**Rascunho**

**(2016) Perceptions of task interdependence and functional leadership in schools – Kerry Barnett, John McCormick**

“teams, whereby two or more people
interact interdependently to achieve common goals (Kozlowski & Bell, 2003). Teams generally are considered potentially effective because they can bring together diverse skills, expertise, and experience necessary to tackle the exceptional complexities of school environments.”

“One of the contingencies considered by Kozlowski et al., (2009) is task dynamics. These
researchers posited ‘team tasks are not fixed, rather, they cycle episodically in terms of complexity and load they place on team member resources (cognitive, behavioral, and motivational) engaged as the team works to accomplish goals’ (Kozlowski et al., 2009, p. 116).”

“Task interdependence is the degree to which team members must rely on, and interact with each other to accomplish their tasks effectively (Campion, Medsker & Higgs, 1993; Saavedra, Earley & Van Dyne, 1993). Task interdependence may refer to the objective degree to which team members depend on one another to perform tasks effectively, or team members’ subjective impressions of task interdependence (LeDoux, 2009).”

“However, several researchers (e.g., Shea & Guzzo, 1987) have emphasized that groups and teams often exercise discretion in establishing levels of interaction and cooperation necessary for effective task performance, so that the degree of task interdependence may vary, even in apparently identical task environments (Gully, Incalcaterra, Joshi & Beaubien, 2002).”

“Hackman & Wageman (2005) suggested the level of effort team members apply carrying
out task work contributes to team performance. ”

**(2001) Reflexion on shared cognition – Cannon-Bowers, Janis;
Salas, Eduardo**

“Therefore, the concept of shared cognition can help us to explain what separates effective from ineffective teams by suggesting that in effective teams, members have similar or compatible knowledge, and that they use this knowledge to guide their (coordinated) behavior.”

“shared cognition research can help establish an understanding of the elements of effective teamwork, which can in turn lead to better interventions for improving team performance.”

“Turning first to task-specific knowledge, theories holding that team members need to share task-specific knowledge typically argue that this type of shared knowledge allows team members to take action in a coordinated manner with- out the need to communicate overtly (e.g., see Cannon-Bowers et al., 1993).”

“While this category (similar/identical) is related to the first (shared/overlapping),
it is slightly different. The first category implies that there is a knowledge base associated with the task, and that a
portion of that knowledge base must be common to members. In this case, we mean that certain attitudes and/or beliefs must be similar in team members to drive effective performance”

“a multidisciplinary team where each member brings specialized expertise to the problem. In such a case, it might be most important that team members have accurate expectations for themselves, their teammates and the task to guide behavior. Such expectations may be derived from dissimilar knowledge, the fact that it leads to complementary behavior causes us to include it in our definition of shared cognition.”

“In many high performance teams, such as mili-
tary combat teams, the systems and tasks are so complex, that it would be impossible for any single team member to hold all the knowledge required to succeed. In such cases, team members' knowledge is specialized and distributed. Importantly then, team members are forced to coordinate since task suc- cess depends on the knowledge of several members.”

**(2013) Coordination breakdowns and their impact on development productivity and software failures – Cataldo, Marcelo;
Herbsleb, James D.**

“the work on modular product designs has extensively examined the role of interdependencies among components of a product and has proposed approaches to minimize those dependencies”

“A key assumption in this line of work is that minimizing technical dependencies among product components will result in a modular work structure”

“those theoretical perspectives have important limitations. A modular strategy is vulnerable to unanticipated “cross-cutting” product features as they require coordinated changes to multiple modules [23]. Moreover, modular structures as well as traditional organizational mechanisms for coordination tend not to be suitable for environments with volatile dependencies”

“Galbraith [19] argued that low levels of interdependency could be managed by traditional mechanisms such as rules, plans, and processes. However, as the level of interdependency increases, additional mechanisms such as lateral communication are required [19].” *J. Galbraith, Designing Complex Organizations. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1973.*

“several researches have documented how the use of modular designs to reduce technical dependencies tends to lead development teams to assume an exaggerated degree of independence”

**(2007) Cooperative outcome interdependence, task reflexivity, and team effectiveness: a motivated information processing perspective. – De Dreu, Carsten K W**

“Under perceived cooperative, rather than competitive, outcome interdependence, team members have high trust, are more likely to experience psycho- logical safety, handle their conflicts more constructively, and benefit from these conflicts both as individuals and as a team (Stanne, Johnson, & Johnson, 1999; Tjosvold, 1998; Wong, Tjos- vold, & Yu, 2005).”

“teams are interdependent in a num-
ber of ways.”

“Such task interdependence (Wage- man, 1995) needs to be distinguished from outcome interdependence, that is, the extent to which team members’ outcomes depend on their personal or team performance”

“The concept of cooperative outcome interdependence is closely
linked to work on prosocial versus proself motivation in interpersonal negotiation and small-group decision making (e.g, De Dreu, Giebels,&Van de Vliert, 1998; Ten Velden, Beersma,&De Dreu, 2007; Weingart, Bennett, & Brett, 1993).”

“When team members adopt a prosocial motivation and per-
ceive cooperative outcome interdependence, they handle differ- ences of opinion and other types of conflict better, learn more, and perform more effectively”

“Alper, Tjosvold, and Law (2000) concluded that “orga- nizational teams that rely on cooperative approaches to conflict would appear to be good candidates for making use of their autonomy for themselves and the organization””

“perceived cooperative outcome interdependence affects job satisfaction and individual and team performance only when task interdependence is high and team members need each other to complete their tasks (e.g., Fan & Gruenfeld, 1998; Van der Vegt et al., 2001; Wageman & Baker, 1997).”

“Evidence shows that laboratory groups make better decisions and negotiate their conflicts more constructively (a) when members perceive cooperative outcome interdependence and have a prosocial motivation and (b) when members (are motivated to) engage in systematic, deliberate, and thorough processing of information.”

**(2012) Beyond Shared Perceptions of Trust and Monitoring in Teams: Implications of Asymmetry and Dissensus – De Jong, Bart A.
Dirks, Kurt T.**

“It is widely assumed that trust will facilitate team performance,
either directly or indirectly (Dirks, 1999).”

“and there is evidence that team members can differ considerably in how much they trust each other (Gillespie, 2005)”

“Trust is defined as the intention to accept vulnerability on the
basis of positive expectations of the intentions or behavior of another (Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt,&Camerer, 1998)”

“Finally, given the multitude of factors that may lead to variation in trust— such as diversity in propensity to trust, differential displays of trustworthy behavior (Yakovleva et al., 2010), subgroup member- ship (Polzer, Crisp, Jarvenpaa,&Kim, 2006), and task dependence asymmetry (De Jong, Van der Vegt, & Molleman, 2007)— variation in trust would seem to be the rule rather than the exception.”

“trust asymmetry, defined as the extent to which two parties differ in the level of trust for one another (Graebner, 2009). The fact that perceptions of trust reside at the individual level allows it to vary across parties within the same dyad.”

“This team-level conceptualization recognizes that, due to factors such as differences in trust-related behavior, subgroup membership, task dependence asymmetry, some dyads may be more symmetric, whereas others may be more asymmetric. For instance, a team where members A and B have high trust in each other as well as in C, but C does not trust either one exemplifies a pattern of relatively high team trust asymmetry. In contrast, a team where A, B, and C all trust each other exemplifies a pattern of low team trust asymmetry.”

“They argued and showed that trust affects performance because individuals are more likely to share resources with coworkers they trust and more likely to receive more resources from coworkers who trust them.”

“Analogous to this distinction, we contend that effective exchange relationships in teams require not only high (mean) levels of trust but also high symmetry (i.e., low asymmetry) in trust among team members.”

“In two field studies, we found that trust asym- metry (i.e., dispersion in trust) moderated the relationship be- tween intrateam trust (i.e., mean levels of trust) and team performance. ”

**(2007) The relationships among asymmetry in task dependence, perceived helping behavior, and trust – de Jong, S B
Van der Vegt, G S
Molleman, E**

“Work teams consist of members who are at least moderately dependent on each other because they are required to work to- gether and/or to rely on each other to reach their goals (Hackman, 1987). “

“Task dependence exists when a team member (A) needs information, resources, advice, knowledge, physical assistance, and/or equipment from another team member (B) to complete his or her task successfully (e.g., Cummings, 1978; Van der Vegt et al., 2005)”

“In a similar way, B may be more or less task dependent on A. When A and B are equally task dependent on each other, they are said to be symmetrically or mutually task dependent (cf. Casciaro & Piskor- ski, 2005, pp. 170–171).”

“When A’s task dependence on B is greater or less than B’s task dependence on A, these two individuals are said to be asymmetrically task dependent”

“symmetrical task dependence has generally been conceptualized and measured at either the team or the individual level of analysis.”

“That is, both team-level and individual-level conceptualizations of symmetrical task dependence ignore potentially important variance at the interpersonal or dyadic level of analysis. In extending previous research, we therefore examine the possibility not only that task dependence can be more or less symmetrical but also that this task dependence can differ across the relationships that one team member has with other team members.”

“we view trust as a quality that is specific to a particular relationship with a fellow team member (cf. Holmes & Rempel, 1989)”

“Greater task interdependence may also lead to a more intense liking of other team members simply as a result of the exposure effect (e.g., Bornstein, 1989) and tends to increase feelings of responsibility for one another’s job performance (Kig- gundu, 1983; Pearce & Gregersen, 1991).”

For instance, Rusbult and Van Lange (2003, p. 355) observed that “the concepts of dependence and power are inextricably related, in that to the extent that one person (A)is relatively more dependent, the other (B) is relatively more powerful”

“Our results suggest that powerful team mem- bers do not always fully recognize helpful behavior by their more dependent colleagues and that this can lead to a decrease in interpersonal trust”