

No	Authors	Year	N Ind	N Groups	Experimental or		Sample description	r	rxx	ryy	X Experimentalel	Predictor category	Predictor sub-category	Source of X	X scale	Y Experimentalel	Outcome category	Team Functioning				
					Correlational?	Country												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	Team members	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	Team members	Manipulation	Manipulation	Group performance	Objective performance	Other	Team members	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	Team members	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	Team members	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	Team members	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	0.03		0.82	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Team performance	Subjective performance	Supervisor	Team members	for this study	No	
6	Aube & Rousseau	2005	392	74	Correlational	Canada	13 organizations in different industries	0.24		0.81	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Quality of group experience	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	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	Team members	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	Team members	Manipulation	Group performance	Objective performance	Other	Team members	for this study	No	
7	Bachrach, Powell, Collins, & Richey	2006	186	62	Experimental	US	University students	0.39	1	0.58	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Manipulation	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	0.37	0.58	0.71	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Social interdependence	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	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	
9	Beersma, Hollenbeck, Humphrey, Moon, Conlon, & Ilgen	2003	300	75	Experimental	US	University students	0.16	1	1	Reward structure	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Average performance	Objective performance		Team members	for this study	No	
9	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		Team members	for this study	No	
9	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		Team members	for this study	No	
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	Financial services company	0.38	0.36	0.57	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence		Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Yes	
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	Information system, insurance, and administrative jobs at financial services company	0.27	0.36	0.52	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Reward/Feedback interdependence	Outcome interdependence		Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Yes	
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	Information system, insurance, and administrative jobs at financial services 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	
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	Information system, insurance, and administrative jobs at financial services 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	
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	Information system, insurance, and administrative jobs at financial services 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	
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	Information system, insurance, and administrative jobs at financial services 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	
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	Information system, insurance, and administrative jobs at financial services 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	
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	Information system, insurance, and administrative jobs at financial services 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	
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	Information system, insurance, and administrative jobs at financial services company	0.34	0.57	0.66	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Flexibility	Action process	Task	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Yes	
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	Information system, insurance, and administrative jobs at financial services company	0.42	0.57	0.55	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Potency	Emergent State	Task	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Yes	
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	Information system, insurance, and administrative jobs at financial services company	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., 1993	Yes	
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	Information system, insurance, and administrative jobs at financial services 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	
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	Information system, insurance, and administrative jobs at financial services 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	
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	Information system, insurance, and administrative jobs at financial services company	0.39	0.52	0.66	Feedback/Reward interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Flexibility	Action process	Task	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Yes	
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	Information system, insurance, and administrative jobs at financial services company	0.49	0.52	0.55	Feedback/Reward interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Potency	Emergent State	Task	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Yes	
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	Information system, insurance, and administrative jobs at financial services company	0.48	0.52	0.51	Feedback/Reward interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Social support	Action process	Task	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Yes	
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	Information system, insurance, and administrative jobs at financial services company	0.44	0.52	0.63	Feedback/Reward interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Workload sharing	Action process	Task	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Yes	
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	60	Correlational	US	Information system, insurance, and administrative jobs at financial services company	0.47	0.52	0.57	Feedback/Reward interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Communication/cooperation within the	Action process	Task	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Yes	
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	59	Correlational	US	Information system, insurance, and administrative jobs at financial services 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	
10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	59	Correlational	US	Information system, insurance, and administrative jobs at financial services 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	

10	Campion, Papper, & Medsker	1996	357	59	Correlational	US	Information system, insurance, and administrative jobs at financial services company	0.41	0.52	0.89	Feedback/Reward 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	391	80	Correlational	US	Clerical workers at a large financial services company	0.12	0.04	0.03	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	for this study	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Team members	for this study	Yes	
11	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993	391	80	Correlational	US	Clerical workers at a large financial services company	0.11	0.04	0.16	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	for this study	Reward/Feedback interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Team members	for this study	Yes	
11	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993	391	80	Correlational	US	Clerical workers at a large financial services company	0.10	0.04	0.33	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	391	80	Correlational	US	Clerical workers at a large financial services company	0.04	0.04	0.66	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	391	80	Correlational	US	Clerical workers at a large financial services 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	391	80	Correlational	US	Clerical workers at a large financial services company	0.05	0.04	0.58	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	391	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	391	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	
11	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993	391	76	Correlational	US	Clerical workers at a large financial services company	-0.06	0.04	0.82	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	for this study	Team effectiveness	Subjective performance	Supervisor	for this study	No	
11	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993	391	80	Correlational	US	Clerical workers at a large financial services company	0.29	0.03	0.82	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	391	80	Correlational	US	Clerical workers at a large financial services company	0.14	0.03	0.33	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	391	80	Correlational	US	Clerical workers at a large financial services company	0.22	0.03	0.66	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	391	80	Correlational	US	Clerical workers at a large financial services 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	391	80	Correlational	US	Clerical workers at a large financial services company	0.16	0.03	0.58	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	391	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	391	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	
11	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993	391	76	Correlational	US	Clerical workers at a large financial services company	0.11	0.03	0.82	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	for this study	Team effectiveness	Subjective performance	Supervisor	for this study	No	
11	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993	391	80	Correlational	US	Clerical workers at a large financial services company	0.16	0.16	0.33	Feedback/Reward interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	for this study	Flexibility	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
11	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993	391	80	Correlational	US	Clerical workers at a large financial services company	0.18	0.16	0.66	Feedback/Reward interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	for this study	Potency	Emergent State	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
11	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993	391	80	Correlational	US	Clerical workers at a large financial services company	0.14	0.16	0.44	Feedback/Reward interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	for this study	Social support	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
11	Campion, Medsker, & Higgs	1993	391	80	Correlational	US	Clerical workers at a large financial services company	0.17	0.16	0.58	Feedback/Reward 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	391	80	Correlational	US	Clerical workers at a large financial services company	0.15	0.16	0.57	Feedback/Reward interdependence	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	391	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	391	76	Correlational	US	Clerical workers at a large financial services company	0.13	0.16	0.82	Feedback/Reward interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	for this study	Team effectiveness	Subjective performance	Supervisor	for this study	No	
12	Chen, Kirkman, Kanfer, Allen, & Rosen	2007	445	62	Correlational	US	Home improvement company	-0.04	1	0.38	Team interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Other	Comparison of high (freight) and low (Team empowerment	Emergent State	Task	Team members	Kirkman & Rosen, 1999	No
12	Chen, Kirkman, Kanfer, Allen, & Rosen	2007	445	62	Correlational	US	Home improvement company	-0.06	1	0.97	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	270	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	270	53	Correlational	Taiwan	R&D departments of 53 companies in Taiwan	0.54	0.39	0.65	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	270	53	Correlational	Taiwan	R&D departments of 53 companies in Taiwan	0.27	0.39		Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Van der Vegt et al., 2001	Organizational citizenship behavior (tear	Action process	Task	Team members	Farh, Earley, & Lin, 1997	Yes
13	Chen, Tang, & Wang	2009	270	53	Correlational	Taiwan	R&D departments of 53 companies in Taiwan	0.48	0.46	0.65	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Mixed OI	Team members	Van der Vegt et al., 2003	Group cohesion	Emergent State	Relational	Team members	Dobbins & Zaccaro, 1986	Yes
13	Chen, Tang, & Wang	2009	270	53	Correlational	Taiwan	R&D departments of 53 companies in Taiwan	0.29	0.46		Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Mixed OI	Team members	Van der Vegt et al., 2003	Organizational citizenship behavior (tear	Action process	Task	Team members	Farh, Earley, & Lin, 1997	Yes
15	Cheng	1983		127	Correlational	Belgium	Research units from 33 Belgium organizations	0.31			Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Mohr (1971)	Coordination	Action process	Task	Team members	Georgeopoulos & Mann, 1962	Yes
15	Cheng	1983		127	Correlational	Belgium	Research units from 33 Belgium organizations	0.00		0.87	Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Mohr (1971)	Unit performance -- output quality	Subjective performance	Supervisor	Pelz & Andrews, 1966	No	
16	David, Pearce, & Randolph	1989	221	42	Correlational	US	Five banks in southeastern U.S.	0.11			Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Mohr (1971)	Unit performance -- output quantity	Objective performance	Other	Team members	social network measure	No
16	David, Pearce, & Randolph	1989	221	42	Correlational	US	Five banks in southeastern U.S.	-0.07			Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	for this study	Connectedness	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	for this study	Yes
17	De Dreu	2007	368	46	Correlational	Netherlands	Private recruiting, selection, and assessment company	-0.33		0.96	Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	for this study	Performance	Subjective performance	Supervisor	for this study	No	
17	De Dreu	2007	368	46	Correlational	Netherlands	Private recruiting, selection, and assessment company	0.14	0.66	0.63	Cooperative outcome interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Mixed OI	Team members	Janssen, Van de Vliert, & Veenstra, 200	Task reflexivity	Transition process	Task	Team members	Carter & West, 1998	Yes
17	De Dreu	2007	368	46	Correlational	Netherlands	Private recruiting, selection, and assessment company	0.08	0.66	0.7	Cooperative outcome interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Mixed OI	Team members	Janssen, Van de Vliert, & Veenstra, 200	Information sharing	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
17	De Dreu	2007	368	46	Correlational	Netherlands	Private recruiting, selection, and assessment company	0.26	0.66	0.5	Cooperative outcome interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Mixed OI	Team members	Janssen, Van de Vliert, & Veenstra, 200	Learning	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
17	De Dreu	2007	368	46	Correlational	Netherlands	Private recruiting, selection, and assessment company	0.15	0.66	0.69	Cooperative outcome interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Mixed OI	Team members	Janssen, Van de Vliert, & Veenstra, 200	Team effectiveness	Subjective performance	Supervisor	Hackman (1987)	No	
18	De Dreu	2002	215	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	215	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	215	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
18	De Dreu	2002	215	32	Correlational	Netherlands	Private selection and assessment company	0.04		0.79	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Team effectiveness	Subjective performance	Supervisor	Hackman (1983)	No	
18	De Dreu	2002	215	32	Correlational	Netherlands	Private selection and assessment company	0.15			Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Mixed OI	Team members	Van der Vegt et al. (2000)	Team reflexivity	Transition process	Task	Team members	Carter & West, 1998	Yes
18	De Dreu	2002	215	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

18	De Dreu	2002	215	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		
19	De Dreu & West	2001	109	21	Correlational	Netherlands	International postal service in Netherlands	0.14		Cooperative goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Mixed OI	Team members	Janssen, Van de Vliert, & Veenstra, 2000	Task conflict	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	Jehn (1995)	Yes	
19	De Dreu & West	2001	109	21	Correlational	Netherlands	International postal service in Netherlands	-0.13		Cooperative goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Mixed OI	Team members	Janssen, Van de Vliert, & Veenstra, 2000	Minority dissent	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	for this study	Yes	
20	De Dreu & West	2001	207	28	Correlational	Netherlands	Private recruiting, selection, and assessment company	0.07		Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Team members	Janssen, Van de Vliert, & Veenstra, 2000	Yes		
20	De Dreu & West	2001	207	28	Correlational	Netherlands	Private recruiting, selection, and assessment company	-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 Dreu & West	2001	207	28	Correlational	Netherlands	Private recruiting, selection, and assessment company	-0.14		Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Mixed OI	Team members	Janssen, Van de Vliert, & Veenstra, 2000	Minority dissent	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	for this study	Yes	
21	Fan & Gruenfeld	1998	162	#REF!	Experimental	US	University students	0.20	1	1	Reward Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward Manipulation		Time to solution	Objective performance				No	
21	Fan & Gruenfeld	1998	162	#REF!	Experimental	US	University students	0.18	1	1	Reward Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward Manipulation		Rounds completed	Objective performance				No	
21	Fan & Gruenfeld	1998	162	#REF!	Experimental	US	University students	0.20	1	1	Reward Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward Manipulation		Points earned	Objective performance				No	
21	Fan & Gruenfeld	1998	162	#REF!	Experimental	US	University students	0.23	1	1	Reward Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward Manipulation		Points per round	Objective performance				No	
21	Fan & Gruenfeld	1998	162	#REF!	Experimental	US	University students	0.32	1	1	Resource interdependence	Task interdependence	Resource Manipulation		Time to solution	Objective performance				No	
21	Fan & Gruenfeld	1998	162	#REF!	Experimental	US	University students	0.25	1	1	Resource interdependence	Task interdependence	Resource Manipulation		Rounds completed	Objective performance				No	
21	Fan & Gruenfeld	1998	162	#REF!	Experimental	US	University students	0.28	1	1	Resource interdependence	Task interdependence	Resource Manipulation		Points earned	Objective performance				No	
21	Fan & Gruenfeld	1998	162	#REF!	Experimental	US	University students	0.26	1	1	Resource interdependence	Task interdependence	Resource Manipulation		Points per round	Objective performance				No	
23	Goldman, Stockbauer & McAuliffe	1977	128	64	Experimental	US	University students	0.52	1	1	means-interdependence	Task interdependence	Process Manipulation		Performance	Objective performance				No	
23	Goldman, Stockbauer & McAuliffe	1977	128	64	Experimental	US	University students	0.37	1	1	Intergroup Reward Structure	Outcome interdependence	Reward Manipulation		Performance	Objective performance				No	
24	Gordon, Welch, Offringa & Katz	2000	240	#REF!	Experimental	US	recruited by newspaper ads in Boston, MA	0.54	1	1	Reward Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward Manipulation		Total Points Earned	Objective performance				No	
24	Gordon, Welch, Offringa & Katz	2000	240	#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	Gordon, Welch, Offringa & Katz	2000	240	#REF!	Experimental	US	recruited by newspaper ads in Boston, MA	0.19	1		Reward Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward Manipulation		Number of Loaners Used	Action process	Task	Other	objective	No	
25	Guymon	2006	54	27	Experimental	US	U Iowa Students	-0.13	1	1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process Manipulation		Performance	Objective performance				No	
25	Guymon	2006	54	27	Experimental	US	U Iowa Students	0.09	1		Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process Manipulation		Group commitment	Emergent State	Relational	team members	Klein et al., 2001	No	
26	Harrison, Price, Gavin & Florey	2002	562	144	Correlational	US	University students	0.07	1		Team reward contingency	Outcome interdependence	Reward Manipulation	coded for this study	Team performance	Objective performance				No	
26	Harrison, Price, Gavin & Florey	2002	562	144	Correlational	US	University students	0.38			Team reward contingency	Outcome interdependence	Reward Manipulation	coded for this study	ColExperimentaloration	Action process	Task	team members	draws from Hambrick, 1994; Campion et al., 1993; and Wageman, 1995	No	
27	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004	109	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	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004	109	31	Correlational	Germany	2 large businesses in Germany	0.39			Quality of Goal Setting Processes	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Konradt et al, 2003	Instrumentality	Emergent State	Task	Team members	Hertel, 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
27	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004	109	31	Correlational	Germany	2 large businesses in Germany	0.71			Quality of Goal Setting Processes	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team 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	109	31	Correlational	Germany	2 large businesses in Germany	0.26	1		Quality of Goal Setting Processes	Outcome interdependence	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	109	31	Correlational	Germany	2 large businesses in Germany	-0.06			Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Supervisor	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified b	Valence	Emergent State	Task	Team members	Hertel, 2002	No
27	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004	109	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	No
27	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004	109	31	Correlational	Germany	2 large businesses in Germany	0.13			Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Supervisor	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified b	Self-efficacy	Emergent State	Task	Team members	Hertel, 2002	No
27	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004	109	31	Correlational	Germany	2 large businesses in Germany	-0.07			Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Supervisor	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified b	Trust	Emergent State	Relational	Team members	Hertel, 2002	No
27	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004	109	31	Correlational	Germany	2 large businesses in Germany	0.30	0.82		Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Supervisor	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified b	Team effectiveness	Subjective performance	Other		No	
27	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004	109	31	Correlational	Germany	2 large businesses in Germany	0.18			Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Supervisor	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified b	Quality of Goal Setting Processes	Outcome interdependence	Team members	Konradt et al, 2003	No	
27	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004	109	31	Correlational	Germany	2 large businesses in Germany	0.25			Team based rewards	Outcome interdependence	Reward Manipulation		dichotomous variable derived through	Valence	Emergent State	Task	Team members	Hertel, 2002	No
27	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004	109	31	Correlational	Germany	2 large businesses in Germany	0.31			Team based rewards	Outcome interdependence	Reward Manipulation		dichotomous variable derived through	Instrumentality	Emergent State	Task	Team members	Hertel, 2002	No
27	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004	109	31	Correlational	Germany	2 large businesses in Germany	0.28			Team based rewards	Outcome interdependence	Reward Manipulation		dichotomous variable derived through	Self-efficacy	Emergent State	Task	Team members	Hertel, 2002	No
27	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004	109	31	Correlational	Germany	2 large businesses in Germany	0.04			Team based rewards	Outcome interdependence	Reward Manipulation		dichotomous variable derived through	Trust	Emergent State	Relational	Team members	Hertel, 2002	No
27	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004	109	31	Correlational	Germany	2 large businesses in Germany	0.46	0.82		Team based rewards	Outcome interdependence	Reward Manipulation		dichotomous variable derived through	Team effectiveness	Subjective performance	Other		No	
27	Hertel, Conradt, & Orlikowski	2004	109	31	Correlational	Germany	2 large businesses in Germany	0.05			Team based rewards	Outcome interdependence	Reward Manipulation		dichotomous variable derived through	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Supervisor	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991 (modified by Liden, Wayne & Bradway, 1997)	No	
28	Hirst & Yetton	1999	64	32	Experimental	Unsure	Managers	-0.61	1	1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process Manipulation		Task Performance	Objective performance				No	
29	Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra	1999		102	Correlational	Netherlands	members of management teams	0.21			Positive interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal Supervisor	for this study	task conflict	Interpersonal process	Relational	Supervisor	Jehn's 1995	Yes	
29	Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra	1999		102	Correlational	Netherlands	members of management teams	-0.45			Positive interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal Supervisor	for this study	Person conflict	Interpersonal process	Relational	Supervisor	Jehn's 1996	Yes	
29	Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra	1999		102	Correlational	Netherlands	members of management teams	0.38			Positive interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal Supervisor	for this study	Integrative Behavior	Interpersonal process	Relational	Supervisor	Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976	Yes	
29	Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra	1999		102	Correlational	Netherlands	members of management teams	0.40			Positive interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal Supervisor	for this study	Distributive Behavior	Interpersonal process	Relational	Supervisor	Thomas & Killman, 1974; Rahim, 1983; Janssen & van de Vliert, 1976	Yes	
29	Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra	1999		102	Correlational	Netherlands	members of management teams	0.45	0.8		Positive interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal Supervisor	for this study	Decision quality	Subjective performance				for this study	Yes
29	Janssen, van de Vliert, Veenstra	1999		102	Correlational	Netherlands	members of management teams	0.49			Positive interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal Supervisor	for this study	Affective acceptance	Interpersonal process	Relational	Supervisor	for this study	Yes	
30	Jehn	1995	589	105	Correlational	Unsure	large freight transportation firm	-0.04	0.81		Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	adaptation of van de ven, Delbecq, & I	Supervisor Report	Subjective performance			No	
30	Jehn	1995	589	105	Correlational	Unsure	large freight transportation firm	0.27	1		Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	adaptation of van de ven, Delbecq, & I	Production Report	Objective performance			No	
30	Jehn	1995	589	105	Correlational	Unsure	large freight transportation firm	0.03			Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	adaptation of van de ven, Delbecq, & I	Liking	Emergent State	Relational	Team members	unsure	Yes
30	Jehn	1995	589	105	Correlational	Unsure	large freight transportation firm	0.07			Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	adaptation of van de ven, Delbecq, & I	Intent to remain	Emergent State	Relational	Team members	Kraut, 1975	Yes
30	Jehn	1995	589	105	Correlational	Unsure	large freight transportation firm	0.11			Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	adaptation of van de ven, Delbecq, & I	Degree of resolution	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	for this study	Yes
30	Jehn	1995	589	105	Correlational	Unsure	large freight transportation firm	0.06			Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	adaptation of van de ven, Delbecq, & I	Relationship Conflict	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	for this study	Yes
30	Jehn	1995	589	105	Correlational	Unsure	large freight transportation firm	0.02			Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	adaptation of van de ven, Delbecq, & I	task conflict	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	for this study	Yes
30	Jehn	1995	589	105	Correlational	Unsure	large freight transportation firm	0.12			Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	adaptation of van de ven, Delbecq, & I	Conflict norms	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	Based on Cosier & Dalton (1990)	Yes
31	Jehn, Northcraft & Neale	1999	485	92	Correlational	Unsure	top 3 firms in the household goods moving industry - various functions	0.05			Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	van de ven, Delbecq, & Koenig, 1976	Relationship Conflict	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	Jehn, 1995	Yes
31	Jehn, Northcraft & Neale	1999	485	92	Correlational	Unsure	top 3 firms in the household goods moving industry - various functions	0.07			Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	van de ven, Delbecq, & Koenig, 1976	process conflict	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	Shah & Jehn, 1993	Yes
31	Jehn, Northcraft & Neale	1999	485	92	Correlational	Unsure	top 3 firms in the household goods moving industry - various functions	0.06			Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	van de ven, Delbecq, & Koenig, 1976	task conflict	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	Jehn, 1995	Yes
31	Jehn, Northcraft & Neale	1999	485	92	Correlational	Unsure	top 3 firms in the household goods moving industry - various functions	0.15			Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	van de ven, Delbecq, & Koenig, 1976	Commitment	Emergent State	Relational	Team members	adaptation of O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986	Yes
31	Jehn, Northcraft & Neale	1999	485	92	Correlational	Unsure	top 3 firms in the household goods moving industry - various functions	0.07			Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	van de ven, Delbecq, & Koenig, 1976	Intent to remain	Emergent State	Relational	Team members	Kraut, 1975	Yes

31	Jehn, Northcraft & Neale	1999	485	92	Correlational	Unsure	top 3 firms in the household goods moving industry - various functions	0.05	0.88	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	van de ven, Delbecq, & Koenig, 1976	Perceived performance	Subjective performance	Team members	for this study	Yes		
31	Jehn, Northcraft & Neale	1999	485	92	Correlational	Unsure	top 3 firms in the household goods moving industry - various functions	-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	top 3 firms in the household goods moving industry - various functions	0.06	0.88	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	80	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, Jundt, & Meyer	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	Johnson, Hollenbeck, Humphrey, Ilgen, 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		
32	Johnson, Hollenbeck, Humphrey, Ilgen, Jundt, & Meyer	2006	320	80	Experimental	US	University students	0.62	1	1	Reward Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Time 2	Time 2 Information Sharing	Action process	Task	No		
33	Katz-Navon & Erez	2005	120	40	Experimental	Unsure	University students	0.58	1	1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Manipulation		Number of completed assessments (spee	Objective performance		No		
34	Kirkman & Shapiro	2000	618	57	Correlational	US	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
35	Langfred	2000	255	25	Correlational	US	large technology firm	0.31	0.88	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Other	adapted from Shanley & Langfred, 195	Group Effectiveness	Subjective performance	Supervisor	Supervisor	Shanley & Langfred, 1998	No	
36	Langfred	2005		89	Correlational	US	2 midwestern facilities of a manufacturer of 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	0.68	TIME 2 Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Kiggundu, 1983	task conflict	Interpersonal process	Relational	team members	Jehn, 1995	Yes
37	Langfred	2007	140	35	Correlational	US	University students	0.34	0.69	0.73	TIME 2 Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Kiggundu, 1983	Relationship Conflict	Interpersonal process	Relational	team members	Jehn, 1995	Yes
37	Langfred	2007	140	35	Correlational	US	University students	0.59	0.69	0.71	TIME 2 Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Kiggundu, 1983	trust	Emergent State	Relational	team members	Simons & Peterson, 2000	Yes
37	Langfred	2007	140	35	Correlational	US	University students	0.02		1	TIME 2 Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Kiggundu, 1983	Performance	Objective performance		No		
37	Langfred	2007	140	35	Correlational	US	University students	0.62	0.69	0.68	TIME 3 Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Kiggundu, 1983	task conflict	Interpersonal process	Relational	team members	Jehn, 1995	Yes
37	Langfred	2007	140	35	Correlational	US	University students	0.68	0.69	0.73	TIME 3 Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Kiggundu, 1983	Relationship Conflict	Interpersonal process	Relational	team members	Jehn, 1995	Yes
37	Langfred	2007	140	35	Correlational	US	University students	0.81	0.69	0.71	TIME 3 Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Kiggundu, 1983	trust	Emergent State	Relational	team members	Simons & Peterson, 2000	Yes
37	Langfred	2007	140	35	Correlational	US	University students	0.19		1	TIME 3 Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Kiggundu, 1983	Performance	Objective performance		No		
38	Liden, Erdogan, Wayne & Sparrowe	2006	834	129	Correlational	US	ee's of 6 orgs located in the midwest	0.05	0.52	0.87	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Pearce & Greggersen, 1991	Group Performance	Subjective performance	Supervisor	for this study	No	
39	Liden, Wayne & Bradway	1997		77	Correlational	US	managers at a large service organization and a large manufacturing organization	0.24	0.88	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Supervisor	modified Pearce & Greggersen, 1991	Group performance	Subjective performance	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	Team 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	Team members	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	0.08	0.89	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Pearce & Greggersen, 1991	Performance	Subjective performance	Supervisor	Supervisor	for this study	No	
40	Liden, Wayne, Jaworski & Bennett	2004	168	23	Correlational	US	2 large orgs engaged in global ops	0.03	0.99	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Pearce & Greggersen, 1991	Cohesiveness	Emergent State	Relational	Team members	O'Reilly, Caldwell and Barnett (1989)	Yes	
41	Liyan	2005	321	107	Correlational	China	financial companies in mainland China	0.34	0.88	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Chen & Tjosvold (2004)	Departmental Effectiveness	Subjective performance		Supervisor	Chen, Tjosvold and Wang (2004)	No	
41	Liyan	2005	321	107	Correlational	China	financial companies in mainland China	0.40	0.88	Reward Interdependence	Reward interdependence	Reward	Team members	Tjosvold (1998)	Departmental Effectiveness	Subjective performance		Supervisor	Chen, Tjosvold and Wang (2004)	No	
41	Liyan	2005	321	107	Correlational	China	financial companies in mainland China	0.13	0.88	Goal Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Alper, Tjosvold, & Law, 1998; Tjosvold	Departmental Effectiveness	Subjective performance		Supervisor	Chen, Tjosvold and Wang (2004)	No	
42	Loughry	2008	598	67	Correlational	US	theme park work units	0.14			Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Supervisor	Mohr, 1971; Pearce & Greggersen, 199	Cohesiveness	Emergent State	Relational	Team members	Mullen & Cooper, 1994	No
42	Loughry	2008	598	67	Correlational	US	theme park work units	-0.13			Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Supervisor	Mohr, 1971; Pearce & Greggersen, 199	Direct Peer Monitoring	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	No
42	Loughry	2008	598	67	Correlational	US	theme park work units	-0.07			Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Supervisor	Mohr, 1971; Pearce & Greggersen, 199	Indirect Peer Monitoring	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	No
42	Loughry	2008	598	67	Correlational	US	theme park work units	0.22	0.91	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Supervisor	Mohr, 1971; Pearce & Greggersen, 199	Problem-free Performance	Subjective performance		Team members	for this study	No	
43	Lu, Tjosvold & Shi	2010	146	13	Correlational	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	China	Software company in Beijing	0.38			Goal Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998	Creative Strategy	Transition process	Task	Team members	Denison et al., 1996	Yes
43	Lu, Tjosvold & Shi	2010	146	13	Correlational	China	Software company in Beijing	0.47	0.8	Goal Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998	Group Performance	Subjective performance		Team members	van der Vegt, Emans, and van de Vliert, 2000	Yes	
43	Lu, Tjosvold & Shi	2010	146	13	Correlational	China	Software company in Beijing	0.50			Goal Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Alper, Tjosvold & Law, 1998	Constructive controversy	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	developed from Tjosvold, 1998 and Tjosvold, Wedley, & Correlational, 1986	Yes
44	Magjuka & Baldwin	1991		72	Correlational	US	Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi-product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools	-0.04			Financial Rewards	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation		% of salary received by a team in the I: Effectiveness	subjective performance		Other	modified Van de Ven and Ferry, 1980	No
44	Magjuka & Baldwin	1991		72	Correlational	US	Fortune 500 multi-divisional & multi-product firm, and one privately owned manufacturer of hand held tools	-0.21			Financial Rewards	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation		% of salary received by a team in the I: Information Access	Action process	Task	Supervisor	for this study	No
45	Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy	2007	398	94	Correlational	Canada	customer service technicians	0.27	0.72	Team interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	for this study	Team Process	Overall process		team members	correspond to Mark et al, 2001	Yes	
45	Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson & Ruddy	2007	398	94	Correlational	Canada	customer service technicians	0.32	0.72	1	Team interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	for this study	Team performance	Objective performance				No
46	Miller & Hamblin	1963	90	30	Experimental	US	University students	0.37	1	1	Differential Rewarding	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation		Productivity	Objective performance				No
47	Mitchell & Silver	1990	96	#REF!	Experimental	US	University students	0.18	1		Goal Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Manipulation		Goal commitment	Emergent State		team members	for this study	No
47	Mitchell & Silver	1990	96	#REF!	Experimental	US	University students	0.01	1		Goal Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Manipulation		Goal Acceptance	Interpersonal process	Relational	team members	for this study	No
48	Moye & Langfred	2004	104	38	Correlational	Mixed	MBA students	0.23			Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Kiggundu, 1983	task conflict	Interpersonal process	Relational	team members	Jehn, 1995	Yes
48	Moye & Langfred	2004	104	38	Correlational	Mixed	MBA students	0.36			Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Kiggundu, 1983	Relationship Conflict	Interpersonal process	Relational	team members	Jehn, 1995	Yes
48	Moye & Langfred	2004	104	38	Correlational	Mixed	MBA students	0.36			Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Kiggundu, 1983	Team performance	subjective performance		Other		No
48	Moye & Langfred	2004	104	38	Correlational	Mixed	MBA students	0.61			Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Kiggundu, 1983	Information Sharing	Action process	Task	team members	Bunderson & Sutcliffe, 2002	Yes
49	Okun & DiVesta	1975	96	#REF!	Experimental	US	University students	0.82	1	1	Reward structure	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation		Group Efficiency	Objective performance		Other		No
49	Okun & DiVesta	1975	96	#REF!	Experimental	US	University students	0.62	1		Reward structure	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation		Information Sharing	Action process	Task	Other	objectively measured	No
50	Ortega, Sanchez-Manzanares, Gil & Rico	2010	144	48	Correlational	Spain	University students	0.62			Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	van der Vegt et al. 2001	Team Learning	Action process	Task	team members	Edmondson, 1999	Yes
50	Ortega, Sanchez-Manzanares, Gil & Rico	2010	144	48	Correlational	Spain	University students	0.40			Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	van der Vegt et al. 2001	Collective efficacy	Emergent State	Task	team members	Bandura, 1986, adapted by Jung & Sosik, 2002	Yes
50	Ortega, Sanchez-Manzanares, Gil & Rico	2010	144	48	Correlational	Spain	University students	0.30	0.84	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	van der Vegt et al. 2001	Team performance	subjective performance		Other		No	
50	Ortega, Sanchez-Manzanares, Gil & Rico	2010	144	48	Correlational	Spain	University students	0.42			Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	van der Vegt et al. 2001	Viability	Emergent State	Task	team members	Lewis, 2004	Yes
51	Philo	2004	450	150	Experimental	Mixed	University students	0.18	1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Manipulation	Tesluk et al. (1997)	Team viability	Emergent State	Task	Team members	Sinclair, 2003	Unsure	
51	Philo	2004	450	150	Experimental	Mixed	University students	0.31	1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Manipulation	Tesluk et al. (1997)	Team Cohesion	Emergent State	Relational	Team members	Widmeyer, Brawley, & Carron, 1985	Unsure	

52	Poon, Pike & Tjosvold	2001	64	Correlational	China	Managers at a large public utility in Hong 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		
52	Poon, Pike & Tjosvold	2001	64	Correlational	China	Managers at a large public utility in Hong Kong	0.30	0.84	Goal Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Supervisor	for this study	Budget quality	Subjective performance		Supervisor	for this study	Yes		
53	Quigley, Tesluk, Locke & Bartole	2007	120	60	Experimental	Unsure	0.37	1	0.59	Incentive Condition	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Norms for knowledge sharing	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	No		
54	Raven & Shaw	1970	60	20	Experimental	US	UCLA undergraduates	0.43	1	1	Dependency		Manipulation	Manipulation	Communication	Action process	Task	Other	Total message units transmitted	Unsure	
55	Rico & Cohen	2005	240	80	Experimental	Spain	Undergraduate and graduate students in Spain	0.09	1	1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Manipulation	Manipulation	Team performance	Objective performance	Other		No	
56	Rico, Alcover, Sanchez-Manzanares, & Gil	2009	187	53	Correlational	Latin America	Virtual project teams from multinational software development firm in Latin America	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	53	Correlational	Latin America	Virtual project teams from multinational software development firm in Latin America	-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
56	Rico, Alcover, Sanchez-Manzanares, & Gil	2009	187	53	Correlational	Latin America	Virtual project teams from multinational software development firm in Latin America	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	53	Correlational	Latin America	Virtual project teams from multinational software development firm in Latin America	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	53	Correlational	Latin America	Virtual project teams from multinational software development firm in Latin America	0.35	0.78	0.78	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Van der Vegt & Janssen, 2003	Trustworthiness	Emergent State	Relational	Team members	Schoorman, Mayer, & Davis, 1996	Yes
57	Rispens	2006	252	51	Correlational	Netherlands	R&D teams from 11 Dutch companies	-0.11			Functional interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	network analysis	Affect-based interdependence	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	for this study	Yes
57	Rispens	2006	252	51	Correlational	Netherlands	R&D teams from 11 Dutch companies	-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	Undergraduate project teams in Org Design class	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	Undergraduate project teams in Org Design class	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	Undergraduate project teams in Org Design 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	118	Experimental	US	Undergraduates in management classes	0.06	1	1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Manipulation	Manipulation	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence		Manipulation		No
59	Saavedra, Earley, & Van Dyne	1993	354	118	Experimental	US	Undergraduates in management classes	0.03	1	1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Manipulation	Manipulation	Feedback interdependence	Outcome interdependence		Manipulation		No
59	Saavedra, Earley, & Van Dyne	1993	354	118	Experimental	US	Undergraduates in management classes	-0.01	1	1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Manipulation	Manipulation	Quantity (performance)	Objective performance		Other		No
59	Saavedra, Earley, & Van Dyne	1993	354	118	Experimental	US	Undergraduates in management classes	-0.01	1	1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Manipulation	Manipulation	Quality (performance)	Objective performance		Other		No
59	Saavedra, Earley, & Van Dyne	1993	354	118	Experimental	US	Undergraduates in management classes	0.01	1		Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Manipulation	Manipulation	Intragroup conflict	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	Lee, Earley, Lituchy, & Wagner (1991)	No
59	Saavedra, Earley, & Van Dyne	1993	354	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	118	Experimental	US	Undergraduates in management classes	-0.02	1	1	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Manipulation	Manipulation	Feedback interdependence	Outcome interdependence				No
59	Saavedra, Earley, & Van Dyne	1993	354	118	Experimental	US	Undergraduates in management classes	0.23	1	1	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Manipulation	Manipulation	Quantity (performance)	Objective performance		Other		No
59	Saavedra, Earley, & Van Dyne	1993	354	118	Experimental	US	Undergraduates in management classes	0.28	1	1	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Manipulation	Manipulation	Quality (performance)	Objective performance		Other		No
59	Saavedra, Earley, & Van Dyne	1993	354	118	Experimental	US	Undergraduates in management classes	0.21	1		Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Manipulation	Manipulation	Intragroup conflict	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	Lee, Earley, Lituchy, & Wagner (1991)	No
59	Saavedra, Earley, & Van Dyne	1993	354	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	118	Experimental	US	Undergraduates in management classes	0.03	1	1	Feedback interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Quantity (performance)	Objective performance		Other		No
59	Saavedra, Earley, & Van Dyne	1993	354	118	Experimental	US	Undergraduates in management classes	0.11	1	1	Feedback interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Quality (performance)	Objective performance		Other		No
59	Saavedra, Earley, & Van Dyne	1993	354	118	Experimental	US	Undergraduates in management classes	0.04	1		Feedback interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Intragroup conflict	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	Lee, Earley, Lituchy, & Wagner (1991)	No
59	Saavedra, Earley, & Van Dyne	1993	354	118	Experimental	US	Undergraduates in management classes	0.02	1		Feedback interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Group strategy	Transition process	Task	Team members	Hackman (1982)	No
60	Sargent & Sue-Chan	2001	169	42	Correlational	Canada	Undergraduate project groups	0.62			Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	for this study	Social cohesion	Emergent State	Relational	Team members	for this study	Yes
60	Sargent & Sue-Chan	2001	169	42	Correlational	Canada	Undergraduate project groups	0.52			Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	for this study	Group potency	Emergent State	Task	Team members	Guzzo et al. 1993	Yes
60	Sargent & Sue-Chan	2001	169	42	Correlational	Canada	Undergraduate project groups	0.46			Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	for this study	Group outcome efficacy	Emergent State	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
61	Sarin & Mahajan	2001	246	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	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	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	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	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	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
62	Schippers, Hartog, Koopman, & Wienk	2003	406	54	Correlational	Netherlands	10 mgmt teams, 13 production teams, 9 service teams, 11 school management teams, and 10 facilitating teams from 13 different orgs	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	54	Correlational	Netherlands	10 mgmt teams, 13 production teams, 9 service teams, 11 school management 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

62	Schippers, Hartog, Koopman, & Wienk	2003	406	54	Correlational	Netherlands	10 mgmt teams, 13 production teams, 9 service teams, 11 school management teams, and 10 facilitating teams from 13 different orgs	0.23	0.92	Outcome interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Mixed OI	Team members	Van der Vegt (1998)	Self-rated performance	Subjective performance	Team members	Roe et al., 1995	Yes		
63	Somech, Desivilya, & Lidogoster	2009	339	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	Team members	Henry et al., 1999	Yes		
63	Somech, Desivilya, & Lidogoster	2009	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	Team members	Rahim, 1983	Yes		
63	Somech, Desivilya, & Lidogoster	2009	339	77	Correlational	Unsure	R&D teams from high tech companies	0.21	0.85	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Van der Vegt et al., 2003	Team performance	Subjective performance	Supervisor	Tjosvold, Leung, & Johnson, 2000	No		
63	Somech, Desivilya, & Lidogoster	2009	339	77	Correlational	Unsure	R&D teams from high tech companies	0.21		Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Van der Vegt et al., 2003	Frequency of meetings	Action process	Task	Team members	West, 1994	Yes	
63	Somech, Desivilya, & Lidogoster	2009	339	77	Correlational	Unsure	R&D teams from high tech companies	0.19		Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Van der Vegt et al., 2003	Task conflict	Interpersonal process	Team members	Jehn & Mannix, 2001	Yes		
63	Somech, Desivilya, & Lidogoster	2009	339	77	Correlational	Unsure	R&D teams from high tech companies	0.29		Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Van der Vegt et al., 2003	Relationship conflict	Interpersonal process	Team members	Jehn & Mannix, 2001	Yes		
64	Stewart & Barrick, 2000	2000	626	45	Correlational	US	Employees in teams at three manufacturing plants	-0.12	0.73	0.75	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Kiggundu, 1983	Communication	Action process	Task	Team members	O'Reilly & Roberts, 1976	Yes
64	Stewart & Barrick, 2000	2000	626	45	Correlational	US	Employees in teams at three manufacturing plants	0.05	0.73	0.71	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Kiggundu, 1983	Conflict	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	Rahim, 1983	Yes
64	Stewart & Barrick, 2000	2000	626	45	Correlational	US	Employees in teams at three manufacturing plants	0.04	0.73	0.74	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Kiggundu, 1983	Shirking	Action process	Task	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Yes
64	Stewart & Barrick, 2000	2000	626	45	Correlational	US	Employees in teams at three manufacturing plants	0.55	0.73	0.79	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Kiggundu, 1983	Flexibility	Action process	Task	Team members	Campion et al., 1993	Yes
64	Stewart & Barrick, 2000	2000	626	45	Correlational	US	Employees in teams at three manufacturing plants	0.01	0.73	0.83	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Kiggundu, 1983	Supervisor ratings	Subjective performance	Supervisor	for this study	No	
65	Tjosvold & Yu	2004	200	100	Correlational	China	Various teams in firms located in Shanghai, China	0.21	0.67	Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Alper, Tjosvold, & Law (1998)	In-role performance	Subjective performance	Supervisor	Williams, 1998	No		
65	Tjosvold & Yu	2004	200	100	Correlational	China	Various teams in firms located in Shanghai, 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	
66	Tjosvold, Law, & Sun	2003	689	194	Correlational	China	Production teams in 12 machinery and 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	
66	Tjosvold, Law, & Sun	2003	689	194	Correlational	China	Production teams in 12 machinery and 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		
67	Tjosvold, Tang, & West, 2004	2004	200	100	Correlational	China	Various teams in firms located in Shanghai, China	0.50		Goal interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Alper, Tjosvold, & Law (1998)	Task reflexivity	Transition process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes	
68	Van der Vegt, de Jong, Bunderson, & Molleman	2010	218	46	Correlational	Unsure	Teams in a variety of settings (banking, medicine, etc.)	0.31	0.69	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	network analysis	Group performance feedback	Outcome interdependence	Team members	Van der Vegt et al., 2003	Yes		
68	Van der Vegt, de Jong, Bunderson, & Molleman	2010	218	46	Correlational	Unsure	Teams in a variety of settings (banking, medicine, etc.)	0.26	0.62	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	network analysis	Team learning	Action process	Task	Team members	Schippers et al., 2003	Yes	
68	Van der Vegt, de Jong, Bunderson, & Molleman	2010	218	46	Correlational	Unsure	Teams in a variety of settings (banking, medicine, etc.)	0.02	0.9	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	network analysis	Team performance	Subjective performance	Supervisor	Ancona & Caldwell, 1992	No		
68	Van der Vegt, de Jong, Bunderson, & Molleman	2010	218	46	Correlational	Unsure	Teams in a variety of settings (banking, medicine, etc.)	0.58	0.69	0.62	Group performance feedback	Outcome interdependence	Mixed OI	Team members	Van der Vegt et al., 2003	Team learning	Action process	Task	Team members	Schippers et al., 2003	Yes
68	Van der Vegt, de Jong, Bunderson, & Molleman	2010	218	46	Correlational	Unsure	Teams in a variety of settings (banking, 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	
69	Wageman	2001		34	Correlational	US	Customer service teams at Xerox Corporation	0.22	1	1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Manipulation	for this study	Group rewards	Outcome interdependence	Supervisor	for this study	Yes	
69	Wageman	2001		34	Correlational	US	Customer service teams at Xerox Corporation	0.43	1		Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Manipulation	for this study	Overall performance	Objective performance	Other		No	
69	Wageman	2001		34	Correlational	US	Customer service teams at Xerox 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
69	Wageman	2001		34	Correlational	US	Customer service teams at Xerox 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
69	Wageman	2001		34	Correlational	US	Customer service teams at Xerox 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
69	Wageman	2001		34	Correlational	US	Customer service teams at Xerox 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
69	Wageman	2001		34	Correlational	US	Customer service teams at Xerox 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
69	Wageman	2001		34	Correlational	US	Customer service teams at Xerox Corporation	0.52	1		Group rewards	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	for this study	Overall performance	Objective performance	Other		No	
69	Wageman	2001		34	Correlational	US	Customer service teams at Xerox Corporation	0.33	1		Group rewards	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	for this study	Quality of process	Action process	Task	Team 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
69	Wageman	2001		34	Correlational	US	Customer service teams at Xerox 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
69	Wageman	2001		34	Correlational	US	Customer service teams at Xerox Corporation	-0.07	1		Group rewards	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	for this study	AvaiExperimentalle information	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	No
69	Wageman	2001		34	Correlational	US	Customer service teams at Xerox Corporation	0.32	1		Group rewards	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	for this study	Material resources	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	No
70	Wageman	1995	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	for this study	No
70	Wageman	1995	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
70	Wageman	1995	1120	115	Correlational	US	Xerox technician teams	-0.13	1		Outcome interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	quasi-experiment	Effort norms	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	No
70	Wageman	1995	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	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	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	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	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
70	Wageman	1995	96	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	for this study	No
70	Wageman	1995	96	96	Correlational	US	Xerox technician teams	0.11	1		Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Manipulation	quasi-experiment	Internal work motivation	Emergent State	Task	Team members	for this study	No
70	Wageman	1995	96	96	Correlational	US	Xerox technician teams	0.24	1		Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Manipulation	quasi-experiment	Learning	Action process	Task	Team members	Allmendinger et al., 1992	No
70	Wageman	1995	96	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	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	
71	Wageman & Baker	1997	112	56	Experimental	US	Undergraduates at northeastern university	0.29	1	1	Reward interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Performance	Objective performance	Other		No	
71	Wageman & Baker	1997	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
71	Wageman & Baker	1997	112	56	Experimental	US	Undergraduates at northeastern university	0.40	1		Reward interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Cooperation	Interpersonal process	Relational	Other	for this study -- experimenter-rated	No
72	Wang, Chen, Tjosvold, & Shi	2010	299	60	Correlational	China	Call center of large mobile phone service 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	
73	Wong	2008	320	80	Correlational	Singapore	Undergraduates in strategic management 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		
75	Wong, Tjosvold, & Liu		2009	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 (tear	Action process	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		
76	Wong, Tjosvold, & Liu			292	101	Correlational	China	Cross-functional teams in a variety of industries in China	0.19	0.41	0.87	Cooperative goals	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Supervisor	Alper, Tjosvold, & Law (1998)	Innovation	Subjective performance	Supervisor	Burpitt & Bigones (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	network analysis	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		2007	566	104	Correlational	China	Teams from 114 companies	0.34	0.34	0.55	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Support for innovation	Transition process	Task	Team members	Anderson & West, 1998	Yes
78	Zhang, Han, Hempel, & Tjosvold, 2007		2007	566	104	Correlational	China	Teams from 114 companies	0.10	0.34	0.82	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Team performance	Subjective performance	Supervisor	Ancona & Caldwell, 1992	No	
78	Zhang, Han, Hempel, & Tjosvold, 2007		2007	566	104	Correlational	China	Teams from 114 companies	0.19	0.54	0.82	interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Tjosvold, Andrews, & Jones, 1983	Team performance	Subjective performance	Supervisor	Ancona & Caldwell, 1992	No	
79	Zhu		2009	673	92	Correlational	US	Charter school boards	0.42	0.24		Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Closeness	Emergent State	Relational	Team members	social network measure	Yes
79	Zhu		2009	673	92	Correlational	US	Charter school boards	0.20	0.24		Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Communication frequency	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	social network measure	Yes
79	Zhu		2009	673	92	Correlational	US	Charter school boards	0.18	0.24	0.83	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Performance (composite)	Subjective performance	Supervisor	Ancona & Caldwell, 1992	No	
79	Zhu		2009	673	92	Correlational	US	Charter school boards	0.33	0.24	0.81	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Innovation (composite)	Subjective performance	Supervisor	Drach-Zahavy & Somech, 2001	No	
80	Maynard, Mathieu, & Ruddy		2011	534	106	Correlational	US	Customer service engineers for office equipment and technology company	0.15			Task interdependence	Task interdependence		Team members		Outcome interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Team members		Yes	
80	Maynard, Mathieu, & Ruddy		2011	534	106	Correlational	US	Customer service engineers for office equipment and technology company	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	Customer service engineers for office equipment and technology company	0.19			Task interdependence	Task interdependence		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	0.25			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		2011	176	44	Experimental	US	Undergraduate students	0.03	1		Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Manipulation	for this study	Task cohesion	Emergent State	Relational	Team members	Careless & DePaola, 2000	No
85	Pauly		2011	176	44	Experimental	US	Undergraduate students	0.58	1		Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Manipulation	for this study	Communication	Action process	Task	Team members	Eby et al., 2001	No
85	Pauly		2011	176	44	Experimental	US	Undergraduate students	0.26	1		Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Manipulation	for this study	Task conflict	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	Jehn, 1995	No
85	Pauly		2011	176	44	Experimental	US	Undergraduate students	0.29	1	1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Manipulation	for this study	Quantity of output	Objective performance	Other		No	
85	Pauly		2011	176	44	Experimental	US	Undergraduate students	0.14	1	1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Manipulation	for this study	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	for this study	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		2004	3445	383	Correlational	US	Departments in grocery store chain	-0.23	0.82	0.94	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Supervisor	for this study	Customer satisfaction	Subjective performance	Other		No	
88	Liu		2006	1657	312	Correlational	China	Five orgs in China	0.51			Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Other	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Guanxi (engaging in social activities outside	Interpersonal process	Relational	Other	Wong et al., 2003	Both
88	Liu		2006	1657	312	Correlational	China	Five orgs in China	0.59			Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Other	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Team orientation	Overall process	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	Communication	Action process	Task	Other	Rosenstein, 1994	Both
88	Liu		2006	1657	312	Correlational	China	Five orgs in China	0.57			Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Other	Pearce & Gregersen, 1991	Backup	Action process	Task	Other	Rosenstein, 1994	Both
88	Liu		2006	1657	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	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	Three different performance 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	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	0.02		1	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	for this study	Group performance	Objective performance	Other		No	

90	Ariel, Shiera		2000		85	Correlational	Mixed	Process improvement teams in a large, multidivisional, multinational company in the computer industry	0.31		Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	for this study	Communication Problems	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes	
90	Ariel, Shiera		2000		85	Correlational	Mixed	Process improvement teams in a large, multidivisional, multinational company in the computer industry	-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	Process improvement teams in a large, multidivisional, multinational company in the computer industry	0.15	0.91	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	Process improvement teams in a large, 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	
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		Task	Team members	adapted from Campion et al, 1993	Yes	
91	DeMatteo, Jacquelyn Suzanne	1997	330	45	Correlational	US	10 varied organizations in the US (largely insurance industry)	-0.21		Outcome Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	Q's adapted from Campion et al, 1993	Team Productivity	Subjective performance		Task	Supervisor	for this study	No	
91	DeMatteo, Jacquelyn Suzanne	1997	330	45	Correlational	US	10 varied organizations in the US (largely insurance industry)	-0.03	0.94	Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Pearce & Gregerson, 1991	Team Productivity	Subjective performance		Task	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	0.89	Outcome Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	Q's adapted from Campion et al, 1993	Team Effectiveness	Subjective performance		Task	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	0.89	Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Pearce & Gregerson, 1991	Team Effectiveness	Subjective performance		Task	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, 1993	Collective Efficacy	Emergent State	Task	Task	Team members	Riggs and Knight, 1994; plus for this study	Yes	
91	DeMatteo, Jacquelyn Suzanne	1997	330	45	Correlational	US	10 varied organizations in the US (largely insurance industry)	0.50		Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Pearce & Gregerson, 1991	Collective Efficacy	Emergent State	Task	Task	Team members	Riggs and Knight, 1994; plus for this study	Yes	
91	DeMatteo, Jacquelyn Suzanne	1997	330	45	Correlational	US	10 varied organizations in the US (largely insurance industry)	-0.23		Outcome Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	Q's adapted from Campion et al, 1993	Helping Behavior	Action process	Task	Task	Supervisor	Smith et al. 1983	No	
91	DeMatteo, Jacquelyn Suzanne	1997	330	45	Correlational	US	10 varied organizations in the US (largely insurance industry)	0.00		Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Pearce & Gregerson, 1991	Helping Behavior	Action process	Task	Task	Supervisor	Smith et al. 1983	No	
91	DeMatteo, Jacquelyn Suzanne	1997	330	45	Correlational	US	10 varied organizations in the US (largely insurance industry)	-0.29		Outcome Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	Q's adapted from Campion et al, 1993	Information Sharing	Action process	Task	Task	Supervisor	Barnard and Rush, 1995	No	
91	DeMatteo, Jacquelyn Suzanne	1997	330	45	Correlational	US	10 varied organizations in the US (largely insurance industry)	-0.04		Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Pearce & Gregerson, 1991	Information Sharing	Action process	Task	Task	Supervisor	Barnard and Rush, 1995	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		Task	Team members	adapted from Campion et al, 1993	Yes	
92	Ford, Lucy R.		1989	283	40	Correlational	Mixed	European company global manufacturing company, a small paper product manufacturing company, and a small US subsidiary of a large	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	
92	Ford, Lucy R.		1989	283	40	Correlational	Mixed	European company global manufacturing company, a small paper product manufacturing company, and a small US subsidiary of a large	0.11		Work Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Klein et al., 2003	TMX	Action process	Task	Team members	Seers et al., 2001	Yes	
92	Ford, Lucy R.		1989	283	40	Correlational	Mixed	European company global manufacturing company, a small paper product manufacturing company, and a small US subsidiary of a large	0.11		Work Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Klein et al., 2003	Mutual influence	Interpersonal process	Relational	Team members	for this study	Yes	
92	Ford, Lucy R.		1989	283	40	Correlational	Mixed	European company global manufacturing company, a small paper product manufacturing company, and a small US subsidiary of a large	-0.08		Work Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Klein et al., 2003	Role clarity	Transition process	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes	
92	Ford, Lucy R.		1989	283	40	Correlational	Mixed	European company global manufacturing company, a small paper product manufacturing company, and a small US subsidiary of a large	0.06	0.75	Work Interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	Klein et al., 2003	Work group effectiveness	Subjective performance		Team members	for this study	Yes	
93	Gibson, Cristina	1995	187	71	Correlational	Mixed	Nursing teams	-0.06		Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	for this study	Group efficacy	Emergent State	Task	Task	Team members	for this study	No	
93	Gibson, Cristina	1995	187	71	Correlational	Mixed	Nursing teams	-0.03	0.95	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	for this study	Performance	Subjective performance		Task	Supervisor	for this study	Yes	
93	Gibson, Cristina	1995	187	71	Correlational	Mixed	Nursing teams	0.19		Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	for this study	Identification	Emergent State	Relational	Task	Team members	for this study	Yes	
93	Gibson, Cristina	1995	187	71	Correlational	Mixed	Nursing teams	0.27	0.76	Task interdependence	Task interdependence	Process	Team members	for this study	Reputation	Subjective performance		Task	Other	for this study	No	
94	Goldstein, Nancy B.	1996	#REF!	64	Experimental	US	Undergrads at Tulane	0.07		Task Interdependence	Task Interdependence	Process	Team members		Group Performance	Objective performance		Task			No	
94	Goldstein, Nancy B.	1996	#REF!	64	Experimental	US	Undergrads at Tulane	0.01		Task Interdependence	Task Interdependence	Process	Team members		Interpersonal Cohesion	Emergent State	Relational	Task	Team members	Carron, Brawley, and Widmeyer (1985)	No	
95	Halfhill, Terry	2000	198	40	Correlational	US	Air National Guardsmen	-0.12	0.75	0.85	Task Interdependence	Task Interdependence	Process	Team members	Kiggundu et al, 1983	Group Performance	Subjective performance		Task	Supervisor		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		Task	Other		No
97	Huang, Meikuan		2007	208	17	Correlational	Mixed	existing work teams in europe and north 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	
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	Goal Interdependence	Outcome interdependence		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	0.37		Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Feedback / Reward Interdependence	Outcome interdependence		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	0.58		Goal Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Feedback / Reward Interdependence	Outcome interdependence		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	0.16	0.89	Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Team effectiveness	Subjective performance		Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
98	Kwak, Eun J. Lynn		2004	131	34	Correlational	US	Apparel Product Development teams from various companies	0.24	0.89	Goal Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Team effectiveness	Subjective performance		Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
98	Kwak, Eun J. Lynn		2004	131	34	Correlational	US	Apparel Product Development teams from various companies	0.30	0.89	Feedback / Reward Interdependence	Reward interdependence	Reward	Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Team effectiveness	Subjective performance		Task	Team members	for this study	Yes
98	Kwak, Eun J. Lynn		2004	131	34	Correlational	US	Apparel Product Development teams from various companies	0.26		Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Potency	Emergent State	Task	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	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	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	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	0.20		Goal Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Social Support	Action process	Task	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	0.27			Feedback / Reward Interdependence	Reward interdependence	Reward	Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Social Support	Action process	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	0.19			Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Workload Sharing	Action process	Task	Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Yes
98	Kwak, Eun J. Lynn	2004	131	34	Correlational	US	Apparel Product Development teams from 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
98	Kwak, Eun J. Lynn	2004	131	34	Correlational	US	Apparel Product Development teams from various companies	0.32			Feedback / Reward Interdependence	Reward interdependence	Reward	Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Workload Sharing	Action process	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			Task Interdependence	Task interdependence	Mixed TI	Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Communication / Cooperation within Te	Action process	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	0.27			Goal Interdependence	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Communication / Cooperation within Te	Action process	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	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Team members	Campion et al, 1993	Communication / Cooperation within Te	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	Task	Other	for this study	No
100	DeShon, Kozlowski, Schmidt, Milner, & 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
100	DeShon, Kozlowski, Schmidt, Milner, & 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
100	DeShon, Kozlowski, Schmidt, Milner, & 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
100	DeShon, Kozlowski, Schmidt, Milner, & 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	Experimental	US	Undergrade psych students in US	0.18	1	1	Team feedback	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Team-focused effort	Action process	Task	Team members	for this study	No
100	DeShon, Kozlowski, Schmidt, Milner, & 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	Task	Other	for this study	No
101	Crown & Rosse	1995	420	60	Experimental	US	Preexisting intramural and professional sports teams	0.60	1	1	Group goal	Outcome interdependence	Goal	Manipulation	Manipulation	Group performance	Objective performance	Task	Other	for this study	No
102	Berkowitz & Levy	1956		25	Experimental	US	Basic trainees in Air Force	0.09	1	1	Group feedback	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Group performance	Objective performance	Task	Other	for this study	No
102	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
103	Zajonc	1962	140	20	Experimental	US	Air Force personnel	0.52	1	1	Group feedback	Outcome interdependence	Reward	Manipulation	Manipulation	Group performance	Objective performance	Task	Other	for this study	No
104	Van der Vegt & Janssen	2003	343	41	Correlational	Netherlands	Financial service teams in Dutch 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	Task	Team members	Van der Vegt et al., 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	Task	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	Task	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