	No
21	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004 10	31	Correlational	Germany	2 large businesses in Germany	0.39		Quality of Goal Setting Processes	outcome interdependence	Goal	ream members	Konradt et al, 2003	Instrumentality	Emergent State	Task	Team members	nertei, 2002	No
27	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004 109	31	Correlational	Germany	2 large businesses in Germany	0.55		Quality of Goal Setting Processes	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Konradt et al, 2003	Self-efficacy	Emergent State	Task	Team members	Hertel, 2002	No
2/	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004 10	31	Correlational	Germany	2 large businesses in Germany	0.71		Quality of Goal Setting Processes	Outcome interdependence	Goal	leam members	Konradt et al, 2003	Trust	Emergent State	Relational	Team members	Hertel, 2002	No
27	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004 109	31	Correlational	Germany	2 large businesses in Germany	0.42	0.82	Quality of Goal Setting Processes	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Konradt et al, 2003	Team effectiveness	Subjective performance		Other		No
27	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004 10	31	Correlational	Germany	2 large businesses in Germany	0.26	1	Quality of Goal Setting Processes	Outcome interdenendence	Goal	Team members	Konradt et al, 2003	Team based rewards	Outcome interdependence		Other	dichotomous variable derived through qualitative interviews	No
27	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004 10		Correlational	Germany	2 large businesses in Germany	-0.06	1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Supervisor	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified		Emergent State	Task			No
27						=			rusk interacpendence	rusk interacpendence	William II	Super visor	rearee a dregersen, 1551 (mounted	D Valence	Emergent state	10310	ream members	·	
	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004 10	31	Correlational	Germany	2 large businesses in Germany	0.32		Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Supervisor	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified	b Instrumentality	Emergent State	Task	Team members	Hertel, 2002	Nο
27	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004 109 2004 109		Correlational Correlational	Germany Germany	2 large businesses in Germany 2 large businesses in Germany	0.32 0.13		Task interdependence Task interdependence	Task interdependence Task interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI	Supervisor Supervisor	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified	·	Emergent State Emergent State	Task Task	Team members Team members	·	No No
27 27			31			= :			Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence			Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified	b Self-efficacy	Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State			Hertel, 2002	
	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004 10	31 31	Correlational	Germany	2 large businesses in Germany	0.13	0.82	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Supervisor	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified	b Self-efficacy b Trust	Emergent State	Task	Team members	Hertel, 2002	No
27	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004 109 2004 109	31 31 31 31	Correlational Correlational	Germany Germany	2 large businesses in Germany 2 large businesses in Germany	0.13 -0.07	0.82	Task interdependence Task interdependence	Task interdependence Task interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI	Supervisor Supervisor	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness	Emergent State Emergent State	Task	Team members Team members Other	Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002	No
27 27	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004 109 2004 109 2004 109	31 31 31 31 31 31	Correlational Correlational Correlational	Germany Germany Germany	2 large businesses in Germany 2 large businesses in Germany 2 large businesses in Germany	0.13 -0.07 0.30	0.82	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance	Task	Team members Team members Other Team members	Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Konradt et al, 2003	No No No
27 27 27	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004 109 2004 109 2004 109 2004 109	31 31 31 31 31 31 31	Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational	Germany Germany Germany Germany	2 large businesses in Germany 2 large businesses in Germany 2 large businesses in Germany 2 large businesses in Germany	0.13 -0.07 0.30 0.18	0.82	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes gh Valence	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance Outcome interdependence	Task Relational	Team members Team members Other Team members Team members	Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Konradt et al, 2003 Hertel, 2002	No No No No
27 27 27 27	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004 109 2004 109 2004 109 2004 109 2004 109	31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31	Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational	Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany	2 large businesses in Germany 2 large businesses in Germany 2 large businesses in Germany 2 large businesses in Germany 2 large businesses in Germany	0.13 -0.07 0.30 0.18 0.25	0.82	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Team based rewards	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Reward	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Manipulation	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified dichotomous variable derived throug	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes th Valence b Instrumentality	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance Outcome interdependence Emergent State	Task Relational Task	Team members Team members Other Team members Team members	Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Konradt et al, 2003 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002	No No No No No
27 27 27 27 27	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10:	31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31	Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational	Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany	2 large businesses in Germany 2 large businesses in Germany	0.13 -0.07 0.30 0.18 0.25 0.31 0.28 0.04	0.82	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Team based rewards Team based rewards	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Reward Reward	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Manipulation Manipulation	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified dichotomous variable derived throug dichotomous variable derived throug	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes sh Valence th Instrumentality sh Self-efficacy	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance Outcome interdependence Emergent State Emergent State	Task Relational Task Task	Team members Team members Other Team members Team members Team members	Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Konradt et al, 2003 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002	No No No No No
27 27 27 27 27 27 27	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10:	31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31	Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational	Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany	2 large businesses in Germany	0.13 -0.07 0.30 0.18 0.25 0.31		Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Team based rewards Team based rewards Team based rewards	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Reward Reward Reward	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified dichotomous variable derived throug dichotomous variable derived throug dichotomous variable derived throug	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes gh Valence gh instrumentality gh Self-efficacy gh Trust	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance Outcome interdependence Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State	Task Relational Task Task Task	Team members Team members Other Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members	Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Konradt et al, 2003 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002	No No No No No No No
27 27 27 27 27 27 27	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10:	31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31	Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational	Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany	2 large businesses in Germany	0.13 -0.07 0.30 0.18 0.25 0.31 0.28 0.04		Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Team based rewards Team based rewards Team based rewards Team based rewards	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Reward Reward Reward Reward	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified dichotomous variable derived throug dichotomous variable derived throug dichotomous variable derived throug dichotomous variable derived throug dichotomous variable derived throug	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes gh Valence gh instrumentality gh Self-efficacy gh Trust	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance Outcome interdependence Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State	Task Relational Task Task Task	Team members Team members Other Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members	Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Konradt et al, 2003 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	No No No No No No No
27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10:	31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 3	Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational	Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany	2 large businesses in Germany	0.13 -0.07 0.30 0.18 0.25 0.31 0.28 0.04		Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Team based rewards Team based rewards Team based rewards Team based rewards	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Reward Reward Reward Reward	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified dichotomous variable derived throug dichotomous variable derived throug dichotomous variable derived throug dichotomous variable derived throug dichotomous variable derived throug	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes sh Valence gh Instrumentality sh Self-efficacy gh Trust gh Team effectiveness	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance Outcome interdependence Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State	Task Relational Task Task Task	Team members Team members Other Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members	Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Konradt et al, 2003 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified by Liden, Wayne &	No No No No No No No
27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004 10: 2004 10:	31 31 31 32 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 32	Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational	Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany	2 large businesses in Germany	0.13 -0.07 0.30 0.18 0.25 0.31 0.28 0.04 0.46		Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Team based rewards	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified dichotomous variable derived throug dichotomous variable derived throug	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes sh Valence gh Instrumentality sh Self-efficacy gh Trust gh Team effectiveness	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance Outcome interdependence Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance	Task Relational Task Task Task	Team members Team members Other Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Other	Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Konradt et al, 2003 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified by Liden, Wayne & Bradway, 1997)	No No No No No No No No No
27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 28 29	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hartel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hirst & Yetton Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra	2004 10: 2004 10:	31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 3	Correlational	Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Unsure Netherlands	2 large businesses in Germany managers members of management teams	0.13 -0.07 0.30 0.18 0.25 0.31 0.28 0.04 0.46	0.82	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Team based rewards	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Roward	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Supervisor	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified dichotomous variable derived throug dichotomous variable derived through the control of the control	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes gh Valence gh Instrumentality gh Fefficacy gh Trust gh Team effectiveness gh Task interdependence Task Performance task conflict	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance Outcome interdependence Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance  Task interdependence Objective performance Interpersonal process	Task Relational  Task Task Task Relational	Team members Team members Other Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Other  Supervisor	Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Konradt et al, 2003 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified by Liden, Wayne & Bradway, 1997)	No No No No No No No No No No
27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004 10: 2004 10:	31 31 31 32 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 32	Correlational	Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Unsure	2 large businesses in Germany	0.13 -0.07 0.30 0.18 0.25 0.31 0.28 0.04 0.46	0.82	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Team based rewards	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified dichotomous variable derived throug	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes sh Valence sh Instrumentality sh Self-efficacy sh Trust sh Team effectiveness sh Task interdependence Task Performance	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance Outcome interdependence Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance  Task interdependence Objective performance	Task Relational Task Task Task Relational	Team members Team members Other Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Other Supervisor	Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Konradt et al, 2003 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified by Liden, Wayne & Bradway, 1997) Jehn's 1995 Jehn's 1996	No No No No No No No No No No
27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 28 29	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hartel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hirst & Yetton Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra	2004 10: 2004 10:	31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 3	Correlational	Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Unsure Netherlands	2 large businesses in Germany managers members of management teams	0.13 -0.07 0.30 0.18 0.25 0.31 0.28 0.04 0.46	0.82	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Team based rewards	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Roward	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Supervisor	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified dichotomous variable derived throug for this study	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes gh Valence gh Instrumentality gh Fefficacy gh Trust gh Team effectiveness gh Task interdependence Task Performance task conflict	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance Outcome interdependence Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance  Task interdependence Objective performance Interpersonal process	Task Relational  Task Task Task Relational	Team members Team members Other Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Other  Supervisor	Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Konradt et al, 2003 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified by Liden, Wayne & Bradway, 1997)	No No No No No No No No No No
27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 29 29	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hartel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hirst & Yetton Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra	2004 10: 2004 10:	31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 3	Correlational	Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Unsure Netherlands	2 large businesses in Germany managers in Germany Managers members of management teams members of management teams	0.13 -0.07 0.30 0.18 0.25 0.31 0.28 0.04 0.46	0.82	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Team based rewards	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Roward	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Supervisor	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified dichotomous variable derived throug for this study	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes gh Valence gh Instrumentality gh Fefficacy gh Trust gh Team effectiveness gh Task interdependence Task Performance task conflict	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance Outcome interdependence Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance  Task interdependence Objective performance Interpersonal process	Task Relational  Task Task Task Relational	Team members Team members Other Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Other  Supervisor	Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Konradt et al, 2003 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified by Liden, Wayne & Bradway, 1997)  Jehn's 1995 Jehn's 1995 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976	No No No No No No No No No No
27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 29 29	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hirst & Yetton Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra	2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10:	31 31 31 31 32 102 102	Correlational Experimental Correlational	Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Unsure Netherlands	2 large businesses in Germany managers in Germany Managers members of management teams members of management teams	0.13 -0.07 0.30 0.18 0.25 0.31 0.28 0.04 0.46 0.05 -0.61 1 0.21 -0.45	0.82	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Team based rewards	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Geward Reward Roward Roward Roward Roward	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Supervisor Supervisor	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified dichotomous variable derived throug for this study for this study	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes sh Valence sh Instrumentality sh Self-efficacy sh Trust sh Team effectiveness sh Task interdependence Task Performance task conflict Person conflict	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance Outcome interdependence Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance  Task interdependence Objective performance Interpersonal process Interpersonal process	Task Relational  Task Task Task Relational  Relational	Team members Team members Other Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Other Supervisor Supervisor	Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Konradt et al, 2003 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified by Liden, Wayne & Bradway, 1997)  Jehn's 1995 Jehn's 1996 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1976	No No No No No No No No No No
27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 28 29 29	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hirst & Yetton Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra	2004 10: 2009 64	31 31 31 32 102 102	Correlational	Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Unsure Netherlands Netherlands	2 large businesses in Germany managers members of management teams members of management teams	0.13 -0.07 0.30 0.18 0.25 0.31 0.28 0.04 0.46 0.05 -0.61 1 0.21 -0.45	0.82	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Team based rewards To still the task interdependence Positive interdependence Positive interdependence	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Goal Goal	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Supervisor Supervisor	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified dichotomous variable derived throug for this study for this study	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes sh Valence sh Instrumentality sh Self-efficacy sh Trust sh Team effectiveness  sh Task interdependence Task Performance task conflict Person conflict  Integrative Behavior	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance Outcome interdependence Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance  Task interdependence Objective performance Interpersonal process Interpersonal process	Task Relational  Task Task Task Relational  Relational  Relational	Team members Team members Other Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Other Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor	Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Konradt et al, 2003 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified by Liden, Wayne & Bradway, 1997)  Jehn's 1995 Jehn's 1995 Jehn's 1996 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert,	No No No No No No No No No No
27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 28 29 29	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hirst & Yetton Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra	2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 1999 64 1999 1999	31 31 31 31 31 31 32 102 102 102	Correlational	Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Germany Unsure Netherlands Netherlands	2 large businesses in Germany manager in Germany Managers members of management teams members of management teams members of management teams	0.13 -0.07 0.30 0.18 0.25 0.31 0.28 0.04 0.04 0.46	0.82	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Team based rewards	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Geward Reward Reward Reward Remard Reward Reward Reward Rocal	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified dichotomous variable derived throug for this study for this study	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes sh Valence sh Instrumentality sh Self-efficacy sh Trust sh Team effectiveness sh Task interdependence Task Performance task conflict Person conflict  Integrative Behavior	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance Outcome interdependence Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance  Task interdependence Objective performance Interpersonal process Interpersonal process	Task Relational  Task Task Task Relational  Relational	Team members Team members Other Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Other Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor	Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Konradt et al, 2003 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified by Liden, Wayne & Bradway, 1997) Jehn's 1995 Jehn's 1996 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976	No No No No No No No No No No
27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 28 29 29	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra	2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2009 10: 200	10 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31	Correlational	Germany Metherlands Netherlands Netherlands	2 large businesses in Germany managers members of management teams members of management teams members of management teams members of management teams	0.13 -0.07 0.30 0.18 0.25 0.31 0.28 0.04 0.46 0.05 -0.61 1 0.21 -0.45	0.82	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Team based rewards	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Goal Goal	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991) (modified dichotomous variable derived throug for this study	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes gh Valence gh Instrumentality gh Self-efficacy gh Trust gh Team effectiveness  gh Task interdependence Task Performance task conflict Person conflict  Integrative Behavior Decision quality	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance Outcome interdependence Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance  Task interdependence Objective performance Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Interpersonal process  Interpersonal process Subjective performance	Task Relational  Task Task Task Relational  Relational  Relational	Team members Team members Other Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Other  Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor	Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Konradt et al, 2003 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified by Liden, Wayne & Bradway, 1997)  Jehn's 1995 Jehn's 1996 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 for this study	No No No No No No No No No No
27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 28 29 29 29	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra	2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2009 64 1999 1999 1999	10 31 31 31 31 31 32 102 102 102 102 102	Correlational	Germany  Germany  Netherlands  Netherlands  Netherlands  Netherlands	2 large businesses in Germany 8 large businesses in Germany 9 large businesses in Germany 9 manager 9 members of management teams	0.13 -0.07 0.30 0.18 0.25 0.31 0.28 0.04 0.46 0.05 -0.61 1 0.21 -0.45	0.82	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Team based rewards Tea	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Goal Goal Goal Goal	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified dichotomous variable derived throug for this study	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes sh Valence sh Instrumentality sh Self-efficacy sh Trust sh Team effectiveness  Sh Task interdependence Task Performance task conflict Person conflict  Integrative Behavior Distributive Behavior Decision quality Affective acceptance	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance Outcome interdependence Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance  Task interdependence Objective performance Interpersonal process Interpersonal process  Interpersonal process Subjective performance Interpersonal process	Task Relational  Task Task Task Relational  Relational  Relational	Team members Team members Other Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Other  Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor	Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Konradt et al, 2003 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified by Liden, Wayne & Bradway, 1997) Jehn's 1995 Jehn's 1996 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976	No No No No No No No No No No No
27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 28 29 29	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra	2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2009 10: 200	10 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 32 102 102 102 102 102 102 105 105 115 115 115 115 115 115 115 115	Correlational	Germany Metherlands Netherlands Netherlands	2 large businesses in Germany 8 large businesses in Germany 9 managers 9 members of management teams	0.13 -0.07 0.30 0.18 0.25 0.31 0.28 0.04 0.46 0.05 -0.61 1 0.21 -0.45	0.82	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Team based rewards	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Goal Goal	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified dichotomous variable derived throug for this study for this study  for this study  for this study  for this study  for this study  daptation of van de ven, Delbecq, 8	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes sh Valence sh Instrumentality sh Self-efficacy sh Trust sh Team effectiveness  sh Task interdependence Task Performance task conflict Person conflict  Integrative Behavior Decision quality Affective acceptance sh Supervisor Report	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance Outcome interdependence Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance  Task interdependence Objective performance Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Subjective performance Interpersonal process Subjective performance	Task Relational  Task Task Task Relational  Relational  Relational	Team members Team members Other Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Other  Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor	Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Konradt et al, 2003 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified by Liden, Wayne & Bradway, 1997)  Jehn's 1995 Jehn's 1996 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 for this study	No No No No No No No No No No
27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 28 29 29 29	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra	2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 1999 64 1999 1999 1999 1999 1999 1999 1999 19	10 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31	Correlational	Germany  Netherlands  Netherlands  Netherlands  Netherlands  Netherlands  Netherlands  Netherlands  Netherlands	2 large businesses in Germany 8 large businesses in Germany 9 manager 9 members of management teams	0.13 -0.07 0.30 0.18 0.25 0.31 0.28 0.04 0.46 0.05 -0.61 1 0.21 -0.45 0.38	0.82	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Team based rewards Tea	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Goal Goal Goal Goal Goal Goal Frocess	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Team members Team members	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified dichotomous variable derived throug for this study for this study  for this study  for this study  for this study  for this study  daptation of van de ven, Delbecq, 8	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes gh Valence gh Instrumentality gh Self-efficacy gh Trust gh Team effectiveness  Task interdependence Task Performance task conflict Person conflict  Integrative Behavior Decision quality Affective acceptance & I Supervisor Report	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance Outcome interdependence Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance  Task interdependence Objective performance Interpersonal process Interpersonal process  Interpersonal process Subjective performance Interpersonal process	Task Relational  Task Task Task Relational  Relational  Relational	Team members Team members Other Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Other  Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor	Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Konradt et al, 2003 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified by Liden, Wayne & Bradway, 1997)  Jehn's 1995 Jehn's 1996 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 for this study for this study	No No No No No No No No No No
27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 28 29 29 29 29	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra	2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2009 64 1999 1999 1999 1999 1999 1999 1999 19	10 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 32 102 102 102 102 105 105 105 105 105	Correlational Experimental Correlational	Germany Metherlands Netherlands	2 large businesses in Germany members of management teams	0.13 -0.07 0.30 0.18 0.25 0.31 0.28 0.04 0.46 -0.61 1 -0.45 0.38	0.82	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Team based rewards T	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Goal Goal Goal Goal Goal Goal Frocess Process	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Team members Team members	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991) (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991) (modified dichotomous variable derived throug for this study for this study  for this study  for this study  for this study  for this study  adaptation of van de ven, Delbecq, 8	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes gh Valence gh instrumentality gh Self-efficacy gh Trust gh Team effectiveness  Task interdependence Task Performance task conflict Person conflict  Integrative Behavior Decision quality Affective acceptance k I Production Report	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance Outcome interdependence Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance  Task interdependence Objective performance Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Subjective performance Interpersonal process Subjective performance Interpersonal process Subjective performance Interpersonal process Objective performance	Task Relational  Task Task Task Relational  Relational  Relational  Relational	Team members Team members Other Team members Other  Supervisor	Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Konradt et al, 2003 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified by Liden, Wayne & Bradway, 1997)  Jehn's 1995 Jehn's 1996 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 for this study unsure	No No No No No No No No No No No No No N
27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 28 29 29 29 29 29 29	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hist & Yetton Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra Jehn Jehn	2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2009 64 1999 1999 1999 1999 1999 1999 1999 19	10 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 32 102 102 102 102 102 105 105 105 105 105 105 105 105 105 105	Correlational	Germany  Netherlands Netherlands Netherlands Netherlands Netherlands Netherlands Unsure Unsure Unsure	2 large businesses in Germany Managers members of management teams	0.13 -0.07 0.30 0.18 0.25 0.31 0.28 0.04 0.46 0.05 -0.61 1 -0.45 0.38	0.82	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Team based rewards Tea	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Goal Goal Goal Goal Goal Goal Frocess Process Process	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Team members Team members Team members	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991) (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991) (modified dichotomous variable derived throug for this study for this study  for this study  for this study  for this study  for this study  for this study  for this study  for this this study  for this study	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes sh Valence sh Instrumentality sh Self-efficacy sh Trust sh Team effectiveness  sh Task interdependence Task Performance task conflict Person conflict  Integrative Behavior  Distributive Behavior  Distributive Behavior  Distributive Behavior  Ecision quality Affective acceptance a I Supervisor Report a I Liking a Intent to remain	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance Outcome interdependence Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance  Task interdependence Objective performance Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Subjective performance Emergent State	Task Relational  Task Task Task Relational  Relational  Relational  Relational  Relational	Team members Team members Other Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Other  Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Team members	Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Konradt et al, 2003 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified by Liden, Wayne & Bradway, 1997)  Jehn's 1995 Jehn's 1995 Jehn's 1996 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 for this study unsure Kraut, 1975	No No No No No No No No No No No No No N
27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 28 29 29 29 29 29 29 30 30 30 30 30	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hists & Yetton Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra Jehn Jehn Jehn	2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2009 64: 1999 1999 1999 1999 1999 1999 1999 19	10 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 32 102 102 102 102 102 105 105 105 105 105 105 105 105 105 105	Correlational	Germany  Germany  Metherlands  Netherlands  Netherlands  Netherlands  Netherlands  Unsure Unsure Unsure Unsure	2 large businesses in Germany 8 large businesses in Germany 9 large businesses in Germany 9 manager 9 members of management teams 9 members of management te	0.13 -0.07 0.30 0.18 0.25 0.31 0.28 0.04 0.46 0.05 -0.61 1 -0.45 0.38	0.82	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Team based rewards To am based rewards Team based rewards Te	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward  Roal Goal Goal Goal Goal Goal Frocess Process Process Process	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Supervisor	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991) (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991) (modified dichotomous variable derived throug for this study for this study  for this study  for this study  for this study  for this study  for this study  for this study  for this this study  for this study	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes sh Valence sh Instrumentality sh Self-efficacy sh Trust sh Team effectiveness  sh Task interdependence Task Performance task conflict Person conflict  Integrative Behavior Decision quality Affective acceptance sk I Supervisor Report sk I Liking sk I Liking sk I Liking sk I Lintent to remain sk Degree of resolution	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance Outcome interdependence Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance  Task interdependence Objective performance Interpersonal process Interpersonal process  Interpersonal process  Subjective performance Interpersonal process  Comparison of the performance Comparison of the	Task Relational  Task Task Task Relational  Relational  Relational  Relational  Relational  Relational	Team members Team members Other Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Other  Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Team members Team members Team members	Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Konradt et al, 2003 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified by Liden, Wayne & Bradway, 1997)  Jehn's 1995 Jehn's 1996 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 for this study  unsure Kraut, 1975 for this study	No No No No No No No No No No No No No N
27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 28 29 29 29 29 29 29 29 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn	2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2005 58: 1995 58: 1995 58: 1995 58:	10 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31	Correlational	Germany  Metherlands Netherlands Netherlands Netherlands Netherlands Unsure Unsure Unsure Unsure	2 large businesses in Germany 8 large businesses in Germany 9 members of management teams 1 memb	0.13 -0.07 0.30 0.18 0.25 0.31 0.28 0.04 0.46 0.05 -0.61 1 0.21 -0.45 0.38	0.82	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Team based rewards Tea	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Remard Reward Reward Reward Process Goal Goal Goal Goal Goal Goal Frocess Process Process Process Process	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Team members	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991) (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991) (modified dichotomous variable derived throug for this study dapatation of van de ven, Delbecq, 8 adapatation of van d	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes gh Valence gh Instrumentality gh Self-efficacy gh Trust gh Team effectiveness  Task interdependence Task Performance task conflict Person conflict  Integrative Behavior  Distributive Behavior  Decision quality Affective acceptance & I Supervisor Report & I Production Report & Liking & Intent to remain & Degree of resolution & Relationship Conflict	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance Outcome interdependence Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance  Task interdependence Objective performance Interpersonal process Interpersonal process  Interpersonal process Subjective performance Interpersonal process Subjective performance Emergent State Emergent State Interpersonal process	Task Relational  Task Task Task Task Relational  Relational  Relational  Relational  Relational  Relational  Relational	Team members Team members Other Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Other Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members	Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Konradt et al, 2003 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2009 Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified by Liden, Wayne & Bradway, 1997)  Jehn's 1995 Jehn's 1996 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 for this study	No No No No No No No No No No No No No N
27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 28 29 29 29 29 29 29 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hists & Yetton Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn	2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2009 64 1999 1999 1999 1999 1999 1999 1999 19	102	Correlational	Germany  Metherlands  Netherlands  Netherlands  Netherlands  Unsure	2 large businesses in Germany 8 large businesses in Germany 9 large businesses in Germany 9 managers 9 members of management teams 9 members of management t	0.13 -0.07 0.30 0.18 0.25 0.31 0.28 0.04 0.46  0.05 -0.61 1 0.21 -0.45  0.38  0.40 0.45 0.49 -0.04 0.27 0.03 0.07 0.11 0.06 0.02	0.82	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Team based rewards Tea	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Rocas Goal Goal Goal Goal Goal Process	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Team members	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991) (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991) (modified dichotomous variable derived throug for this study for this study  for this study  for this study  for this study  for this study  adaptation of van de ven, Delbecq, 8	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes sh Valence sh Instrumentality sh Self-efficacy sh Trust sh Team effectiveness  sh Task interdependence Task Performance task conflict  Integrative Behavior  Distributive Behavior  Distributive Behavior  Distributive Behavior  El Supervisor Report al Production Report al Liking al Intent to remain al Degree of resolution al Relationship Conflict al task conflict	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance Outcome interdependence Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance  Task interdependence Objective performance Interpersonal process Interpersonal process  Interpersonal process Subjective performance Interpersonal process Subjective performance Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Subjective performance Objective performance Objective performance Emergent State Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Interpersonal process	Task Relational  Task Task Task Task Relational  Relational	Team members Team members Other Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Other  Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Team members	Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Konradt et al, 2003 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified by Liden, Wayne & Bradway, 1997)  Jehn's 1995 Jehn's 1996 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 for this study unsure Kraut, 1975 for this study for this study for this study for this study	No No No No No No No No No No No No No N
27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 28 29 29 29 29 29 29 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn	2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2009 10: 2009 56: 1999 58: 1995 58: 1995 58: 1995 58: 1995 58:	102	Correlational	Germany  Metherlands Netherlands Netherlands Netherlands Netherlands Netherlands Unsure Unsure Unsure Unsure Unsure	2 large businesses in Germany members of management teams member	0.13 -0.07 0.30 0.18 0.25 0.31 0.28 0.04 0.46  0.05 -0.61 1 0.21 -0.45  0.38  0.40 0.45 0.49 -0.04 0.27 0.03 0.07 0.03 0.07 0.01 0.11 0.06	0.82	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Team based rewards T	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Rocas Goal Goal Goal Goal Goal Goal Frocess Process Process Process Process Process Process Process	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Team members	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991) (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991) (modified dichotomous variable derived throug for this study for this study for this study for this study adaptation of van de ven, Delbecq, 8 adapta	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes sh Valence sh Instrumentality sh Self-efficacy sh Trust sh Team effectiveness  sh Task interdependence Task Performance task conflict  Integrative Behavior  Distributive Behavior  Distributive Behavior  Distributive Behavior  El Supervisor Report al Production Report al Liking al Intent to remain al Degree of resolution al Relationship Conflict al task conflict	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance Outcome interdependence Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance  Task interdependence Objective performance Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Subjective performance Interpersonal process Subjective performance Interpersonal process Subjective performance Emergent State Emergent State Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Interpersonal process	Task Relational  Task Task Task Relational	Team members Team members Other Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Other  Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Team members	Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Konradt et al, 2003 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2009 Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified by Liden, Wayne & Bradway, 1997)  Jehn's 1995 Jehn's 1996 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 for this study	No No No No No No No No No No No No No N
27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 28 29 29 29 29 29 29 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hists & Yetton Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn	2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2009 64 1999 1999 1999 1999 1999 1999 1999 19	10 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31	Correlational	Germany  Metherlands  Netherlands  Netherlands  Netherlands  Unsure	2 large businesses in Germany Managers members of management teams large freight transportation firm	0.13 -0.07 0.30 0.18 0.25 0.31 0.28 0.04 0.46  0.05 -0.61 1 0.21 -0.45  0.38  0.40 0.45 0.49 -0.04 0.27 0.03 0.07 0.11 0.06 0.02	0.82	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Team based rewards Tea	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Rocas Goal Goal Goal Goal Goal Process	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Team members	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991) (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991) (modified dichotomous variable derived throug for this study for this study  for this study  for this study  for this study  for this study  adaptation of van de ven, Delbecq, 8	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes gh Valence gh instrumentality gh Self-efficacy gh Trust gh Team effectiveness  Task interdependence Task Performance task conflict  Integrative Behavior  Distributive Behavior  Distributive Behavior Decision quality Affective acceptance & I Supervisor Report & I Liking & Intent to remain & I Degree of resolution & Relationship Conflict	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance Outcome interdependence Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance  Task interdependence Objective performance Interpersonal process Interpersonal process  Interpersonal process Subjective performance Interpersonal process Subjective performance Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Subjective performance Objective performance Objective performance Emergent State Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Interpersonal process	Task Relational  Task Task Task Task Relational  Relational	Team members Team members Other Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Other  Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Team members	Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Konradt et al, 2003 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified by Liden, Wayne & Bradway, 1997)  Jehn's 1995 Jehn's 1996 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 for this study for this study unsure Kraut, 1975 for this study for this study for this study for this study Based on Cosier & Dalton (1990)	No No No No No No No No No No No No No N
27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 28 29 29 29 29 29 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn	2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2005 58: 1999 1999 1999 1999 1999 58: 1995 58: 1995 58: 1995 58: 1995 58: 1995 58: 1995 58:	10 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31	Correlational	Germany Netherlands Netherlands Netherlands Netherlands Netherlands Unsure	2 large businesses in Germany 3 large businesses in Germany 4 large businesses in Germany 5 large businesses in Germany 6 large businesses in Germany 7 large businesses in Germany 8 large businesses in Germany 8 large businesses in Germany 9 larg	0.13 -0.07 0.30 0.18 0.25 0.31 0.28 0.04 0.46  0.05 -0.61 1 0.21 -0.45 0.38  0.40 0.45 0.49 0.49 0.27 0.03 0.07 0.01 0.06 0.02 0.12 0.05	0.82	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Team based rewards T	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Rocal Goal Goal Goal Goal Frocess Process	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Team members	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991) (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991) (modified dichotomous variable derived throug for this study adaptation of van de ven, Delbecq, 8 adaptation of va	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes gh Valence gh Instrumentality gh Self-efficacy gh Trust gh Team effectiveness  Task Performance task conflict Person conflict  Integrative Behavior Desision quality Affective acceptance k I Supervisor Report k I Production Report k I Ilking k I Integrative Desiration k I Cepter of resolution k I Relationship Conflict k I Conflict norms	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance Outcome interdependence Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance  Task interdependence Objective performance Interpersonal process Interpersonal process  Interpersonal process Subjective performance Interpersonal process Subjective performance Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Interpersonal process	Task Relational  Task Task Task Relational	Team members Team members Other Team members Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Team members	Hertel, 2002 Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified by Liden, Wayne & Bradway, 1997)  Jehn's 1995 Jehn's 1996 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 for this study for this study unsure Kraut, 1975 for this study for this study for this study for this study Based on Cosier & Dalton (1990)	No No No No No No No No No No No No No N
27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 28 29 29 29 29 29 29 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hista & Yetton Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn	2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2005 58: 1995 58: 1995 58: 1995 58: 1995 58:	10 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31	Correlational	Germany  Metherlands Netherlands Netherlands Netherlands Netherlands Unsure	2 large businesses in Germany Managers members of management teams large freight transportation firm	0.13 -0.07 0.30 0.18 0.25 0.31 0.28 0.04 0.46  0.05 -0.61 1 0.21 -0.45  0.38  0.40 0.45 0.49 -0.04 0.27 0.03 0.07 0.11 0.06 0.02  0.12	0.82	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Team based rewards Tea	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Rocal Goal Goal Goal Goal Goal Frocess Process	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Team members	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991) (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991) (modified dichotomous variable derived throug for this study for this study  for this study  for this study  for this study  for this study  for this study  adaptation of van de ven, Delbecq, 8 adaptation of van de ven, Del	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes gh Valence gh Instrumentality gh Self-efficacy gh Trust gh Team effectiveness  Task Performance task conflict Person conflict  Integrative Behavior Desision quality Affective acceptance k I Supervisor Report k I Production Report k I Ilking k I Integrative Desiration k I Cepter of resolution k I Relationship Conflict k I Conflict norms	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance Outcome interdependence Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance  Task interdependence Objective performance Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Subjective performance Interpersonal process Subjective performance Interpersonal process Subjective performance Emergent State Emergent State Interpersonal process	Task Relational  Task Task Task Task Relational	Team members Team members Other Team members Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Team members	Hertel, 2002 Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified by Liden, Wayne & Bradway, 1997)  Jehn's 1995 Jehn's 1996 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 for this study for this study unsure Kraut, 1975 for this study for this study for this study Based on Cosier & Dalton (1990) Jehn, 1995	No No No No No No No No No No No No No N
27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 28 29 29 29 29 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 31	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hirts & Yetton Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn	2004 10: 200	102	Correlational	Germany  Metherlands  Netherlands  Netherlands  Netherlands  Netherlands  Unsure	2 large businesses in Germany 3 large businesses in Germany 4 large businesses in Germany 5 large businesses in Germany 6 managers 8 members of management teams 8 members of management teams 9 members of management t	0.13 -0.07 0.30 0.18 0.25 0.31 0.28 0.04 0.46  0.05 -0.61 1 0.21 -0.45 0.38  0.40 0.45 0.49 0.49 0.27 0.03 0.07 0.01 0.06 0.02 0.12 0.05	0.82	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Team based rewards Task interdependence Positive interdependence Positive interdependence Positive interdependence Positive interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Rocas Goal Goal Goal Goal Goal Frocess Process	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Team members	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991) (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991) (modified dichotomous variable derived throug for this study for this study  for this study  for this study  for this study  for this study  adaptation of van de ven, Delbecq, 8 adaptati	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes gh Valence gh Instrumentality gh Self-efficacy gh Trust gh Team effectiveness  Task interdependence Task Performance task conflict  Integrative Behavior Distributive Behavior Decision quality Affective acceptance k   Supervisor Report k   Liking k   Intent to remain k   Legree of resolution k   Relationship Conflict k   Conflict norms Relationship Conflict	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance Outcome interdependence Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance  Task interdependence Objective performance Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Subjective performance Interpersonal process Subjective performance Interpersonal process Subjective performance Emergent State Emergent State Interpersonal process	Task Relational  Task Task Task Task Relational	Team members Team members Other Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Other  Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor  Team members	Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Konradt et al, 2003 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified by Liden, Wayne & Bradway, 1997)  Jehn's 1995 Jehn's 1996 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 for this study Based on Cosier & Dalton (1990) Jehn, 1995 Shah & Jehn, 1993	No No No No No No No No No No No No No N
27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 28 29 29 29 29 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 31	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn	2004 10: 200	102	Correlational	Germany Netherlands Netherlands Netherlands Netherlands Netherlands Unsure	2 large businesses in Germany Managers members of management teams large freight transportation firm	0.13 -0.07 0.30 0.18 0.25 0.31 0.28 0.04 0.46 0.05 -0.61 0.21 -0.45 0.38 0.40 0.45 0.49 -0.04 0.27 0.03 0.07 0.11 0.12 0.06 0.02 0.12 0.05	0.82	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Team based rewards T	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Rocal Goal Goal Goal Goal Frocess Process	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Team members	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991) (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991) (modified dichotomous variable derived throug for this study adaptation of van de ven, Delbecq, 8 adaptation of va	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes gh Valence gh Instrumentality gh Self-efficacy gh Trust gh Team effectiveness  Task interdependence Task Performance task conflict  Integrative Behavior Distributive Behavior Decision quality Affective acceptance k   Supervisor Report k   Liking k   Intent to remain k   Legree of resolution k   Relationship Conflict k   Conflict norms Relationship Conflict	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance Outcome interdependence Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance  Task interdependence Objective performance Interpersonal process Interpersonal process  Interpersonal process Subjective performance Interpersonal process Subjective performance Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Interpersonal process	Task Relational  Task Task Task Relational	Team members Team members Other Team members Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Team members	Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Konradt et al, 2003 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Hertel, 2002 Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified by Liden, Wayne & Bradway, 1997)  Jehn's 1995 Jehn's 1996 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 for this study Based on Cosier & Dalton (1990) Jehn, 1995 Shah & Jehn, 1993	No No No No No No No No No No No No No N
27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 28 29 29 29 29 29 30 30 30 30 30 30 31 31	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Hirts & Yetton Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn	2004 10: 200	10 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31	Correlational	Germany  Metherlands  Netherlands  Netherlands  Netherlands  Netherlands  Unsure	2 large businesses in Germany Managers members of management teams large freight transportation firm	0.13 -0.07 0.30 0.18 0.25 0.31 0.28 0.04 0.46 0.05 -0.61 0.21 -0.45 0.38 0.40 0.45 0.49 -0.04 0.27 0.03 0.07 0.11 0.12 0.06 0.02 0.12 0.05	0.82	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Team based rewards Task interdependence Positive interdependence Positive interdependence Positive interdependence Positive interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Rocas Goal Goal Goal Goal Goal Frocess Process	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Supervisor Team members	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991) (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991) (modified dichotomous variable derived throug for this study for this study  for this study  for this study  for this study  for this study  adaptation of van de ven, Delbecq, 8 adaptati	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes gh Valence gh Instrumentality gh Self-efficacy gh Trust gh Team effectiveness  Task interdependence Task Performance task conflict Person conflict  Integrative Behavior  Distributive Behavior  Distributive Behavior  Distributive Behavior  Liking Lisupervisor Report Liking Lintent to remain Libegree of resolution Relationship Conflict Litask conflict Conflict norms Relationship Conflict Liconflict norms Relationship Conflict Listsk conflict	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance Outcome interdependence Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance  Task interdependence Objective performance Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Subjective performance Interpersonal process Subjective performance Interpersonal process Subjective performance Emergent State Emergent State Interpersonal process	Task Relational  Task Task Task Task Relational	Team members Team members Other Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Team members Other  Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor  Team members	Hertel, 2002 Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified by Liden, Wayne & Bradway, 1997)  Jehn's 1995 Jehn's 1996 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 for this study for this study  unsure Kraut, 1975 for this study for this study for this study Based on Cosier & Dalton (1990) Jehn, 1995 Shah & Jehn, 1993  Jehn, 1995 adaptation of O'Reilly &	No No No No No No No No No No No No No N
27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 28 29 29 29 29 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 31 31	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn Jehn	2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2004 10: 2005 58: 1995 58: 1995 58: 1995 58: 1995 58: 1995 58: 1995 58: 1995 58: 1995 58: 1995 48: 1999 48:	102	Correlational Experimental Correlational	Germany Netherlands Netherlands Netherlands Netherlands Netherlands Unsure	2 large businesses in Germany Managers members of management teams members of management in teams members of management teams large freight transportation firm singe freight transportation firm top 3 firms in the household goods moving industry - various functions top 3 firms in the household goods moving industry - various functions top 3 firms in the household goods moving industry - various functions top 3 firms in the household goods moving industry - various functions	0.13 -0.07 0.30 0.18 0.25 0.31 0.28 0.04 0.46  0.05 -0.61 1 0.21 -0.45  0.38  0.40 0.45 0.49 -0.04 0.27 0.03 0.07 0.01 0.06 0.02 0.12 0.05 0.07	0.82	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Team based rewards T	Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Mixed TI Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Reward Rocal Goal Goal Goal Goal Goal Frocess Process	Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Manipulation Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Team members	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991) (modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991) (modified dichotomous variable derived throug for this study adaptation of van de ven, Delbecq, 8 adaptation	b Self-efficacy b Trust b Team effectiveness b Quality of Goal Setting Processes sh Valence sh Instrumentality sh Self-efficacy sh Trust sh Team effectiveness  Task interdependence Task Performance task conflict Integrative Behavior Distributive Behavior Distributive Behavior Decision quality Affective acceptance k I Supervisor Report k I Liking k Intent to remain k I Degree of resolution k I Relationship Conflict k I Conflict norms Relationship Conflict sh Task conflict c task conflict	Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance Outcome interdependence Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Subjective performance  Task interdependence Objective performance Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Subjective performance Interpersonal process Subjective performance Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Interpersonal process	Task Relational  Task Task Task Relational	Team members Team members Other Team members Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Supervisor Team members	Hertel, 2002 Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified by Liden, Wayne & Bradway, 1997)  Jehn's 1995 Jehn's 1996 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976 for this study Based on Cosier & Dalton (1990) Jehn, 1995 Shah & Jehn, 1993 Jehn, 1995 adaptation of O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986	No No No No No No No No No No No No No N

	Jehn, Northcraft & Neale	1999 485	92	Correlational	Unsure	top 3 firms in the household goods moving industry - various functions		8 Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	van de ven, Delbecq, & Koenig, 1976	Percieved performance	Subjective performance		Team members	for this study	Yes
31	Jenn, Northcraft & Neale	1999 403	92	Correlational	Offsure	top 3 firms in the household goods moving		io Task interdependence	rask interdependence	Process	realli illellibers	van de ven, Deibecq, & Roenig, 1970	rercieved performance	Subjective performance		realli illellibers	ioi tiiis study	res
31	Jehn, Northcraft & Neale	1999 485	92	Correlational	Unsure	industry - various functions top 3 firms in the household goods moving	-0.01 1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	van de ven, Delbecq, & Koenig, 1976	Actual group performance	Objective performance		Other		No
31	Jehn, Northcraft & Neale	1999 485	92	Correlational	Unsure	industry - various functions		8 Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	van de ven, Delbecq, & Koenig, 1976	Group Efficiency	Subjective performance		Supervisor	for this study	No
32	Johnson, Hollenbeck, Humphrey, Ilgen, Jundt, & Meyer	2006 320	80	Experimental	US	University students	-0.25 1 1	Reward Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	TIME 1	Time 1 Speed	Objective performance				No
32	Johnson, Hollenbeck, Humphrey, Ilgen, Jundt, & Meyer	2006 320	90	Experimental	US	University students	0.33 1 1	Reward Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	TIME 1	Time 1 Accuracy	Objective performance				No
32	Johnson, Hollenbeck, Humphrey, Ilgen,	2000 320	80	Experimental	03	University students	0.55 1 1	kewara interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	ivianipulation	THAT I	Time 1 Accuracy	Objective performance				NO
32	Jundt, & Meyer Johnson, Hollenbeck, Humphrey, Ilgen,	2006 320	80	Experimental	US	University students	0.61 1 1	Reward Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	TIME 1	Time 1 Information Sharing	Action process	Task			No
32	Jundt, & Meyer	2006 320	80	Experimental	US	University students	-0.12 1 1	Reward Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Time 2	Time 2 Speed	Objective performance				No
32	Johnson, Hollenbeck, Humphrey, Ilgen, Jundt, & Meyer	2006 320	80	Experimental	US	University students	0.09 1 1	Reward Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Time 2	Time 2 Accuracy	Objective performance				No
	Johnson, Hollenbeck, Humphrey, Ilgen,	2006 220	00				0.62 4 4	Para distribution de con			•	T' 2			Toda			N.
32 33	Jundt, & Meyer Katz-Navon & Erez	2006 320 2005 120	80 40	Experimental Experimental	US Unsure	University students University students	0.62 1 1 0.58 1 1	Reward Interdependence Task interdependence	Outcome interdependence Task interdependence		Manipulation Manipulation	Time 2	Time 2 Information Sharing Number of completed assessments (spe	Action process e Objective performance	Task			No No
34	Kirkman & Shapiro	2000 618	57	Correlational	US	line-level employees of a Fortune 50 insurance company	0.15	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Team commitment	Emergent State	Relational	Team members	Kirkman & Rosen, 1999	Yes
	Langfred	2000 255	25	Correlational	US	large technology firm		8 Task interdependence	Task interdependence		Other	adapted from Shanley & Langfred, 19		Subjective performance	Relational	Supervisor	Shanley & Langfred, 1998	No
						2 midwestern facilities of a manufacturer o	ıf											
36	Langfred	2005	89	Correlational	US	personal care and household products	-0.13 0.88 1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Kiggundu, 1983	Team performance	Objective performance				No
37	Langfred	2007 140	35	Correlational	US	University students	0.24 0.69 0.		Task interdependence		Team members		task conflict	Interpersonal process	Relational	team members		Yes
	Langfred	2007 140	35	Correlational	US	University students	0.34 0.69 0.		Task interdependence			Kiggundu, 1983	Relationship Conflict	Interpersonal process	Relational		Jehn, 1995	Yes
	Langfred	2007 140	35	Correlational	US	University students	0.59 0.69 0.	· ·	Task interdependence			Kiggundu, 1983	trust	Emergent State	Relational	team members	Simons & Peterson, 2000	Yes
	Langfred	2007 140	35	Correlational	US	University students	0.02 1	TIME 2 Task Interdependence	Task interdependence			Kiggundu, 1983	Performance	Objective performance				No
	· ·	2007 140	35	Correlational	US	University students	0.62 0.69 0.		Task interdependence		Team members		task conflict	Interpersonal process	Relational	team members		Yes
	Langfred	2007 140	35	Correlational	US	University students	0.68 0.69 0.		Task interdependence			Kiggundu, 1983	Relationship Conflict	Interpersonal process	Relational	team members	Jehn, 1995	Yes
	Langfred	2007 140	35	Correlational	US	University students	0.81 0.69 0.	· ·	Task interdependence			Kiggundu, 1983	trust	Emergent State	Relational	team members	Simons & Peterson, 2000	Yes No
	Langfred Liden, Erdogan, Wayne & Sparrowe	2007 140 2006 834	35 129	Correlational Correlational	US US	University students ee's of 6 orgs located in the midwest	0.19 1	TIME 3 Task Interdependence Task interdependence	Task interdependence Task interdependence			Kiggundu, 1983 Pearce & Greggersen, 1991	Performance Group Performance	Objective performance Subjective performance		Supervisor	for this study	No
36	Elderi, Erdogari, Wayne & Sparrowe	2000 834	123	Correlational	03	-	0.05 0.52 0.	7 Task Interdependence	rask interdependence	Wilkeu II	realli illellibers	realte & dieggeiseil, 1991	Group Performance	Subjective performance		Super visor	Tor this study	140
20	Lides Warre & Danderson	1007	77	Connelational	uc	managers at a large service organization	0.24	IO Took intended	Tools introduced and	Mairing TI	Companience		Carrie and annual and	Cubination neuforman		Communication	for this stand.	V
39	Liden, Wayne & Bradway	1997	77 23	Correlational	US	and a large manufacturing organization		8 Task interdependence	Task interdependence		Supervisor	modified Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	• •	Subjective performance	Teels	Supervisor	for this study	Yes
40	Liden, Wayne, Jaworski & Bennett	2004 168	23	Correlational	US	2 large orgs engaged in global ops	0.05	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	ream members	Pearce & Greggersen, 1991	perceived social loafing	Action process	Task	Team members	George, 1992	No
40	Liden, Wayne, Jaworski & Bennett	2004 168	23	Correlational	US	2 large orgs engaged in global ops	-0.22	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Toom mombors	Pearce & Greggersen, 1991	OCB	Action process	Task	Supervisor	Wayne, Shore and Liden, 1997	' No
40	Liden, Wayne, Jaworski & Bennett	2004 168	23	Correlational	US	2 large orgs engaged in global ops		9 Task interdependence	Task interdependence			Pearce & Greggersen, 1991	Performance	Subjective performance	103K	Supervisor	for this study	No
40	Lidell, Waylie, Jaworski & Berliett	2004 108	23	Correlational	03	2 large orgs engaged in global ops	0.08 0.	13 Task interdependence	rask interdependence	Wilked 11	realli illellibers	rearce & dreggersen, 1991	renormance	Subjective performance		Super visor	O'Reilly, Caldwell and Barnett	NO
40	Liden, Wayne, Jaworski & Bennett	2004 168	23	Correlational	US	2 large orgs engaged in global ops	0.03 0.	9 Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Pearce & Greggersen, 1991	Cohesiveness	Emergent State	Relational	Team members	· ·	Yes
41	Liyan	2005 321	107	Correlational	China	financial companies in mainland China	0.34 0.	8 Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Chen & Tjosvold (2004)	Departmental Effectiveness	Subjective performance		Supervisor	Chen, Tjosvold and Wang (2004	4) No
											_							
41	Liyan	2005 321	107	Correlational	China	financial companies in mainland China	0.40 0.	8 Reward Interdependence	Reward interdependence	Reward	leam members	Tjosvold (1998)	Departmental Effectiveness	Subjective performance		Supervisor	Chen, Tjosvold and Wang (2004	i) No
41	Liyan	2005 321	107	Correlational	China	financial companies in mainland China	0.13 0.	8 Goal Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Alper, Tjosvold, & Law, 1998; Tjosvol	d Denartmental Effectiveness	Subjective performance		Supervisor	Chen, Tjosvold and Wang (2004	4) No
	Loughry	2008 598	67	Correlational	US	theme park work units	0.14	Task interdependence	Task interdependence		Supervisor	Mohr, 1971; Pearce & Gregersen, 199		Emergent State	Relational		Mullen & Cooper, 1994	No.
	Loughry	2008 598	67	Correlational	US	theme park work units	-0.13	Task interdependence	Task interdependence		Supervisor	Mohr, 1971; Pearce & Gregersen, 199		Action process	Task	Team members		No
	Loughry	2008 598	67	Correlational	US	theme park work units	-0.07	Task interdependence	Task interdependence		Supervisor	Mohr, 1971; Pearce & Gregersen, 199		Action process	Task	Team members	•	No
	Loughry	2008 598	67	Correlational	US	theme park work units		1 Task interdependence	Task interdependence		Supervisor	Mohr, 1971; Pearce & Gregersen, 199		Subjective performance	Tusk	Team members	·	No
												, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,					Guzzo, Yost, Campbell, & Shea,	
					China	Software company in Beijing	0.50	Goal Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998	Group Potency	Emergent State	Task	Team members	1993	Yes
43	Lu, Tjosvold &Shi	2010 146	13	Correlational						Goal		Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998	Creative Strategy	Tanadition			Denison et al., 1996	Yes
	Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Lu, Tjosvold &Shi	2010 146 2010 146	13 13	Correlational Correlational	China	Software company in Beijing	0.38	Goal Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Guai	Team members			Transition process	Task	Team members		de
	· · · ·				China	Software company in Beijing	0.38	Goal Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	leam members		<i>5,</i>	Transition process		Team members	van der Vegt, Emans, and van de	
43	· · · ·				China	Software company in Beijing  Software company in Beijing	0.38 0.47 0.	·	Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence			Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998	Group Performance	Subjective performance		Team members Team members	Vliert, 2000	Yes
43	Lu, Tjosvold &Shi	2010 146		Correlational				·						·				Yes
43 43	Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Lu, Tjosvold &Shi	<ul><li>2010 146</li><li>2010 146</li></ul>	13 13	Correlational	China	Software company in Beijing	0.47 0.	Goal Interdependence		Goal	Team members	Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998	Group Performance	Subjective performance	Task	Team members	Vliert, 2000 developed from Tjosvold, 1998 and Tjosvold, Wedley, &	Yes
43 43	Lu, Tjosvold &Shi	2010 146	13 13	Correlational Correlational	China			·	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998		·		Team members	Vliert, 2000 developed from Tjosvold, 1998	Yes
43 43	Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Lu, Tjosvold &Shi	<ul><li>2010 146</li><li>2010 146</li></ul>	13 13	Correlational Correlational	China	Software company in Beijing  Software company in Beijing	0.47 0.	Goal Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998	Group Performance	Subjective performance	Task	Team members	Vliert, 2000 developed from Tjosvold, 1998 and Tjosvold, Wedley, &	Yes 3 Yes
43 43 43	Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Lu, Tjosvold &Shi	<ul><li>2010 146</li><li>2010 146</li></ul>	13 13	Correlational Correlational	China	Software company in Beijing  Software company in Beijing Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi-	0.47 0.	Goal Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members Team members	Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998	Group Performance  Constructive controversy	Subjective performance	Task	Team members	Vliert, 2000 developed from Tjosvold, 1998 and Tjosvold, Wedley, & Correlational, 1986	Yes 3 Yes
43 43 43	Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Lu, Tjosvold &Shi	<ul><li>2010 146</li><li>2010 146</li><li>2010 146</li></ul>	13 13	Correlational  Correlational	China	Software company in Beijing  Software company in Beijing  Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi- product firm, and one privately owned	0.47 0.	Goal Interdependence Goal Interdependence	Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members Team members	Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998	Group Performance  Constructive controversy	Subjective performance Interpersonal process	Task	Team members Team members	Vliert, 2000 developed from Tjosvold, 1998 and Tjosvold, Wedley, & Correlational, 1986 modified Van de Ven and Ferry,	Yes 3 Yes
43 43 43	Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Magjuka & Baldwin	<ul><li>2010 146</li><li>2010 146</li><li>2010 146</li><li>1991</li></ul>	13 13 13 72	Correlational  Correlational  Correlational	China China US	Software company in Beijing  Software company in Beijing  Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi- product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools  Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi- product firm, and one privately owned	0.47 0. 0.50 -0.04	Goal Interdependence  Goal Interdependence  Financial Rewards	Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence	Goal Goal Reward	Team members Team members Manipulation	Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  % of salary received by a team in the	Group Performance  Constructive controversy  I: Effectiveness	Subjective performance Interpersonal process subjective performance	Task Relational	Team members Team members Other	Vliert, 2000 developed from Tjosvold, 1998 and Tjosvold, Wedley, & Correlational, 1986 modified Van de Ven and Ferry, 1980	Yes 3 Yes No
43 43 43	Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Lu, Tjosvold &Shi	<ul><li>2010 146</li><li>2010 146</li><li>2010 146</li></ul>	13 13	Correlational  Correlational	China	Software company in Beijing  Software company in Beijing Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi- product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi-	0.47 0.	Goal Interdependence Goal Interdependence	Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence	Goal Goal Reward	Team members Team members Manipulation	Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998	Group Performance  Constructive controversy  I: Effectiveness	Subjective performance Interpersonal process	Task	Team members Team members	Vliert, 2000 developed from Tjosvold, 1998 and Tjosvold, Wedley, & Correlational, 1986 modified Van de Ven and Ferry,	Yes 3 Yes
43 43 43 44	Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Magjuka & Baldwin	2010 146 2010 146 2010 146 1991	13 13 13 72	Correlational  Correlational  Correlational	China China US	Software company in Beijing  Software company in Beijing  Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi- product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools  Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi- product firm, and one privately owned	0.47 0. 0.50 -0.04	Goal Interdependence  Goal Interdependence  Financial Rewards	Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence	Goal Goal Reward Reward	Team members Team members Manipulation	Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  % of salary received by a team in the  % of salary received by a team in the	Group Performance  Constructive controversy  I: Effectiveness	Subjective performance Interpersonal process subjective performance	Task Relational	Team members Team members Other Supervisor	Vliert, 2000 developed from Tjosvold, 1998 and Tjosvold, Wedley, & Correlational, 1986 modified Van de Ven and Ferry, 1980	Yes  Yes  You  No
43 43 43 44 44 45	Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Magjuka & Baldwin Magjuka & Baldwin Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy	2010 146 2010 146 2010 146 1991 1991 2007 398	13 13 13 72 72 94	Correlational  Correlational  Correlational  Correlational  Correlational	China US US Canada	Software company in Beijing Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi- product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi- product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools customer service technicians	0.47	Goal Interdependence  Goal Interdependence  Financial Rewards  Financial Rewards  Team interdependence	Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence	Goal  Goal  Reward  Reward  Mixed TI	Team members Team members Manipulation Manipulation Team members	Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  % of salary received by a team in the  % of salary received by a team in the  for this study	Group Performance  Constructive controversy  I: Effectiveness  I: Information Access  Team Process	Subjective performance Interpersonal process subjective performance Action process Overall process	Task Relational	Team members Team members Other Supervisor	Vliert, 2000 developed from Tjosvold, 1998 and Tjosvold, Wedley, & Correlational, 1986 modified Van de Ven and Ferry, 1980 for this study	Yes  Yes  No  No  Yes
43 43 43 44 44 45 45	Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Magjuka & Baldwin Magjuka & Baldwin Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy	2010 146 2010 146 2010 146 1991 1991 2007 398 2007 398	13 13 13 72 72 94 94	Correlational  Correlational  Correlational  Correlational  Correlational  Correlational	China US US Canada Canada	Software company in Beijing  Software company in Beijing Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi-product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi-product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools customer service technicians customer service technicians	0.47 0.50 -0.04 -0.21 0.27 0.72 0.32 0.72 1	Goal Interdependence  Goal Interdependence  Financial Rewards  Financial Rewards  Team interdependence  Team interdependence	Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence	Goal  Goal  Reward  Reward  Mixed TI  Mixed TI	Team members Team members Manipulation Manipulation Team members Team members	Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  % of salary received by a team in the  % of salary received by a team in the  for this study	Group Performance  Constructive controversy  I: Effectiveness  I: Information Access  Team Process  Team performance	Subjective performance Interpersonal process subjective performance Action process Overall process Objective performance	Task Relational	Team members Team members Other Supervisor	Vliert, 2000 developed from Tjosvold, 1998 and Tjosvold, Wedley, & Correlational, 1986 modified Van de Ven and Ferry, 1980 for this study	Yes  Yes  Yes  No  No  No  No  No  No  No
43 43 43 44 44 45 45 46	Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Magjuka & Baldwin Magjuka & Baldwin Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy Miller & Hamblin	2010 146 2010 146 2010 146 1991 1991 2007 398 2007 398 1963 90	13 13 13 72 72 94 94 30	Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Experimental	China US US Canada Canada US	Software company in Beijing  Software company in Beijing Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi- product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi- product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools  customer service technicians  Customer service technicians  University students	0.47 0.50 -0.50 -0.04 -0.21 -0.27 0.72 0.32 0.72 1 0.37 1 1	Goal Interdependence  Goal Interdependence  Financial Rewards  Financial Rewards  Team interdependence  Team interdependence  Differential Rewarding	Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence	Goal  Reward  Reward  Mixed TI  Reward	Team members  Team members  Manipulation  Manipulation  Team members  Team members  Manipulation	Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  % of salary received by a team in the  % of salary received by a team in the  for this study	Group Performance  Constructive controversy  I: Effectiveness  I: Information Access  Team Process  Team performance  Productivity	Subjective performance  Interpersonal process  subjective performance  Action process  Overall process  Objective performance Objective performance	Task Relational Task	Team members  Team members  Other  Supervisor team members	Vliert, 2000 developed from Tjosvold, 1998 and Tjosvold, Wedley, & Correlational, 1986 modified Van de Ven and Ferry, 1980 for this study correspond to Mark et al, 2001	Yes  Yes  Yes  No  No  No  No No No
43 43 43 44 44 45 45 46 47	Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Magjuka & Baldwin Magjuka & Baldwin Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy Miller & Hamblin Mitchell & Silver	2010 146 2010 146 2010 146 1991 1991 2007 398 2007 398 1963 90 1990 96	13 13 13 72 72 94 94 30 #REF!	Correlational  Correlational  Correlational  Correlational  Correlational  Correlational  Experimental  Experimental	China US US Canada Canada US US	Software company in Beijing Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi- product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi- product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools customer service technicians Customer service technicians University students University students	0.47 0.50  -0.04  -0.21  0.27 0.72  0.32 0.72 1  0.37 1 1  0.18 1	Goal Interdependence  Goal Interdependence  Financial Rewards  Financial Rewards  Team interdependence  Team interdependence  Differential Rewarding Goal Interdependence	Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence	Goal  Reward  Reward  Mixed TI  Mixed TI  Reward  Goal	Team members  Team members  Manipulation  Manipulation  Team members  Team members  Manipulation  Manipulation	Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  % of salary received by a team in the  % of salary received by a team in the  for this study	Group Performance  Constructive controversy  I: Effectiveness  I: Information Access  Team Process  Team performance  Productivity  Goal commitment	Subjective performance Interpersonal process subjective performance Action process Overall process Objective performance Objective performance Emergent State	Task  Relational  Task  Relational	Team members  Other  Supervisor team members  team members	Vliert, 2000 developed from Tjosvold, 1998 and Tjosvold, Wedley, & Correlational, 1986 modified Van de Ven and Ferry, 1980  for this study correspond to Mark et al, 2001	Yes  Yes  Yes  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  N
43 43 43 44 44 45 45 46 47 47	Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Magjuka & Baldwin Magjuka & Baldwin Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy Miller & Hamblin Mitchell & Silver Mitchell & Silver	2010 146  2010 146  2010 146  1991  1991  2007 398 1963 90 1990 96 1990 96	13 13 13 72 72 94 94 30 #REF!	Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Experimental Experimental Experimental	China US US Canada Canada US US US	Software company in Beijing  Software company in Beijing Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi- product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi- product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools  customer service technicians  Customer service technicians  University students  University students  University students	0.47 0.50  -0.04  -0.21  0.27 0.72  0.32 0.72 1  0.37 1 1  0.18 1  0.01 1	Goal Interdependence  Financial Rewards  Financial Rewards  Team interdependence  Team interdependence Differential Rewarding Goal Interdependence Goal Interdependence	Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence	Goal  Reward  Reward  Mixed TI  Reward  Goal  Goal	Team members  Team members  Manipulation  Manipulation  Team members  Team members  Manipulation  Manipulation  Manipulation	Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  % of salary received by a team in the  % of salary received by a team in the  for this study	Group Performance  Constructive controversy  I: Effectiveness  I: Information Access  Team Process  Team performance Productivity Goal commitment Goal Acceptance	Subjective performance Interpersonal process subjective performance Action process Overall process Objective performance Objective performance Emergent State Interpersonal process	Task  Relational  Task  Relational Relational	Team members  Other  Supervisor team members  team members	Vliert, 2000 developed from Tjosvold, 1998 and Tjosvold, Wedley, & Correlational, 1986 modified Van de Ven and Ferry, 1980  for this study correspond to Mark et al, 2001  for this study for this study	Yes  Yes  Yes  No  No  L  Yes  No  No  No  No  No  No  No
43 43 44 44 45 45 46 47 47 48	Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Lu, Tjosvold &Shi Magjuka & Baldwin Magjuka & Baldwin Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy Miller & Hamblin Mitchell & Silver Moye & Langfred	2010 146  2010 146  2010 146  1991  1991  2007 398  2007 398 1963 90 1990 96 2004 104	13 13 13 72 72 94 94 30 #REF! #REF! 38	Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Experimental Experimental Experimental Correlational	China US US Canada Canada US US US Mixed	Software company in Beijing  Software company in Beijing Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi- product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi- product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools  customer service technicians  Cuiversity students University students University students University students MBA students	0.47 0.50 -0.50 -0.04 -0.21 0.27 0.72 0.32 0.72 1 0.37 1 1 0.18 1 0.01 1 0.23	Goal Interdependence  Goal Interdependence  Financial Rewards  Financial Rewards  Team interdependence  Team interdependence  Differential Rewarding  Goal Interdependence  Goal Interdependence  Task interdependence	Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence	Goal  Reward  Reward  Mixed TI  Mixed TI  Reward  Goal  Goal  Process	Team members  Team members  Manipulation  Manipulation  Team members  Team members  Manipulation  Manipulation  Manipulation  Team members	Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  of salary received by a team in the salary received by a team in the for this study  for this study  Kiggundu, 1983	Group Performance  Constructive controversy  I: Effectiveness  I: Information Access  Team Process  Team performance Productivity Goal commitment Goal Acceptance task conflict	Subjective performance  Interpersonal process  subjective performance  Action process  Overall process  Objective performance Defective performance Emergent State Interpersonal process Interpersonal process	Task  Relational  Task  Relational Relational Relational	Team members  Other  Supervisor team members  team members team members team members team members	Vliert, 2000 developed from Tjosvold, 1998 and Tjosvold, Wedley, & Correlational, 1986 modified Van de Ven and Ferry, 1980  for this study correspond to Mark et al, 2001  for this study for this study Jehn, 1995	Yes  Yes  Yes  No  No  Ves  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  Yes
43 43 43 44 44 45 45 46 47 47 48 48	Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Magjuka & Baldwin  Magjuka & Baldwin  Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy  Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy  Miller & Hamblin  Mitchell & Silver  Mitchell & Silver  Moye & Langfred  Moye & Langfred	2010 146  2010 146  2010 146  1991  1991  2007 398  2007 398  1963 90 1990 96 1990 96 1990 96 2004 104 2004 104	13 13 13 13 72 72 94 94 30 #REF! #REF! 38 38	Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Experimental Experimental Experimental Correlational Correlational Correlational	China US US Canada Canada US US US Mixed Mixed Mixed	Software company in Beijing  Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi- product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools  Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi- product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools  customer service technicians  customer service technicians  University students University students University students MBA students MBA students MBA students	0.47 0.50  -0.50  -0.04  -0.21  0.27 0.72  0.32 0.72 1  0.37 1 1  0.18 1  0.01 1  0.23  0.36	Goal Interdependence  Goal Interdependence  Financial Rewards  Financial Rewards  Team interdependence  Differential Rewarding Goal Interdependence Goal Interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence	Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence	Goal  Reward  Reward  Mixed TI  Mixed TI  Reward  Goal  Goal  Process  Process	Team members  Team members  Manipulation  Team members  Team members  Manipulation  Manipulation  Manipulation  Team members  Team members	Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  of salary received by a team in the salary received by a team in the for this study  for this study  Kiggundu, 1983  Kiggundu, 1983	Group Performance  Constructive controversy  I: Effectiveness  I: Information Access  Team Process  Team performance Productivity Goal commitment Goal Acceptance task conflict Relationship Conflict	Subjective performance  Interpersonal process  subjective performance  Action process  Overall process  Objective performance Chipective performance Emergent State Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Interpersonal process	Task  Relational  Task  Relational Relational	Team members  Other  Supervisor team members team members team members team members team members	Vliert, 2000 developed from Tjosvold, 1998 and Tjosvold, Wedley, & Correlational, 1986 modified Van de Ven and Ferry, 1980  for this study correspond to Mark et al, 2001  for this study for this study Jehn, 1995	Yes  Yes  Yes  No  No  No  L Yes  No  No  No  No  No  Yes  Yes  Yes
43 43 44 44 45 45 46 47 47 48 48 48	Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Magjuka & Baldwin  Magjuka & Baldwin  Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy Miller & Hamblin Mitchell & Silver Mitchell & Silver Moye & Langfred	2010 146  2010 146  2010 146  1991  1991  2007 398 1963 90 1990 96 1990 96 2004 104 2004 104 2004 104	13 13 13 72 72 94 94 30 #REF! #REF! 38 38 38	Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Experimental Experimental Experimental Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational	China  US  US  Canada  Canada  US  US  WS  WS  Mixed  Mixed  Mixed	Software company in Beijing Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi- product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi- product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools customer service technicians customer service technicians University students University students University students MBA students MBA students MBA students MBA students MBA students	0.47 0.50  -0.04  -0.21  0.27 0.72  0.32 0.72 1  0.37 1 1  0.18 1  0.01 1  0.23 0.36  0.36	Goal Interdependence  Goal Interdependence  Financial Rewards  Financial Rewards  Team interdependence  Differential Rewarding Goal Interdependence Goal Interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence	Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence	Goal  Reward  Reward  Mixed TI  Mixed TI  Reward  Goal  Goal  Process  Process  Process	Team members  Team members  Manipulation  Manipulation  Team members  Manipulation  Manipulation  Manipulation  Manipulation  Manipulation  Team members  Team members  Team members  Team members  Team members	Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  % of salary received by a team in the standy for this study  Kiggundu, 1983  Kiggundu, 1983  Kiggundu, 1983  Kiggundu, 1983	Group Performance  Constructive controversy  I: Effectiveness  I: Information Access  Team Process  Team performance Productivity Goal commitment Goal Acceptance task conflict Relationship Conflict Team performance	Subjective performance  Interpersonal process  subjective performance  Action process  Overall process  Objective performance Objective performance Emergent State Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Interpersonal process subjective performance	Task  Relational  Relational Relational Relational	Team members  Other  Supervisor team members team members team members team members team members other	Vliert, 2000 developed from Tjosvold, 1998 and Tjosvold, Wedley, & Correlational, 1986 modified Van de Ven and Ferry, 1980  for this study correspond to Mark et al, 2001  for this study for this study Jehn, 1995 Jehn, 1995	Yes  Yes  Yes  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  N
43 43 44 44 45 45 46 47 47 48 48 48 48	Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Magjuka & Baldwin  Magjuka & Baldwin  Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy Miller & Hamblin Mitchell & Silver Mitchell & Silver Moye & Langfred	2010 146  2010 146  2010 146  1991  1991  2007 398  2007 398 1963 90 1990 96 1990 96 2004 104 2004 104 2004 104 2004 104	13 13 13 13 72 72 94 94 30 #REF! #REF! 38 38 38 38	Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Experimental Experimental Experimental Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational	China US US Canada Canada US US US Mixed Mixed Mixed Mixed Mixed	Software company in Beijing  Software company in Beijing Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi-product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi-product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools customer service technicians customer service technicians University students University students University students MBA students	0.47 0.50  -0.50  -0.04  -0.21  0.27 0.72  0.32 0.72 1  0.37 1 1  0.18 1  0.01 1  0.23  0.36  0.36  0.36  0.61	Goal Interdependence  Financial Rewards  Financial Rewards  Team interdependence Differential Rewarding Goal Interdependence Goal Interdependence Task interdependence	Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence	Goal  Reward  Reward  Mixed TI  Mixed TI  Reward  Goal  Goal  Process  Process  Process  Process	Team members  Manipulation  Manipulation  Team members  Team members  Manipulation  Manipulation  Manipulation  Team members  Team members  Team members	Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  of salary received by a team in the salary received by a team in the for this study  for this study  Kiggundu, 1983  Kiggundu, 1983	Group Performance  Constructive controversy  I: Effectiveness  I: Information Access  Team Process  Team performance Productivity Goal commitment Goal Acceptance task conflict Relationship Conflict Team performance Information Sharing	Subjective performance  Interpersonal process  subjective performance  Action process  Overall process  Objective performance Objective performance Emergent State Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Subjective performance Action process	Task  Relational  Task  Relational Relational Relational	Team members  Other  Supervisor team members	Vliert, 2000 developed from Tjosvold, 1998 and Tjosvold, Wedley, & Correlational, 1986 modified Van de Ven and Ferry, 1980  for this study correspond to Mark et al, 2001  for this study for this study Jehn, 1995	Yes  Yes  Yes  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  N
43 43 44 44 45 45 46 47 47 48 48 48 48 49	Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Magjuka & Baldwin  Magjuka & Baldwin  Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy Miller & Hamblin Mitchell & Silver Mitchell & Silver Moye & Langfred Moye & Langfred Moye & Langfred Moye & Langfred Okun & DiVesta	2010 146  2010 146  2010 146  1991  1991  2007 398  2007 398 1963 90 1990 96 2004 104 2004 104 2004 104 2004 104 1904 104 1975 96	13 13 13 13 72 72 94 94 30 #REF! #REF! 38 38 38 #REF!	Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Experimental Experimental Experimental Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Experimental Experimental Experimental	China  US  US  Canada  Canada  US  US  WS  Mixed  Mixed  Mixed  Mixed  US	Software company in Beijing  Software company in Beijing Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi- product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi- product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools  customer service technicians  customer service technicians University students University students University students MBA students University students University students	0.47 0.50 -0.50 -0.04 -0.21 0.27 0.72 0.32 0.72 1 0.37 1 1 0.18 1 0.01 1 0.03 0.36 0.36 0.36 0.36 0.36 0.36 0.36	Goal Interdependence  Financial Rewards  Financial Rewards  Team interdependence Differential Rewarding Goal Interdependence Goal Interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Reward structure	Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence	Goal  Reward  Reward  Mixed TI  Mixed TI  Reward  Goal  Goal  Process  Process  Process  Reward	Team members  Team members  Manipulation  Team members  Team members  Manipulation  Manipulation  Manipulation  Team members  Manipulation	Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  % of salary received by a team in the standy for this study  Kiggundu, 1983  Kiggundu, 1983  Kiggundu, 1983  Kiggundu, 1983	Group Performance  Constructive controversy  I: Effectiveness  I: Information Access  Team Process  Team performance Productivity Goal commitment Goal Acceptance task conflict Relationship Conflict Team performance Information Sharing Group Efficiency	Subjective performance  Interpersonal process  subjective performance  Action process  Overall process  Objective performance Emergent State Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Subjective performance Action process Objective performance Objective performance Objective performance	Task  Relational  Task  Relational Relational Relational Relational Task	Team members  Other  Supervisor team members team members team members team members team members Other team members Other	Vliert, 2000 developed from Tjosvold, 1998 and Tjosvold, Wedley, & Correlational, 1986 modified Van de Ven and Ferry, 1980  for this study correspond to Mark et al, 2001  for this study Jehn, 1995 Jehn, 1995 Bunderson & Sutcliffe, 2002	Yes  Yes  Yes  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  N
43 43 44 44 45 45 46 47 47 48 48 48 48 49	Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Magjuka & Baldwin  Magjuka & Baldwin  Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy Miller & Hamblin Mitchell & Silver Mitchell & Silver Moye & Langfred	2010 146  2010 146  2010 146  1991  1991  2007 398  2007 398 1963 90 1990 96 1990 96 2004 104 2004 104 2004 104 2004 104	13 13 13 13 72 72 94 94 30 #REF! #REF! 38 38 38 38	Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Experimental Experimental Experimental Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational	China US US Canada Canada US US US Mixed Mixed Mixed Mixed Mixed	Software company in Beijing  Software company in Beijing Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi-product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi-product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools customer service technicians customer service technicians University students University students University students MBA students	0.47 0.50  -0.50  -0.04  -0.21  0.27 0.72  0.32 0.72 1  0.37 1 1  0.18 1  0.01 1  0.23  0.36  0.36  0.36  0.61	Goal Interdependence  Financial Rewards  Financial Rewards  Team interdependence Differential Rewarding Goal Interdependence Goal Interdependence Task interdependence	Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence	Goal  Reward  Reward  Mixed TI  Mixed TI  Reward  Goal  Goal  Process  Process  Process  Reward	Team members  Manipulation  Manipulation  Team members  Team members  Manipulation  Manipulation  Manipulation  Team members  Team members  Team members	Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  % of salary received by a team in the standy for this study  Kiggundu, 1983  Kiggundu, 1983  Kiggundu, 1983  Kiggundu, 1983	Group Performance  Constructive controversy  I: Effectiveness  I: Information Access  Team Process  Team performance Productivity Goal commitment Goal Acceptance task conflict Relationship Conflict Team performance Information Sharing	Subjective performance  Interpersonal process  subjective performance  Action process  Overall process  Objective performance Objective performance Emergent State Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Subjective performance Action process	Task  Relational  Relational Relational Relational	Team members  Other  Supervisor team members	Vliert, 2000 developed from Tjosvold, 1998 and Tjosvold, Wedley, & Correlational, 1986 modified Van de Ven and Ferry, 1980  for this study correspond to Mark et al, 2001  for this study for this study Jehn, 1995 Jehn, 1995	Yes  Yes  Yes  No  No  Ves  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  N
43 43 44 44 45 45 46 47 47 48 48 48 48 49 49	Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Magjuka & Baldwin  Magjuka & Baldwin  Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy Miller & Hamblin Mitchell & Silver Mitchell & Silver Moye & Langfred Moye & Langfred Moye & Langfred Moye & Langfred Okun & DiVesta	2010 146  2010 146  2010 146  1991  1991  2007 398  2007 398 1963 90 1990 96 2004 104 2004 104 2004 104 2004 104 1904 104 1975 96	13 13 13 13 72 72 94 94 30 #REF! #REF! 38 38 38 #REF!	Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Experimental Experimental Experimental Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Experimental Experimental Experimental	China  US  US  Canada  Canada  US  US  WS  Mixed  Mixed  Mixed  Mixed  US	Software company in Beijing  Software company in Beijing Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi- product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi- product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools  customer service technicians  customer service technicians University students University students University students MBA students University students University students	0.47 0.50 -0.50 -0.04 -0.21 0.27 0.72 0.32 0.72 1 0.37 1 1 0.18 1 0.01 1 0.03 0.36 0.36 0.36 0.36 0.36 0.36 0.36	Goal Interdependence  Financial Rewards  Financial Rewards  Team interdependence Differential Rewarding Goal Interdependence Goal Interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Reward structure	Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence	Goal  Reward  Reward  Mixed TI  Mixed TI  Reward  Goal  Goal  Process  Process  Process  Process  Reward  Reward  Reward	Team members  Manipulation  Manipulation  Team members  Team members  Manipulation  Manipulation  Manipulation  Team members  Manipulation  Manipulation	Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  % of salary received by a team in the for this study  for this study  Kiggundu, 1983  Kiggundu, 1983  Kiggundu, 1983	Group Performance  Constructive controversy  I: Effectiveness  I: Information Access  Team Process  Team performance Productivity Goal commitment Goal Acceptance task conflict Relationship Conflict Team performance Information Sharing Group Efficiency	Subjective performance  Interpersonal process  subjective performance  Action process  Overall process  Objective performance Emergent State Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Subjective performance Action process Objective performance Objective performance Objective performance	Task  Relational  Task  Relational Relational Relational Relational Task	Team members  Other  Supervisor team members team members team members team members other team members Other Other Other	Vliert, 2000 developed from Tjosvold, 1998 and Tjosvold, Wedley, & Correlational, 1986 modified Van de Ven and Ferry, 1980  for this study correspond to Mark et al, 2001  for this study for this study Jehn, 1995 Jehn, 1995 Bunderson & Sutcliffe, 2002 objectively measured Edmondson, 1999	Yes  Yes  Yes  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  Yes  Yes  No  Yes  No  Yes
43 43 44 44 45 45 46 47 47 47 48 48 48 48 49 49	Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Magjuka & Baldwin  Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy Miller & Hamblin Mitchell & Silver Mitchell & Silver Moye & Langfred Moye & Langfred Moye & Langfred Moye & Langfred Okun & DiVesta Okun & DiVesta Okun & DiVesta Ortega, Sanchez-Manzanares, Gil & Rico	2010 146  2010 146  2010 146  1991  1991  2007 398  2007 398 1963 90 1990 96 1990 96 2004 104 2004 104 2004 104 2004 104 2004 104 1975 96	13 13 13 13 72 72 94 94 30 #REF! #REF! 38 38 38 #REF!	Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Experimental Experimental Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Experimental Experimental Experimental Experimental Experimental Experimental	China  China  US  US  Canada  Canada  US  US  Mixed  Mixed  Mixed  Mixed  US  US  US	Software company in Beijing  Software company in Beijing Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi-product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi-product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools customer service technicians  customer service technicians University students University students University students MBA students MBA students MBA students MBA students MBA students University students	0.47 0.50  -0.50  -0.04  -0.21  0.27 0.72  0.32 0.72 1  0.37 1 1  0.18 1  0.01 1  0.23  0.36  0.61  0.82 1 1  0.62 1	Goal Interdependence  Financial Rewards  Financial Rewards  Team interdependence  Team interdependence Differential Rewarding Goal Interdependence Goal Interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Reward structure Reward structure	Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence	Goal  Reward  Reward  Mixed TI  Mixed TI  Reward  Goal  Goal  Process  Process  Process  Process  Reward  Reward  Reward	Team members  Manipulation  Manipulation  Team members  Team members  Manipulation  Manipulation  Team members  Team members  Team members  Team members  Manipulation  Team members  Team members  Manipulation  Manipulation  Team members	Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  of salary received by a team in the salary received by a team in the for this study  for this study  Kiggundu, 1983  Kiggundu, 1983  Kiggundu, 1983  Kiggundu, 1983	Group Performance  Constructive controversy  I: Effectiveness  I: Information Access  Team Process  Team performance Productivity Goal commitment Goal Acceptance task conflict Relationship Conflict Team performance Information Sharing Group Efficiency Information Sharing	Subjective performance  Interpersonal process  subjective performance  Action process  Overall process  Objective performance Objective performance Emergent State Interpersonal process Interpersonal process subjective performance Action process Objective performance Action process Objective performance Action process	Relational Task  Relational Relational Relational Relational Task Task	Team members  Other  Supervisor team members team members team members team members other team members Other Other Other	Vliert, 2000 developed from Tjosvold, 1998 and Tjosvold, Wedley, & Correlational, 1986 modified Van de Ven and Ferry, 1980  for this study correspond to Mark et al, 2001  for this study Jehn, 1995 Jehn, 1995 Bunderson & Sutcliffe, 2002 objectively measured Edmondson, 1999 Bandura, 1986, adapted by Jung	Yes  Yes  Yes  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  N
43 43 44 44 45 45 46 47 47 47 48 48 48 48 49 49	Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Magjuka & Baldwin  Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy Miller & Hamblin Mitchell & Silver Mitchell & Silver Moye & Langfred Moye & Langfred Moye & Langfred Moye & Langfred Okun & DiVesta Okun & DiVesta Okun & DiVesta	2010 146  2010 146  2010 146  1991  1991  2007 398  2007 398 1963 90 1990 96 2004 104 2004 104 2004 104 2004 104 1975 96 1975 96 2010 144	13 13 13 13 72 72 94 94 30 #REF! #REF! 38 38 38 #REF!	Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Experimental Experimental Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Experimental Experimental	China  US  US  Canada  Canada  US  US  Mixed  Mixed  Mixed  Mixed  US  US  Spain	Software company in Beijing  Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi-product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools  Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi-product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools  customer service technicians  customer service technicians  University students  University students  University students  MBA students  MBA students  MBA students  MBA students  University students	0.47 0.50  -0.50  -0.04  -0.21  0.27 0.72  0.32 0.72 1  0.37 1 1  0.18 1  0.01 1  0.23  0.36  0.36  0.36  0.61  0.82 1 1  0.62 1  0.62  0.40	Goal Interdependence  Financial Rewards  Financial Rewards  Team interdependence  Differential Rewarding Goal Interdependence Goal Interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Reward structure Reward structure Task interdependence	Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence	Goal  Reward  Reward  Mixed TI  Mixed TI  Reward  Goal  Goal  Process  Process  Process  Process  Reward  Reward  Process	Team members  Team members  Manipulation  Team members  Team members  Manipulation  Manipulation  Manipulation  Team members	Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  of salary received by a team in the salary received by a team in the for this study  for this study  Kiggundu, 1983	Group Performance  Constructive controversy  I: Effectiveness  I: Information Access  Team Process  Team performance Productivity Goal commitment Goal Acceptance task conflict Relationship Conflict Team performance Information Sharing Group Efficiency Information Sharing Team Learning	Subjective performance  Interpersonal process  subjective performance  Action process  Overall process  Objective performance Emergent State Interpersonal process Interpersonal process subjective performance Action process Objective performance Action process Action process  Action process	Task  Relational  Relational Relational Relational Relational Task Task Task	Team members  Other  Supervisor team members team members team members team members Other team members Other team members Other team members	Vliert, 2000 developed from Tjosvold, 1998 and Tjosvold, Wedley, & Correlational, 1986 modified Van de Ven and Ferry, 1980  for this study correspond to Mark et al, 2001  for this study Jehn, 1995 Jehn, 1995 Bunderson & Sutcliffe, 2002 objectively measured Edmondson, 1999 Bandura, 1986, adapted by Jung	Yes  Yes  Yes  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  N
43 43 44 44 45 45 46 47 47 48 48 48 49 9 50 50	Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Magjuka & Baldwin  Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy Miller & Hamblin Mitchell & Silver Mitchell & Silver Moye & Langfred Moye & Langfred Moye & Langfred Moye & Langfred Okun & DiVesta Okun & DiVesta Ortega, Sanchez-Manzanares, Gil & Rico Ortega, Sanchez-Manzanares, Gil & Rico	2010 146  2010 146  2010 146  1991  1991  2007 398  2007 398  1990 96  1990 96  2004 104  2004 104  2004 104  1975 96  2010 144  2010 144	13 13 13 13 72 72 94 94 30 #REF! #REF! 38 38 #REF! #REF! 48 48	Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Experimental Experimental Experimental Correlational	China  US  US  Canada  Canada  US  US  Mixed  Mixed  Mixed  Mixed  US  US  Spain  Spain	Software company in Beijing Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi- product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi- product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools customer service technicians customer service technicians University students University students University students MBA students MBA students MBA students MBA students University students	0.47 0.50  -0.50  -0.04  -0.21  0.27 0.72  0.32 0.72 1  0.37 1 1  0.18 1  0.01 1  0.23  0.36  0.36  0.36  0.36  0.61  0.62 1  0.62  0.40  0.30 0.50	Goal Interdependence  Financial Rewards  Financial Rewards  Financial Rewards  Team interdependence  Differential Rewarding Goal Interdependence Goal Interdependence Task interdependence	Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence	Goal  Reward  Reward  Mixed TI  Mixed TI  Reward  Goal  Goal  Process  Process  Process  Process  Reward  Reward  Reward  Process  Process  Process  Process  Process  Process	Team members  Manipulation  Manipulation  Team members  Team members  Manipulation  Manipulation  Manipulation  Team members	Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  of salary received by a team in the salary received by a team in the for this study  for this study  Kiggundu, 1983 Kiggundu, 1983 Kiggundu, 1983 Kiggundu, 1983 Van der Vegt et al. 2001  van der Vegt et al. 2001	Group Performance  Constructive controversy  I: Effectiveness  I: Information Access  Team Process  Team performance Productivity Goal commitment Goal Acceptance task conflict Relationship Conflict Team performance Information Sharing Group Efficiency Information Sharing Team Learning  Collective efficacy Team performance	Subjective performance  Interpersonal process  subjective performance  Action process  Overall process  Objective performance Cobjective performance Emergent State Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Subjective performance Action process Objective performance Action process  Action process  Emergent State  subjective performance	Task  Relational  Relational Relational Relational Relational Task  Task  Task  Task	Team members  Other  Supervisor team members team members team members team members Other team members Other team members Other team members Other Other Team members Other Other Team members	Vliert, 2000 developed from Tjosvold, 1998 and Tjosvold, Wedley, & Correlational, 1986 modified Van de Ven and Ferry, 1980  for this study correspond to Mark et al, 2001  for this study for this study Jehn, 1995 Jehn, 1995 Bunderson & Sutcliffe, 2002 objectively measured Edmondson, 1999 Bandura, 1986, adapted by Jung & Sosik, 2002	Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  Yes  No  No  Yes  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  N
43 43 44 44 45 45 46 47 47 48 48 48 49 9 50 50 50	Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Magjuka & Baldwin  Magjuka & Baldwin  Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy Miller & Hamblin Mitchell & Silver Mitchell & Silver Moye & Langfred Okun & DiVesta Okun & DiVesta Ortega, Sanchez-Manzanares, Gil & Rico	2010 146  2010 146  2010 146  1991  1991  2007 398  2007 398 1963 90 1990 96 1990 96 2004 104 2004 104 2004 104 2004 104 1975 96 1975 96 2010 144	13 13 13 13 72 72 94 94 30 #REF! #REF! 38 38 #REF! #REF! 48	Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Experimental Experimental Experimental Correlational	China  China  US  US  Canada  Canada  US  US  Mixed  Mixed  Mixed  Mixed  US  US  Spain	Software company in Beijing  Software company in Beijing Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi-product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi-product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools customer service technicians customer service technicians University students University students University students MBA students MBA students MBA students MBA students University students	0.47 0.50  -0.50  -0.04  -0.21  0.27 0.72  0.32 0.72 1  0.37 1 1  0.18 1  0.01 1  0.23  0.36  0.36  0.36  0.61  0.82 1 1  0.62 1  0.62  0.40	Goal Interdependence  Financial Rewards  Financial Rewards  Team interdependence Differential Rewarding Goal Interdependence Goal Interdependence Task interdependence Reward structure Task interdependence Task interdependence	Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence	Goal  Reward  Reward  Mixed TI  Mixed TI  Reward  Goal  Goal  Process  Process	Team members  Manipulation  Manipulation  Team members  Team members  Manipulation  Manipulation  Manipulation  Manipulation  Team members	Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  of salary received by a team in the salary received by a team in the for this study  for this study  Kiggundu, 1983 Kiggundu, 1983 Kiggundu, 1983 Kiggundu, 1983 Van der Vegt et al. 2001  van der Vegt et al. 2001	Group Performance  Constructive controversy  I: Effectiveness  I: Information Access  Team Process  Team performance Productivity Goal commitment Goal Acceptance task conflict Relationship Conflict Team performance Information Sharing Group Efficiency Information Sharing Team Learning  Collective efficacy	Subjective performance  Interpersonal process  subjective performance  Action process  Overall process  Objective performance Objective performance Emergent State Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Objective performance Action process Objective performance Action process Action process  Action process  Emergent State	Task  Relational  Relational Relational Relational Relational Task Task Task	Team members  Other  Supervisor team members team members team members team members Other team members Other team members Other team members	Vliert, 2000 developed from Tjosvold, 1998 and Tjosvold, Wedley, & Correlational, 1986 modified Van de Ven and Ferry, 1980  for this study correspond to Mark et al, 2001  for this study Jehn, 1995 Jehn, 1995 Bunderson & Sutcliffe, 2002 objectively measured Edmondson, 1999 Bandura, 1986, adapted by Jung & Sosik, 2002  Lewis, 2004	Yes  Yes  Yes  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  Yes  Yes  No  Yes  Yes
43 43 44 44 45 45 46 47 47 48 48 48 49 49 50 50 50 50	Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Magjuka & Baldwin  Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy Miller & Hamblin Mitchell & Silver Mitchell & Silver Moye & Langfred Moye & Langfred Moye & Langfred Moye & Langfred Okun & DiVesta Okun & DiVesta Ortega, Sanchez-Manzanares, Gil & Rico	2010 146  2010 146  2010 146  1991  1991  2007 398  2007 398 1963 90 1990 96 2004 104 2004 104 2004 104 2010 144 2010 144 2010 144 2010 144 2010 144	13 13 13 13 72 72 94 94 30 #REF! #REF! 38 38 38 48 48 48 48	Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Experimental Experimental Experimental Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Experimental Experimental Experimental Experimental Correlational Correlational Correlational	China  US  US  Canada  US  US  Spain  Spain  Spain  Spain  Spain  Spain  Spain	Software company in Beijing Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi- product firm, and one privately owned  manufacturer of hand held tools Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi- product firm, and one privately owned  manufacturer of hand held tools customer service technicians customer service technicians University students University students University students MBA students MBA students MBA students University students	0.47 0.50  -0.50  -0.04  -0.21  0.27 0.72  0.32 0.72 1  0.37 1 1  0.18 1  0.01 1  0.23  0.36  0.36  0.36  0.36  0.36  0.61  0.82 1  0.62 1  0.62  0.40  0.30 0.40  0.40  0.40  0.42  0.18 1	Goal Interdependence  Financial Rewards  Financial Rewards  Financial Rewards  Team interdependence Differential Rewarding Goal Interdependence Goal Interdependence Task interdependence	Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence	Goal  Reward  Reward  Mixed TI  Mixed TI  Reward  Goal  Goal  Process  Process  Process  Process  Reward  Reward  Process  Process  Process  Process  Process  Process	Team members  Manipulation  Manipulation  Team members  Team members  Manipulation  Manipulation  Team members  Manipulation	Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  of salary received by a team in the salary received by a team in the for this study  for this study  Kiggundu, 1983 Kiggundu, 1983 Kiggundu, 1983 Kiggundu, 1983  van der Vegt et al. 2001  resluk et al. (1997)	Group Performance  Constructive controversy  I: Effectiveness  I: Information Access  Team Process  Team performance Productivity Goal commitment Goal Acceptance task conflict Relationship Conflict Team performance Information Sharing Group Efficiency Information Sharing  Team Learning  Collective efficacy  Team performance  Viability Team viability	Subjective performance  Interpersonal process  subjective performance  Action process  Overall process  Objective performance Emergent State Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Subjective performance Action process Objective performance Action process Action process  Emergent State subjective performance Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State Emergent State	Relational Task  Relational Relational Relational Relational Task Task Task Task Task	Team members  Other  Supervisor team members team members team members team members Other team members Other team members Other team members Other team members Team members	Vliert, 2000 developed from Tjosvold, 1998 and Tjosvold, Wedley, & Correlational, 1986 modified Van de Ven and Ferry, 1980  for this study correspond to Mark et al, 2001  for this study for this study Jehn, 1995 Jehn, 1995 Bunderson & Sutcliffe, 2002 objectively measured Edmondson, 1999 Bandura, 1986, adapted by Jung & Sosik, 2002  Lewis, 2004 Sinclair, 2003 Widmeyer, Brawley, & Carron,	Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  Yes  Yes  No  No  Yes  No  Yes
43 43 44 44 45 45 46 47 47 48 48 48 49 49 50 50 50 50	Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Lu, Tjosvold &Shi  Magjuka & Baldwin  Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy Miller & Hamblin Mitchell & Silver Moye & Langfred Moye & Langfred Moye & Langfred Moye & Langfred Okun & DiVesta Okun & DiVesta Ortega, Sanchez-Manzanares, Gil & Rico	2010 146  2010 146  2010 146  1991  1991  2007 398  2007 398 1963 90 1990 96 1990 96 2004 104 2004 104 2004 104 1975 96 1995 96  2010 144  2010 144  2010 144	13 13 13 13 72 72 94 94 30 #REF! #REF! 38 38 48 48 48	Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Correlational Experimental Experimental Correlational	China  China  US  US  Canada  Canada  US  US  Mixed  Mixed  Mixed  Mixed  Spain  Spain  Spain	Software company in Beijing  Software company in Beijing Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi-product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi-product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools customer service technicians  customer service technicians University students University students University students MBA students MBA students MBA students MBA students University students	0.47 0.50  0.50  -0.04  -0.21  0.27 0.72  0.32 0.72 1  0.37 1 1  0.18 1  0.01 1  0.23  0.36  0.61  0.82 1 1  0.62 1  0.62  0.40  0.30 0.42	Goal Interdependence  Financial Rewards  Financial Rewards  Financial Rewards  Team interdependence Differential Rewarding Goal Interdependence Goal Interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Reward structure Reward structure Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Reward structure Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence	Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence Task interdependence	Goal  Reward  Reward  Mixed TI  Mixed TI  Reward Goal Goal Process Process Process Process Process Reward Reward Process Process Process Process Process	Team members  Manipulation  Manipulation  Team members  Team members  Manipulation  Manipulation  Team members  Manipulation	Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998  of salary received by a team in the salary received by a team in the for this study  for this study  Kiggundu, 1983  Kiggundu, 1983  Kiggundu, 1983  Van der Vegt et al. 2001	Group Performance  Constructive controversy  I: Effectiveness  I: Information Access  Team Process  Team performance Productivity Goal commitment Goal Acceptance task conflict Relationship Conflict Team performance Information Sharing Group Efficiency Information Sharing Team Learning  Collective efficacy Team performance Viability	Subjective performance  Interpersonal process  subjective performance  Action process  Overall process  Objective performance Objective performance Emergent State Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Interpersonal process Subjective performance Action process Objective performance Action process  Action process  Emergent State  subjective performance Emergent State	Task  Relational  Task  Relational Relational Relational Task  Task  Task  Task	Team members  Other  Supervisor team members team members team members team members Other team members	Vliert, 2000 developed from Tjosvold, 1998 and Tjosvold, Wedley, & Correlational, 1986 modified Van de Ven and Ferry, 1980  for this study correspond to Mark et al, 2001  for this study for this study Jehn, 1995 Jehn, 1995 Bunderson & Sutcliffe, 2002 objectively measured Edmondson, 1999 Bandura, 1986, adapted by Jung & Sosik, 2002  Lewis, 2004 Sinclair, 2003 Widmeyer, Brawley, & Carron,	Yes  Yes  Yes  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  N

					Managers at a large public utility in Hong												
52 Poon, Pike & Tjosvold	2001	64	Correlational	China	Kong	0.39	Goal Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Supervisor	for this study	Open-minded controversy	Interpersonal process	Relational	Supervisor	for this study	Yes
52 Poon, Pike & Tjosvold	2001	64	Correlational	China	Managers at a large public utility in Hong Kong	0.21	Goal Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Supervisor	for this study	Relationship	Interpersonal process	Relational	Supervisor	for this study	Yes
52 Poon, Pike & Tjosvold	2001	64	Correlational	China	Managers at a large public utility in Hong Kong	0.28	0.78 Goal Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Supervisor	for this study	Group Productivity	Subjective performance		Supervisor	for this study	Yes
<ul><li>52 Poon, Pike &amp; Tjosvold</li><li>53 Quigley, Tesluk, Locke &amp; Bartole</li></ul>	2001 2007 120	64 0 60	Correlational Experimental	China Unsure	Managers at a large public utility in Hong Kong University students		0.84 Goal Interdependence 0.59 Incentive Condition	Outcome interdependence Outcome interdependence		Supervisor Manipulation	for this study	Budget quality Norms for knowledge sharing	Subjective performance Action process	Task	Supervisor team members	for this study for this study	Yes No
54 Raven & Shaw	1970 60	20	Experimental	US	UCLA undergraduates	0.43 1	Dependency	Task interdependence	Process	Manipulation	Manipulation	Communication	Action process	Task	Other	Total message units transmitte	ed Unsure
55 Rico & Cohen	2005 240	0 80	Experimental	Spain	Undergraduate and graduate students in Spain	0.09 1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Manipulation	Manipulation	Team performance	Objective performance		Other		No
56 Rico, Alcover, Sanchez-Manzanares, & Gil	2009 187	7 53	Correlational	Latin America	Virtual project teams from multinational software development firm in Latin America	a 0.45 0.78 (	0.83 Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Van der Vegt & Janssen, 2003	Task-oriented communication	Action process	Task	Team members	Hadtjemihistos & Rico, 2003	Yes
56 Rico, Alcover, Sanchez-Manzanares, & Gil	2009 187	7 53	Correlational	Latin America	Virtual project teams from multinational software development firm in Latin America	a -0.04 0.78 (	0.88 Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Van der Vegt & Janssen, 2003	Socially-oriented communication	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	Hadtjemihistos & Rico, 2003	Yes
					Virtual project teams from multinational		·					,				,	
56 Rico, Alcover, Sanchez-Manzanares, & Gil	2009 187	7 53	Correlational	Latin America	software development firm in Latin America	a 0.39 0.78 (	0.71 Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Van der Vegt & Janssen, 2003	Communication enthusiasm	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	Hadtjemihistos & Rico, 2003	Yes
56 Rico, Alcover, Sanchez-Manzanares, & Gil	2009 187	7 53	Correlational	Latin America	Virtual project teams from multinational software development firm in Latin America	a 0.36 0.78 (	0.82 Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Van der Vegt & Janssen, 2003	Substantive communication	Action process	Task	Team members	Hadtjemihistos & Rico, 2003	Yes
56 Rico, Alcover, Sanchez-Manzanares, & Gil	2009 187	7 53	Correlational	Latin America	Virtual project teams from multinational software development firm in Latin America	2 0 25 0 79 (	179 Task interdenendence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Van der Vegt & Janssen, 2003	Trustworthiness	Emergent State	Relational	Team members	Schoorman, Mayer, & Davis,	Yes
57 Rispens	2006 252		Correlational	Netherlands	R&D teams from 11 Dutch companies	-0.11	Functional interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members		Affect-based interdependence	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members		Yes
57 Rispens	2006 252	2 51	Correlational	Netherlands	R&D teams from 11 Dutch companies Undergraduate project teams in Org Design	-0.09	Functional interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	network analysis	Performance	Subjective performance		Team members	for this study	Yes
58 Rispens	2006 83	22	Correlational	Netherlands	class Undergraduate project teams in Org Design	0.05	Functional interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	network analysis	Affect-based interdependence	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	for this study	Yes
58 Rispens	2006 83	22	Correlational	Netherlands	class Undergraduate project teams in Org Design	0.12	0.82 Functional interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	network analysis	Performance	Subjective performance		Team members	for this study	Yes
58 Rispens	2006 83	22	Correlational	Netherlands	class	0.41	Functional interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	network analysis	Cohesion	Emergent State	Relational	Team members	for this study	Yes
59 Saavedra, Earley, & Van Dyne	1993 354	4 118	Experimental	US	Undergraduates in management classes	0.06 1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Manipulation	Manipulation	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence		Manipulation		No
59 Saavedra, Earley, & Van Dyne	1993 354	4 118	Experimental	US	Undergraduates in management classes	0.03 1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Manipulation	Manipulation	Feedback interdependence	Outcome interdependence		Manipulation		No
59 Saavedra, Earley, & Van Dyne	1993 354	4 118	Experimental	US	Undergraduates in management classes	-0.01 1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Manipulation	Manipulation	Quantity (performance)	Objective performance		Other		No
59 Saavedra, Earley, & Van Dyne	1993 354	4 118	Experimental	US	Undergraduates in management classes	-0.01 1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Manipulation	Manipulation	Quality (performance)	Objective performance		Other	Lee, Earley, Lituchy, & Wagner	No .
59 Saavedra, Earley, & Van Dyne	1993 354	4 118	Experimental	US	Undergraduates in management classes	0.01 1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Manipulation	Manipulation	Intragroup conflict	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members		No
59 Saavedra, Earley, & Van Dyne	1993 354	4 118	Experimental	US	Undergraduates in management classes	0.59 1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Manipulation	Manipulation	Group strategy	Transition process	Task	Team members	Hackman (1982)	No
59 Saavedra, Earley, & Van Dyne	1993 354	4 118	Experimental	US	Undergraduates in management classes	-0.02 1	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Manipulation	Manipulation	Feedback interdependence	Outcome interdependence				
59 Saavedra, Earley, & Van Dyne	1993 354	4 118	Experimental	US	Undergraduates in management classes	0.23 1	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Manipulation	Manipulation	Quantity (performance)	Objective performance		Other		No
59 Saavedra, Earley, & Van Dyne	1993 354	4 118	Experimental	US	Undergraduates in management classes	0.28 1	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Manipulation	Manipulation	Quality (performance)	Objective performance		Other	Lee, Earley, Lituchy, & Wagner	No .
59 Saavedra, Earley, & Van Dyne	1993 354	4 118	Experimental	US	Undergraduates in management classes	0.21 1	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Manipulation	Manipulation	Intragroup conflict	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members		No
59 Saavedra, Earley, & Van Dyne	1993 354	4 118	Experimental	US	Undergraduates in management classes	0.39 1	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Manipulation	Manipulation	Group strategy	Transition process	Task	Team members	Hackman (1982)	No
59 Saavedra, Earley, & Van Dyne	1993 354	4 118	Experimental	US	Undergraduates in management classes	0.03 1	Feedback interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Quantity (performance)	Objective performance		Other		No
59 Saavedra, Earley, & Van Dyne	1993 354	4 118	Experimental	US	Undergraduates in management classes	0.11 1	Feedback interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Quality (performance)	Objective performance		Other	Lee, Earley, Lituchy, & Wagner	No
59 Saavedra, Earley, & Van Dyne	1993 354	4 118	Experimental	US	Undergraduates in management classes	0.04 1	Feedback interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Intragroup conflict	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	(1991)	No
59 Saavedra, Earley, & Van Dyne	1993 354		Experimental	US	Undergraduates in management classes	0.02 1	Feedback interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Group strategy	Transition process	Task		Hackman (1982)	No
60 Sargent & Sue-Chan 60 Sargent & Sue-Chan	2001 169 2001 169		Correlational Correlational	Canada Canada	Undergraduate project groups Undergraduate project groups	0.62 0.52	Task interdependence Task interdependence	Task interdependence Task interdependence	Process Process	Team members Team members	· ·	Social cohesion Group potency	Emergent State Emergent State	Relational Task	Team members	for this study Guzzo et al. 1993	Yes Yes
60 Sargent & Sue-Chan	2001 169		Correlational	Canada	Undergraduate project groups	0.46	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	· ·	Group outcome efficacy	Emergent State	Task	Team members		Yes
61 Sarin & Mahajan	2001 246	6 53	Correlational	Unsure	Cross-functional product development teams in 13 divisions of 6 organizations	-0.09	0.9 Equal rewards	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	for this study	Self-rated performance	Subjective performance		Team members	Ancona & Caldwell, 1991	Yes
61 Sarin & Mahajan	2001 246	6 53	Correlational	Unsure	Cross-functional product development teams in 13 divisions of 6 organizations	0.31	0.86 Equal rewards	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	for this study	Speed to market	Subjective performance		Team members	for this study	Yes
61 Sarin & Mahajan	2001 246	6 53	Correlational	Unsure	Cross-functional product development teams in 13 divisions of 6 organizations	0.17	Equal rewards	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	for this study	Adherence to budget and schedule	Action process	Task	Team members	Ancona & Caldwell, 1991	Yes
61 Sarin & Mahajan	2001 246	6 53	Correlational	Unsure	Cross-functional product development teams in 13 divisions of 6 organizations	0.18	0.85 Equal rewards	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	for this study	Level of innovation	Subjective performance		Team members	for this study	Yes
61 Sarin & Mahajan	2001 246	6 53	Correlational	Unsure	Cross-functional product development teams in 13 divisions of 6 organizations	0.34	0.93 Equal rewards	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	for this study	Product quality	Subjective performance		Team members	for this study	Yes
61 Sarin & Mahajan	2001 246	6 53	Correlational	Unsure	Cross-functional product development teams in 13 divisions of 6 organizations	0.38	0.91 Equal rewards	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	for this study	Market performance	Subjective performance		Team members	for this study	Yes
					10 mgmt teams, 13 production teams, 9 service teams, 11 school management teams, and 10 facilitating teams from 13												
62 Schippers, Hartog, Koopman, & Wienk	2003 406	6 54	Correlational	Netherlands	different orgs 10 mgmt teams, 13 production teams, 9 service teams, 11 school management	0.34	Outcome interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Mixed OI	Team members	Van der Vegt (1998)	Reflexivity	Transition process	Task	Team members	Schippers et al., 2002	Yes
62 Schippers, Hartog, Koopman, & Wienk	2003 406	6 54	Correlational	Netherlands	teams, and 10 facilitating teams from 13 different orgs	0.21	Outcome interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Mixed OI	Team members	Van der Vegt (1998)	Commitment	Emergent State	Relational	Team members	Van der Vegt & Emans, 2000	Yes

10 mgmt teams, 13 production teams, 9 service teams, 11 school management teams, and 10 facilitating teams from 13

							teams, and 10 facilitating teams from 13												
62	Schippers, Hartog, Koopman, & Wienk			54	Correlational	Netherlands	different orgs	0.23 0.9	2 Outcome interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Mixed OI	Team members	Van der Vegt (1998)	Self-rated performance	Subjective performance		Team members		Yes
63	Somech, Desivilya, & Lidogoster			77	Correlational	Unsure	R&D teams from high tech companies	0.17	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Van der Vegt et al., 2003	Team identity	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	Henry et al., 1999	Yes
63	Somech, Desivilya, & Lidogoster	2009 3	339	77	Correlational	Unsure	R&D teams from high tech companies	0.15	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Van der Vegt et al., 2003	Conflict management styles	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members		Yes
																		Tjosvold, Leung, & Johnson,	
63	Somech, Desivilya, & Lidogoster			77	Correlational	Unsure	R&D teams from high tech companies		5 Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process		Van der Vegt et al., 2003	Team performance	Subjective performance		Supervisor	2000	No
63	Somech, Desivilya, & Lidogoster			77	Correlational	Unsure	R&D teams from high tech companies	0.21	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process		Van der Vegt et al., 2003	Frequency of meetings	Action process	Task	Team members		Yes
63	Somech, Desivilya, & Lidogoster			77	Correlational	Unsure	R&D teams from high tech companies	0.19	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process		Van der Vegt et al., 2003	Task conflict	Interpersonal process	Relational			Yes
63	Somech, Desivilya, & Lidogoster	2009	339	77	Correlational	Unsure	R&D teams from high tech companies	0.29	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	leam members	Van der Vegt et al., 2003	Relationship conflict	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	Jehn & Mannix, 2001	Yes
	Street & Breedel 2000	2000		45	Constallerat	116	Employees in teams at three manufacturing		·	To defend the second second		T	K	Community of the Commun	A - 11	T	T	010-111-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10	
64	Stewart & Barrick, 2000	2000 6	526	45	Correlational	US	plants		5 Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	ream members	Kiggundu, 1983	Communication	Action process	Task	ream members	O'Reilly & Roberts, 1976	Yes
61	Stewart & Barrick, 2000	2000 6	626	45	Correlational	US	Employees in teams at three manufacturing plants		1 Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Toom mombors	Kiggundu, 1983	Conflict	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	Pahim 1093	Yes
04	Stewart & Barrick, 2000	2000 (	520	43	Correlational	03	Employees in teams at three manufacturing		1 Task interdependence	rask interdependence	FIOCESS	ream members	Riggundu, 1985	Connict	interpersonal process	Neiational	ream members	Namini, 1983	163
64	Stewart & Barrick, 2000	2000 6	626	45	Correlational	US	plants		4 Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Kiggundu, 1983	Shirking	Action process	Task	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Yes
0-1	Stewart & Barrick, 2000	2000	020	43	Correlational	03	Employees in teams at three manufacturing		4 Task interdependence	rask interacpendence	1100033	ream members	Nigguriau, 1905	Siliking	Action process	Tusk	ream members	campion ce al., 1999	103
64	Stewart & Barrick, 2000	2000 6	526	45	Correlational	US	plants		'9 Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Kiggundu, 1983	Flexibility	Action process	Task	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Yes
							Employees in teams at three manufacturing						00,	,	,			,	
64	Stewart & Barrick, 2000	2000 6	526	45	Correlational	US	plants		3 Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Kiggundu, 1983	Supervisor ratings	Subjective performance		Supervisor	for this study	No
							Various teams in firms located in Shanghai,												
65	Tjosvold & Yu	2004 2	200	100	Correlational	China	China	0.21 0.6	67 Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Alper, Tjosvold, & Law (1998)	In-role performance	Subjective performance		Supervisor	Williams, 1998	No
							Various teams in firms located in Shanghai,												
65	Tjosvold & Yu	2004 2	200	100	Correlational	China	China	0.24	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Alper, Tjosvold, & Law (1998)	Extra-role performance	Action process	Task	Supervisor	Farh, Earley, & Lin, 1997	No
							Production teams in 12 machinery and												
66	Tjosvold, Law, & Sun	2003 6	589	194	Correlational	China	power factories in China	0.75	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Alper, Tjosvold, & Law (1998)	Constructive controversy	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	Tjosvold, 1998	Yes
							Production teams in 12 machinery and												
66	Tjosvold, Law, & Sun	2003 6	589	194	Correlational	China	power factories in China	0.28 0.8	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Alper, Tjosvold, & Law (1998)	Team effectiveness	Subjective performance		Supervisor	for this study	No
							Various teams in firms located in Shanghai,												
67	Tjosvold, Tang, & West, 2004	2004 2	200	100	Correlational	China	China	0.50	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	leam members	Alper, Tjosvold, & Law (1998)	Task reflexivity	Transition process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
	Van der Vegt, de Jong, Bunderson, &	2040	240	46	Constalleral		Teams in a variety of settings (banking,	0.24	·	To defend the control of the control	B	T	and the state of t	Construction of the disease	0.1		T	V dVttt2002	V
68	Molleman	2010 2	218	46	Correlational	Unsure	medicine, etc.)	0.31 0.0	9 Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	leam members	network analysis	Group performance feedback	Outcome interdependence		Team members	Van der Vegt et al., 2003	Yes
co	Van der Vegt, de Jong, Bunderson, & Molleman	2010	210	46	Connelational	Haarina	Teams in a variety of settings (banking,	0.26	2 Task interdependence	Tools introduced and	D	Tanan	and control and bala	Tana lasarina	Anting	Teel	T	Schippers et al., 2003	Yes
80		2010 2	218	46	Correlational	Unsure	medicine, etc.) Teams in a variety of settings (banking,	0.26 0.6	12 Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	ream members	network analysis	Team learning	Action process	Task	ream members	Scrippers et al., 2003	res
69	Van der Vegt, de Jong, Bunderson, & Molleman	2010 2	210	46	Correlational	Unsure	medicine, etc.)	0.02 0.9	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	network analysis	Team performance	Subjective performance		Supervisor	Ancona & Caldwell, 1992	No
08	Van der Vegt, de Jong, Bunderson, &	2010 2	210	40	Correlational	Offsure	Teams in a variety of settings (banking,	0.02 0	rask interdependence	rask interdependence	riocess	ream members	network analysis	ream performance	Subjective performance		Super visor	Alicolla & Caldwell, 1992	NO
68	Molleman	2010 2	218	46	Correlational	Unsure	medicine, etc.)	0.58 0.69 0.6	2 Group performance feedback	Outcome interdependence	Mixed OI	Team members	Van der Vegt et al., 2003	Team learning	Action process	Task		Schippers et al., 2003	Yes
00	Van der Vegt, de Jong, Bunderson, &	2010			Correlational	Onsare	Teams in a variety of settings (banking,	0.50 0.05 0.0	2 Group performance recubuck	outcome interdependence	mixed Of	ream members	van del vege et an, 2005	· cam icaming	, edon process	Tusk		5cmppers et a, 2005	103
68	Molleman	2010 2	218	46	Correlational	Unsure	medicine, etc.)	-0.02 0.69 0.9	Group performance feedback	Outcome interdependence	Mixed OI	Team members	Van der Vegt et al., 2003	Team performance	Subjective performance		Supervisor	Ancona & Caldwell, 1992	No
							Customer service teams at Xerox		• •					•			,	•	
69	Wageman	2001		34	Correlational	US	Corporation	0.22 1 1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Manipulation	for this study	Group rewards	Outcome interdependence		Supervisor	for this study	Yes
							Customer service teams at Xerox												
69	Wageman	2001		34	Correlational	US	Corporation	0.43 1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Manipulation	for this study	Overall performance	Objective performance		Other		No
							Customer service teams at Xerox												
69	Wageman	2001		34	Correlational	US	Corporation	0.25 1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Manipulation	for this study	Quality of process	Action process	Task	Team members	Allmendinger et al., 1992	No
							Customer service teams at Xerox												
69	Wageman	2001		34	Correlational	US	Corporation	-0.03 1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Manipulation	for this study	Challenging task goals	Transition process	Task	Team members	for this study	No
							Customer service teams at Xerox												
69	Wageman	2001		34	Correlational	US	Corporation	0.19 1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Manipulation	for this study	Core strategy norms	Transition process	Task	Team members	for this study	No
							Customer service teams at Xerox												
69	Wageman	2001		34	Correlational	US	Corporation	-0.11 1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Manipulation	for this study	AvaiExperimentalle information	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	No
							Customer service teams at Xerox												
69	Wageman	2001		34	Correlational	US	Corporation	0.11 1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Manipulation	for this study	Material resources	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	No
60	Wassers	2004		24	Constalled	116	Customer service teams at Xerox	0.52	Construction	0.1	D	Advista desta a	Constitution of the	0	Objective of the second		Out		
69	Wageman	2001		34	Correlational	US	Corporation	0.52 1	Group rewards	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	for this study	Overall performance	Objective performance		Other		No
	Wasser	2001		34	Connelational	LIC	Customer service teams at Xerox	0.22 1	Carrier annual de	0	Danierd	Maniaulatian	for this stand.	Overlieve of assesses	Anting	Teel	T	All	No
69	Wageman	2001		34	Correlational	US	Corporation Customer service teams at Verox	0.33 1	Group rewards	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	for this study	Quality of process	Action process	Task	ream members	Allmendinger et al., 1992	No
69	Wageman	2001		34	Correlational	US	Customer service teams at Xerox Corporation	0.30 1	Group rewards	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	for this study	Challenging task goals	Transition process	Task	Team members	for this study	No
03	wageman	2001		34	Correlational	03	Customer service teams at Xerox	0.30 1	Gloup rewards	Outcome interdependence	newaru	ivianipulation	ioi tiiis study	Chanenging task goals	Transition process	103K	ream members	Tor this study	NO
69	Wageman	2001		34	Correlational	US	Corporation	0.19 1	Group rewards	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	for this study	Core strategy norms	Transition process	Task	Team members	for this study	No
0.5	- 0	-301			22.76.0000101		Customer service teams at Xerox			meracpendence		paidtion							
69	Wageman	2001		34	Correlational	US	Corporation	-0.07 1	Group rewards	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	for this study	AvaiExperimentalle information	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	No
	<u> </u>			-			Customer service teams at Xerox	<del>-</del>						p	p			,	-
69	Wageman	2001		34	Correlational	US	Corporation	0.32 1	Group rewards	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	for this study	Material resources	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	No
	Wageman		1120	115	Correlational	US	Xerox technician teams	-0.16 1	Outcome interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	quasi-experiment	Cooperation norms	Action process	Task	Team members	· ·	No
70	Wageman	1995 1	1120	115	Correlational	US	Xerox technician teams	-0.07 1	Outcome interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	quasi-experiment	Quality of group processes	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	No
	Wageman			115	Correlational	US	Xerox technician teams	-0.13 1	Outcome interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	quasi-experiment	Effort norms	Action process	Task	Team members	· ·	No
70	Wageman	1995 1	1120	115	Correlational	US	Xerox technician teams	-0.12 1	Outcome interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	quasi-experiment	Internal work motivation	Emergent State	Task	Team members	Allmendinger et al., 1992	No
70	Wageman	1995 1	1120	115	Correlational	US	Xerox technician teams	-0.01 1	Outcome interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	quasi-experiment	Learning	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	No
70	Wageman	1995 1	1120	115	Correlational	US	Xerox technician teams	0.21 1	Outcome interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	quasi-experiment	Performance rank	Objective performance		Other		No
70	Wageman	1995		96	Correlational	US	Xerox technician teams	0.38 1	Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Manipulation	quasi-experiment	Cooperation norms	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	No
70	Wageman	1995		96	Correlational	US	Xerox technician teams	0.40 1	Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Manipulation	quasi-experiment	Quality of group processes	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	No
	Wageman	1995		96	Correlational	US	Xerox technician teams	0.07 1	Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Manipulation	quasi-experiment	Effort norms	Action process	Task	Team members		No
	Wageman	1995		96	Correlational	US	Xerox technician teams	0.11 1	Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Manipulation	quasi-experiment	Internal work motivation	Emergent State	Task		Allmendinger et al., 1992	No
	Wageman	1995		96	Correlational	US	Xerox technician teams	0.24 1	Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Manipulation	quasi-experiment	Learning	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	No
70	Wageman	1995		96	Correlational	US	Xerox technician teams	0.20 1	Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Manipulation	quasi-experiment	Performance rank	Objective performance		Other		No
_														~ .					
71	Wageman & Baker	1997 1	112	56	Experimental	US	Undergraduates at northeastern university	0.03 1 1	Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Manipulation	Manipulation	Performance	Objective performance		Other		No
74	Wassess & Bales	1007	112	50	Francisco estab	uc	Hadanada ata at a set service as a	0.20 4 3	December 1 and 1 a	Outroma intendenced	Dannad	Mania I-II-	Maninulation	Derfermen	Objective and form		Other		No
/1	Wageman & Baker	1997 1	112	56	Experimental	US	Undergraduates at northeastern university	0.29 1 1	Reward interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Performance	Objective performance		Other	for this study ovnoriments	NO
71	Wageman & Baker	1997 1	112	56	Experimental	US	Undergraduates at northeastern university	0.01 1	Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Manipulation	Manipulation	Cooperation	Interpersonal process	Relational	Other	for this study experimenter- rated	No
/1		1331	-14	30	Experimental	03	oder graduates at northeastern university	5.01 1	rusk interuepenuente	rusk interdependence	WINCU II	wampulation	ampaiacion	Соорстаноп	anter personal process	Acidaoliai	Outel	for this study experimenter-	
71	Wageman & Baker	1997 1	112	56	Experimental	US	Undergraduates at northeastern university	0.40 1	Reward interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Cooperation	Interpersonal process	Relational	Other	rated	No
, 1		1001		50	experimental		Call center of large mobile phone service	I		- accome interacpendence		pulation			ter personal process	c.acional	30.0		
72	Wang, Chen, Tjosvold, & Shi	2010 2	299	60	Correlational	China	provider in China	0.59	Cooperative goals	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Alper, Tjosvold, & Law (1998)	Constructive controversy	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	Tjosvold, 1998	Yes
-	<u> </u>					-	Undergraduates in strategic management					,	,	<del></del> ;	, p				
73	Wong	2008	320	80	Correlational	Singapore	course	-0.07 0.54 1	Task interdependency	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	for this study	Group effectiveness	Objective performance		Other		No

74	Wong	2008		40	Correlational	Singapore	Workers in 3 firms hospital, industrial diversified firm, and high tech	0.13	Task interdependency	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Kiggundu, 1983	Group effectiveness	Objective performance		Supervisor	for this study	No
	Wong, Tjosvold, & Liu		292	101	Correlational	China	Cross-functional teams in a variety of industries in China	0.50 0.41	Cooperative goals	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Supervisor	Alper, Tjosvold, & Law (1998)	Organizational citizenship behavior (tea		Task	Supervisor	Farh, Earley, & Lin, 1997	Yes
76	Wong, Tjosvold, & Liu	:	292	101	Correlational	China	Cross-functional teams in a variety of industries in China	0.63 0.41 0.31	Cooperative goals	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Supervisor	Alper, Tjosvold, & Law (1998)	Potency-initiative	Emergent State	Task	Team members		
7.0	Mana Tinneld 9 Liv		202	101	Carrelational	China	Cross-functional teams in a variety of	0.10 0.41 0.87	Connective and	0	Cool	Commission	Alasa Tiasuald 8 Jan. (1000)	lana anakina	Cubicative and amount		Commission	D	
76	Wong, Tjosvold, & Liu	•	292	101	Correlational	China	industries in China	0.19 0.41 0.87	Cooperative goals	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Supervisor	Alper, Tjosvold, & Law (1998)	Innovation	Subjective performance		Supervisor	Burpitt & Bigoness (1997)	
77	Yuan, Fulk, Monge, & Contractor	2010	218	18	Correlational	Unsure	Teams from five industries: aerospace, hospitality, legal, military, and consulting	0.46	Shared task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	network analysis	Expertise exchange	Action process	Task	Team members	network analysis	Yes
77	Yuan, Fulk, Monge, & Contractor	2010	218	18	Correlational	Unsure	Teams from five industries: aerospace, hospitality, legal, military, and consulting	0.51	Shared task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	network analysis	Communication tie strength	Action process	Task	Team members	•	Yes
78	Zhang, Han, Hempel, & Tjosvold, 2007	2007	566	104	Correlational	China	Teams from 114 companies	0.35 0.34 0.54	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Cooperative goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence		Team members	Tjosvold, Andrews, & Jones, 1983	Yes
78	Zhang, Han, Hempel, & Tjosvold, 2007			104	Correlational	China	Teams from 114 companies	0.34 0.34 0.55	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI		Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Support for innovation	Transition process	Task			Yes
78	Zhang, Han, Hempel, & Tjosvold, 2007	2007	566	104	Correlational	China	Teams from 114 companies	0.10 0.34 0.82	Task interdependence Cooperative goal	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Team performance	Subjective performance		Supervisor	Ancona & Caldwell, 1992	No
78	Zhang, Han, Hempel, & Tjosvold, 2007			104	Correlational	China	Teams from 114 companies	0.19 0.54 0.82		Outcome interdependence	Goal		Tjosvold, Andrews, & Jones, 1983	Team performance	Subjective performance		Supervisor	Ancona & Caldwell, 1992	No
79 79	Zhu Zhu			92 92	Correlational	US US	Charter school boards	0.42 0.24 0.20 0.24	Task interdependence Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI		Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Closeness	Emergent State	Relational Relational	Team members		Yes Yes
79				92	Correlational Correlational	US	Charter school boards Charter school boards	0.18 0.24 0.83	Task interdependence	Task interdependence Task interdependence	Mixed TI		Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Communication frequency Performance (composite)	Interpersonal process Subjective performance	Relational	Team members Supervisor	social network measure Ancona & Caldwell, 1992	No
70	76	2009	673	92	Correlational	US	Charter school boards	0.22 0.24 0.91	Task interdependence	Tack interdependence	Mixed TI	Toom mombors	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Innovation (composite)	Subjective performance		Suponicor	Drach-Zahavy & Somech, 2001	No
79	Zhu	2009	0/5	92	Correlational	03	Customer service engineers for office	0.55 0.24 0.61	·	Task interdependence	Wilkeu II	ream members	rearce & Gregersen, 1991	Innovation (composite)	Subjective performance		Supervisor	Diacii-Zaliavy & Solliecii, 2001	
80	Maynard, Mathieu, & Ruddy	2011	534	106	Correlational	US	equipment and technology company Customer service engineers for office	0.15	Task interdependence	Task interdependence		Team members		Outcome interdependence	Outcome interdependence		Team members		Yes
80	Maynard, Mathieu, & Ruddy	2011	534	106	Correlational	US	equipment and technology company Customer service engineers for office	0.18	Task interdependence	Task interdependence		Team members		Work group empowerment	Emergent State	Task	Team members		Yes
80	Maynard, Mathieu, & Ruddy	2011	534	106	Correlational	US	equipment and technology company Customer service engineers for office	0.19	Task interdependence	Task interdependence		Team members		Team performance	Objective performance		Other		No
80	Maynard, Mathieu, & Ruddy	2011	534	106	Correlational	US	equipment and technology company	0.25	Task interdependence	Task interdependence		Team members		Work process coordination	Action process	Task	Team members		Yes
80	Maynard, Mathieu, & Ruddy	2011	534	106	Correlational	US	Customer service engineers for office equipment and technology company	0.00	Outcome interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members		Work group empowerment	Emergent State	Task	Team members		Yes
80	Maynard, Mathieu, & Ruddy	2011	534	106	Correlational	US	Customer service engineers for office equipment and technology company	-0.15	Outcome interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members		Team performance	Objective performance		Other		No
80	Maynard, Mathieu, & Ruddy	2011	534	106	Correlational	US	Customer service engineers for office equipment and technology company	0.20	Outcome interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members		Work process coordination	Action process	Task	Team members		Yes
81	Chen	1995	322	52	Correlational	Unsure	Mixed (customer service, R&D, quality assurance, health services, education)	0.41	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	for this study	Coordination	Action process	Task	Team members	Van de Ven & Ferry, 1980	Yes
81	Chen	1995	322	52	Correlational	Unsure	Mixed (customer service, R&D, quality assurance, health services, education)	0.23 0.91	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	for this study	Team effectiveness	Subjective performance		Team members	For this study	Yes
82	Lee	1989	295	35	Correlational	US	Hospital teams	0.26	Workflow interdependence (composite)	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	for this study	Group working relationships	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
82	Lee	1989	295	35	Correlational	US	Hospital teams	0.13	Workflow interdependence (composite)	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	for this study	Coordinated efforts	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
82	Lee	1989	295	35	Correlational	US	Hospital teams	0.13	Workflow interdependence (composite)	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	for this study	Group-task effectiveness (PMR)	Objective performance		Supervisor	for this study	No
82	Lee	1989	295	35	Correlational	US	Hospital teams	-0.15 0.88	Workflow interdependence (composite)	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	for this study	Group-task effectiveness global)	Subjective performance		Other		No
83	Wang	2009	213	62	Correlational	Canada	Mixed (retail, media, transportation, forestry, shipbuilding, equipment)	0.48 0.48 0.2	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Wageman & Gordon, 2005	Group identification	Emergent State	Relational	Team members	for this study	Yes
83	Wang	2009	213	62	Correlational	Canada	Mixed (retail, media, transportation, forestry, shipbuilding, equipment)	0.38 0.48 0.35	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Wageman & Gordon, 2005	Collective efficacy	Emergent State	Task	Team members	Riggs & Knight, 1994	Yes
83	Wang	2009	213	62	Correlational	Canada	Mixed (retail, media, transportation, forestry, shipbuilding, equipment)	0.45 0.48 0.43	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Wageman & Gordon, 2005	Helping behavior	Action process	Task	Team members	Podsakoff et al., 1997	Yes
83	Wang	2009	213	62	Correlational	Canada	Mixed (retail, media, transportation, forestry, shipbuilding, equipment)	0.05 0.48 0.88	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Wageman & Gordon, 2005	Group performance	Subjective performance		Supervisor	Barrick, Stewart, Neubert, & Mount, 1998	No
84	Shin	2005	331	56	Correlational	South Korea	Mixed (oil refinery, trading, and media)	0.86 0.84 0.7	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Team process perceptions	Overall process		Team members	Mix of OCB, efficacy, cohesion	Yes
84	Shin	2005	331	56	Correlational	South Korea	Mixed (oil refinery, trading, and media)	0.18 0.84 0.84	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Team performance	Subjective performance		Supervisor	Mix of scales	No
85	Pauly			44	Experimental	US	Undergraduate students	0.03 1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Manipulation	-9 ,	Task cohesion	Emergent State	Relational	•		No
85	Pauly			44	Experimental	US	Undergraduate students	0.58 1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Manipulation		Communication	Action process	Task	Team members	•	No
	Pauly Pauly			44 44	Experimental Experimental	US US	Undergraduate students Undergraduate students	0.26 1 0.29 1 1	Task interdependence Task interdependence	Task interdependence Task interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI	Manipulation Manipulation		Task conflict Quantity of output	Interpersonal process Objective performance	Relational	Team members Other	Jehn, 1995	No No
	Pauly			44	Experimental	US	Undergraduate students	0.14 1 1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Manipulation		Quality of output	Objective performance		Other		No
85	Pauly	2011	176	44	Experimental	US	Undergraduate students	0.06 1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Manipulation		Team viability	Overall process		Team members	George, Perkins, Sundstrom, & Meyers, 1990	No
86	Nielsen	2001	209	52	Correlational	US	Mixed (6 different orgs in healthcare, auditors, HR teams, manufacturing)	0.48 0.76 0.8	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Wageman, 1995	Overall Team OCB	Action process	Task	Team members	Podsakoff et al., 1997	Yes
86	Nielsen	2001	209	52	Correlational	US	Mixed (6 different orgs in healthcare, auditors, HR teams, manufacturing)	0.33 0.76 0.92	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Wageman, 1995	Team performance (Time 1 and 2)	Subjective performance		Supervisor	Ancona & Caldwell, 1992	No
87	Mayer			383	Correlational	US	Departments in grocery store chain		Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Supervisor	for this study	Customer satisfaction	Subjective performance		Other	for this study	No
88	Liu			312	Correlational	China	Five orgs in China	0.51	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Other	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Guanxi (engaging in social activities out		Relational	Other	Wong et al., 2003	Both
88 88	Liu Liu			312 312	Correlational Correlational	China China	Five orgs in China Five orgs in China	0.59 0.56	Task interdependence Task interdependence	Task interdependence Task interdependence	Mixed TI Mixed TI	Other Other	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Team orientation Communication	Overall process Action process	Task	Other Other	Rosenstein, 1994 Rosenstein, 1994	Both Both
88	Liu Liu			312	Correlational	China	Five orgs in China Five orgs in China	0.56	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Other	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Backup	Action process Action process	Task	Other	Rosenstein, 1994	Both
88				312	Correlational	China	Five orgs in China	0.55	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Other	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Monitoring	Action process	Task	Other	Rosenstein, 1994	Both
88	Liu	2006	1657	312	Correlational	China	Five orgs in China	0.56	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Other	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Feedback	Action process	Task	Other	Rosenstein, 1994	Both
88	Liu	2006	1657	312	Correlational	China	Five orgs in China	0.61	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Other	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Team coordination	Action process	Task	Other	Rosenstein, 1994 Three different performance	Both
88	Liu	2006	1657	312	Correlational	China	Five orgs in China	0.56 0.91	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Other	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Team performance	Subjective performance		Other	measures	Both
89	Lin	2001	768	235	Experimental	China	Undergrads from three Chinese universities	0.52	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	for this study	Collective efficacy	Emergent State	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
89	Lin	2001	768	235	Experimental	China	Undergrads from three Chinese universities	5 0.74	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	for this study	Group effort	Transition process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
89	Lin	2001	768	235	Experimental	China	Undergrads from three Chinese universities	5 0.02 1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	for this study	Group performance	Objective performance		Other		No

						Process improvement teams in a large, multidivisional, multinational company in											
90	Ariel, Shiera	2000	85	Correlational	Mixed	the computer industry  Process improvement teams in a large,	0.31	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members for this study	Communication Problems	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
						multidivisional, multinational company in											
90	Ariel, Shiera	2000	85	Correlational	Mixed	the computer industry Process improvement teams in a large,	-0.09	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members for this study	Coordination Problems	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
90	Ariel, Shiera	2000	85	Correlational	Mixed	multidivisional, multinational company in the computer industry Process improvement teams in a large,	0.15 0.9	91 Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members for this study	Team output	Subjective performance		Team members	for this study	Yes
90	Ariel, Shiera	2000	85	Correlational	Mixed	multidivisional, multinational company in the computer industry	-0.02	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members for this study	Goal Clarity	Transition process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
			83			10 varied organizations in the US (largely		·	•		·			Idak		adapted from Campion et al,	
91	DeMatteo, Jacquelyn Suzanne	1997 330	45	Correlational	US	insurance industry) 10 varied organizations in the US (largely	-0.27	Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members Pearce & Gregerson, 1991	Outcome Interdependence	Outcome interdependence		Team members	1993	Yes
91	DeMatteo, Jacquelyn Suzanne	1997 330	45	Correlational	US	insurance industry) 10 varied organizations in the US (largely	-0.21	Outcome Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members Q's adapted from Campion et al, 19	93 Team Productivity	Subjective performance		Supervisor	for this study	No
91	DeMatteo, Jacquelyn Suzanne	1997 330	45	Correlational	US	insurance industry)	-0.03 0.9	94 Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members Pearce & Gregerson, 1991	Team Productivity	Subjective performance		Supervisor	for this study	No
91	DeMatteo, Jacquelyn Suzanne	1997 330	45	Correlational	US	10 varied organizations in the US (largely insurance industry)	-0.07 0.8	89 Outcome Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members Q's adapted from Campion et al, 19	93 Team Effectiveness	Subjective performance		Supervisor	for this study	No
91	DeMatteo, Jacquelyn Suzanne	1997 330	45	Correlational	US	10 varied organizations in the US (largely insurance industry)	-0.10 0.8	89 Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members Pearce & Gregerson, 1991	Team Effectiveness	Subjective performance		Supervisor	for this study	No
91	DeMatteo, Jacquelyn Suzanne	1997 330	45	Correlational	US	10 varied organizations in the US (largely insurance industry)	-0.12	Outcome Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members Q's adapted from Campion et al, 19	193 Collective Efficacy	Emergent State	Task	Team members	Riggs and Knight, 1994; plus for this study	Yes
		1997 330	45	Correlational	US	10 varied organizations in the US (largely	0.50	•		Mixed TI		•		Task	Team members	Riggs and Knight, 1994; plus for	Yes
	DeMatteo, Jacquelyn Suzanne					insurance industry) 10 varied organizations in the US (largely		Task Interdependence	Task interdependence		Team members Pearce & Gregerson, 1991	Collective Efficacy	Emergent State			•	
91	DeMatteo, Jacquelyn Suzanne	1997 330	45	Correlational	US	insurance industry) 10 varied organizations in the US (largely	-0.23	Outcome Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members Q's adapted from Campion et al, 19	193 Helping Behavior	Action process	Task	Supervisor	Smith et al. 1983	No
91	DeMatteo, Jacquelyn Suzanne	1997 330	45	Correlational	US	insurance industry) 10 varied organizations in the US (largely	0.00	Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members Pearce & Gregerson, 1991	Helping Behavior	Action process	Task	Supervisor	Smith et al. 1983	No
91	DeMatteo, Jacquelyn Suzanne	1997 330	45	Correlational	US	insurance industry)  10 varied organizations in the US (largely	-0.29	Outcome Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members Q's adapted from Campion et al, 19	193 Information Sharing	Action process	Task	Supervisor	Barnard and Rush, 1995	No
91	DeMatteo, Jacquelyn Suzanne	1997 330	45	Correlational	US	insurance industry)	-0.04	Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members Pearce & Gregerson, 1991	Information Sharing	Action process	Task	Supervisor	·	No
91	DeMatteo, Jacquelyn Suzanne	1997 330	45	Correlational	US	10 varied organizations in the US (largely insurance industry)	-0.27	Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members Pearce & Gregerson, 1991	Outcome Interdependence	Outcome interdependence		Team members	adapted from Campion et al, 1993	Yes
						global manufacturing company, a small paper product manufacturing company,											
92	Ford, Lucy R.	1989 283	40	Correlational	Mixed	and a small US subsidiary of a large European company	0.21	Work Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members Klein et al., 2003	Social Interaction	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	Klein et al., 2001	Yes
						global manufacturing company, a small paper product manufacturing company,											
92	Ford, Lucy R.	1989 283	40	Correlational	Mixed	and a small US subsidiary of a large European company	0.11	Work Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members Klein et al., 2003	TMX	Action process	Task	Team members	Seers et al., 2001	Yes
						global manufacturing company, a small paper product manufacturing company,											
92	Ford, Lucy R.	1989 283	40	Correlational	Mixed	and a small US subsidiary of a large European company	0.11	Work Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members Klein et al., 2003	Mutual influence	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	for this study	Yes
						global manufacturing company, a small paper product manufacturing company, and a small US subsidiary of a large											
92	Ford, Lucy R.	1989 283	40	Correlational	Mixed	European company global manufacturing company, a small	-0.08	Work Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members Klein et al., 2003	Role clarity	Transition process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
						paper product manufacturing company, and a small US subsidiary of a large											
	Ford, Lucy R. Gibson, Cristina	1989 283	40	Correlational	Mixed	European company	0.06 0.7	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Task interdependence	Process	Team members Klein et al., 2003 Team members for this study	Work group effectiveness	Subjective performance	Tack	Team members Team members		Yes No
	Gibson, Cristina Gibson, Cristina	1995 187 1995 187	71 71	Correlational Correlational	Mixed Mixed	Nursing teams Nursing teams	-0.06 -0.03 0.9	Task interdependence Task interdependence	Task interdependence Task interdependence	Process Process	Team members for this study Team members for this study	Group efficacy Performance	Emergent State Subjective performance	Task	Supervisor	for this study	Yes
93		1995 187	71	Correlational	Mixed	Nursing teams	0.19	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members for this study	Identification	Emergent State	Relational	Team members	for this study	Yes
93 94	Gibson, Cristina Goldstein, Nancy B.	1995 187 1996 #REF!	71 64	Correlational Experimental	Mixed US	Nursing teams Undergrads at Tulane	0.27 0.7 0.07	76 Task interdependence Task Interdependence	Task interdependence Task Interdependence	Process Process	Team members for this study  Manipulation	Reputation Group Performance	Subjective performance Objective performance		Other	for this study	No No
	, , ,			·		_		·	•		·			Balantaral		Carron, Brawley, and Widmeyer	
	Goldstein, Nancy B. Halfhill, Terry	1996 #REF! 2000 198	64 40	Experimental Correlational	US US	Undergrads at Tulane Air National Guardsmen	0.01 -0.12 0.75 0.8	Task Interdependence Task Interdependence	Task Interdependence Task Interdependence	Process Process	Manipulation Team members Kiggundu et al, 1983	Interpersonal Cohesion Group Performance	Emergent State Subjective performance	Relational	Team members Supervisor	• •	No No
96	Heiney, Michele	1996 160	#REF!	Experimental	US	Undergrad psych and business students from VCU	0.07	Task Interdependence	Task Interdependence		Team members	Performance	Objective performance		Other		No
						existing work teams in europe and north											
97	Huang, Meikuan	2007 208	17	Correlational	Mixed	america that utilize a shared digital knowledge repository among the members	0.20	Task Interdependence	Task Interdependence	Process	Team members For this study	Trust	Emergent State	Relational	Team members	For this study	Yes
						Apparel Product Development teams from		·	•				-	Neidelonai		•	
	Kwak, Eun J. Lynn	2004 131	34	Correlational	US	various companies Apparel Product Development teams from	0.40	Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members Campion et al, 1993	Goal Interdependence	Outcome interdependence			•	Yes
98	Kwak, Eun J. Lynn	2004 131	34	Correlational	US	various companies Apparel Product Development teams from	0.37	Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members Campion et al, 1993	Feedback / Reward Interdependence	Outcome interdependence		Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Yes
98	Kwak, Eun J. Lynn	2004 131	34	Correlational	US	various companies Apparel Product Development teams from	0.58	Goal Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members Campion et al, 1993	Feedback / Reward Interdependence	Outcome interdependence		Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Yes
98	Kwak, Eun J. Lynn	2004 131	34	Correlational	US	various companies Apparel Product Development teams from	0.16 0.8	89 Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members Campion et al, 1993	Team effectiveness	Subjective performance		Team members	for this study	Yes
98	Kwak, Eun J. Lynn	2004 131	34	Correlational	US	various companies Apparel Product Development teams from	0.24 0.8	89 Goal Interdependence Feedback / Reward	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members Campion et al, 1993	Team effectiveness	Subjective performance		Team members	for this study	Yes
98	Kwak, Eun J. Lynn	2004 131	34	Correlational	US	various companies Apparel Product Development teams from	0.30 0.8		Reward interdependence	Reward	Team members Campion et al, 1993	Team effectiveness	Subjective performance		Team members	for this study	Yes
98	Kwak, Eun J. Lynn	2004 131	34	Correlational	US	various companies	0.26	Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members Campion et al, 1993	Potency	Emergent State	Task	Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Yes
98	Kwak, Eun J. Lynn	2004 131	34	Correlational	US	Apparel Product Development teams from various companies	0.28	Goal Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members Campion et al, 1993	Potency	Emergent State	Task	Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Yes
98	Kwak, Eun J. Lynn	2004 131	34	Correlational	US	Apparel Product Development teams from various companies	0.45	Feedback / Reward Interdependence	Reward interdependence	Reward	Team members Campion et al, 1993	Potency	Emergent State	Task	Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Yes
98	Kwak, Eun J. Lynn	2004 131	34	Correlational	US	Apparel Product Development teams from various companies	0.40	Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members Campion et al, 1993	Social Support	Action process	Task	Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Yes
	Kwak, Eun J. Lynn	2004 131	34	Correlational	US	Apparel Product Development teams from various companies	0.20	Goal Interdependence	Outcome interdependence		Team members Campion et al, 1993	Social Support	Action process	Task			Yes
20		200. 131	٥.	20.1.C.Gtional		sas companies	3.20	3001 interacpendence	_ accome meruependence	-001		sapport	process		. ca members	pon et al, 1999	

Process improvement teams in a large,

						A		Southerly (Bornell										
00	Kwak, Eun J. Lynn	2004 131	24	Correlational	US	Apparel Product Development teams from various companies	0.27	Feedback / Reward Interdependence	Reward interdependence	Reward	Toom mombors	Campion et al, 1993	Social Support	Action process	Task	Toom mombors	Campion et al, 1993	Voc
98	KWak, Euri J. Lynn	2004 131	. 34	Correlational	US	Apparel Product Development teams from		interdependence	Reward Interdependence	Reward	ream members	Campion et al, 1993	Social Support	Action process	Task	ream members	Campion et al, 1993	Yes
98	Kwak, Eun J. Lynn	2004 131	. 34	Correlational	US	various companies	0.19	Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Workload Sharing	Action process	Task	Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Yes
	•					Apparel Product Development teams from	ı	•	·				J.	·				
98	Kwak, Eun J. Lynn	2004 131	. 34	Correlational	US	various companies	0.25	Goal Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Workload Sharing	Action process	Task	Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Yes
						Apparel Product Development teams from		Feedback / Reward										
98	Kwak, Eun J. Lynn	2004 131	. 34	Correlational	US	various companies	0.32	Interdependence	Reward interdependence	Reward	Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Workload Sharing	Action process	Task	Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Yes
						Apparel Product Development teams from												
98	Kwak, Eun J. Lynn	2004 131	. 34	Correlational	US	various companies  Apparel Product Development teams from	0.45	Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Communication / Cooperation within T	ea Action process	Task	Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Yes
98	Kwak, Eun J. Lynn	2004 131	. 34	Correlational	US	various companies	0.27	Goal Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Communication / Cooperation within T	ea Action process	Task	Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Yes
	•					Apparel Product Development teams from	ı	Feedback / Reward						•			•	
98	Kwak, Eun J. Lynn	2004 131	. 34	Correlational	US	various companies	0.45	Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Communication / Cooperation within T	ea Action process	Task	Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Yes
99	Pearsall, Christian, & Ellis	2010 360	90	Experimental	US	Undergraduates at US university	0.61 1 1	Cooperative condition	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Information allocation	Action process	Task	Other	for this study	No
99	Pearsall, Christian, & Ellis	2010 360	90	Experimental	US	Undergraduates at US university	0.33 1 0.7	Cooperative condition	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Social loafing	Action process	Task	Team members	Liden et al., 2004	No
99	Pearsall, Christian, & Ellis	2010 360	90	Experimental	US	Undergraduates at US university	0.31 1 1	Cooperative condition	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Team performance	Objective performance		Other	for this study	No
	DeShon, Kozlowski, Schmidt, Milner, &																	
100	Wiechmann	2004 237	79	Experimental	US	Undergrade psych students in US	-0.25 1 1	Team feedback	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Team goals	Transition process	Task	Team members	for this study	No
	DeShon, Kozlowski, Schmidt, Milner, &																	
100	Wiechmann	2004 237	79	Experimental	US	Undergrade psych students in US	0.02 1	Team feedback	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Team goal commitment	Emergent State	Relational	Team members	for this study	No
	DeShon, Kozlowski, Schmidt, Milner, &																	
100	Wiechmann	2004 237	79	Experimental	US	Undergrade psych students in US	0.02 1	Team feedback	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Team efficacy	Emergent State	Task	Team members	for this study	No
	DeShon, Kozlowski, Schmidt, Milner, &												_					
100	Wiechmann	2004 237	79	Experimental	US	Undergrade psych students in US	0.16 1	Team feedback	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Team strategy	Transition process	Task	Team members	for this study	No
100	DeShon, Kozlowski, Schmidt, Milner, & Wiechmann	2004 237	79	F	uc	Hadasanda sarah studasta is HC	0.10 1 1	Team feedback	0	Dannard	Maniaulation	Manipulation	Team-focused effort	A-ti	Teel	Team members	for this stand.	Ne
100	DeShon, Kozlowski, Schmidt, Milner, &	2004 237	79	Experimental	US	Undergrade psych students in US	0.18 1 1	ream reedback	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	ream-rocused errort	Action process	Task	ream members	for this study	No
100	Wiechmann	2004 237	79	Experimental	US	Undergrade psych students in US	0.20 1 1	Team feedback	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Team-oriented performance	Objective performance		Other	for this study	No
100	Wicciniani	2004 257	,,	Experimental	03	Preexisting intramural and professional	0.20 1 1	reamreeaback	Outcome interdependence	neward	Wampalation	Wallpalation	ream oriented performance	Objective performance		Other	Tor this study	140
101	Crown & Rosse	1995 420	60	Experimental	US	sports teams	0.60 1 1	Group goal	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Manipulation	Manipulation	Group performance	Objective performance		Other	for this study	No
	Berkowitz & Levv	1956	25	Experimental	US	Basic trainees in Air Force	0.09 1 1	Group feedback	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Group performance	Objective performance		Other	for this study	No
	Berkowitz & Levy	1956	25	Experimental	US	Basic trainees in Air Force	0.35 1	Group feedback	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Pride in group	Emergent State	Relational	Team members	for this study	No
	Zajonc	1962 140	20	Experimental	US	Air Force personnel	0.52 1 1	Group feedback	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Group performance	Objective performance		Other	for this study	No
	-3-			,		Financial service teams in Dutch								,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			,	
104	Van der Vegt & Janssen	2003 343	41	Correlational	Netherlands	multinational company	0.14 0.68	Perceived task interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Process	Team members	Van der Vegt et al., 2000	Perceived goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence		Team members	Van der Vegt etal., 1999	Yes
105	Lian, Hongyu, & Xing	2009 120	30	Experimental	China	College students in China	0.08 1 1	Reward interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Team performance	Objective performance		Other	for this study	No
106	Tjosvold, Yu, & Hui	2004	107	Correlational	China	Teams from organizations in Shanghai	0.63	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Alper, Tjosvold, & Law (1998)	Problem solving	Transition process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
106	Tjosvold, Yu, & Hui	2004	107	Correlational	China	Teams from organizations in Shanghai	0.65	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Alper, Tjosvold, & Law (1998)	Learning by group	Action process	Task	Team members	Van Dyck et al., 1998	Yes
107	Chen & Tjosvold	2002 126	32	Correlational	China	MBA students in China	0.09	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Alper, Tjosvold, & Law (1998)	Innovation	Subjective performance		Team members	Burpitt & Bigoness (1997)	Yes
107	Chen & Tjosvold	2002 126	32	Correlational	China	MBA students in China	0.48	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Alper, Tjosvold, & Law (1998)	Team loyalty	Emergent State	Relational	Team members	For this study	Yes
107	Chen & Tjosvold	2002 126	32	Correlational	China	MBA students in China	0.56	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Alper, Tjosvold, & Law (1998)	Constructive controversy	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	Tjosvold, 1988	Yes