Soojung Kim, Dagobert Soergel, Feb. 2005

Task classification scheme

Intrinsic Task Characteristics

. Overall task type	
. Jonassen (2000) task type	\$Jonassen 2000#
Logical task	
DF: A specific solution path exists. (e	.g. Tower of Hanoi, Puzzle)
Algorithmic task	
DF: A finite set of rules applies. (e.g.	Math questions)
Story task	
DF: Take verbal form but basically the	e same as algorithmic problems.
Rule-using task	
DF: Finite rules are necessary.	
Decision-making task	
DF: Finite outcomes exist. Compari	son and argumentation are necessary. (e.g.
Which school to attend)	
Troubleshooting task	
DF: Multiple solutions paths exist. (e.	g. Fix a car)
Diagnosis-solution tasks	
DF: Multiple solutions paths. Justific	ation of a selected solution is required. (e.g.
Medical diagnosis)	
Strategic performance task	
DF: Multiple solution paths exist. Site	lated case or design problems. (e.g. Drive a
car in different conditions)	
Case analysis task	
DF: Unclear outcome. Criteria for bes	st solution are ambiguous. (e.g. Plan a menu
for foreign dignitaries)	
Design task	
DF: Unclear outcome. Criteria for bes	t solution are ambiguous. (e.g. Design a dog
house)	
Dilemmas	
DF: No solution may exist. (e.g. Shou	ld abortions be banned?)
Whitley and Frost (1972) task type	\$Whitley and Frost 1972#
Responsibility task	
Extension task	
New development task	
Research task	
. Abstract task characteristic	
Task abstractness	\$Jonassen 1997, Jonassen 2000 #
Domain specificity	
Task adaptability	\$ADDE project#
DF: The degree to which a task is adapta	ble in different settings
Task analyzability	Perrow 1967, Daft & Macintosh 1981, Hart

& Rice 1991, Zeffane & Gul 1993#				
Task complexity, task simplicity	\$Campbell 1988, McMullin & Taylor 1984,			
Byström, & Järvelin 1995#				
Task difficulty	\$Bass et al 1958, Shaw 1973#			
Task routineness	\$Hart & Rice 1991#			
Task structuredness	\$Jonassen 1997#			
Well-structured task				
Ill-structured task				
Task traceability	\$ADDE project#			
Task usability	\$ADDE project#			
DF: The degree to which a task is easy t	o learn			
Task variability \$Poole 1	1978#			
Task variety \$Perrow 1967. Daf	t & Macintosh 1981, Zeffane & Gul 1993#			
. Task constraints	,			
. Constraints that need to be satisfied	\$Campbell 1988#			
. Goal				
Satisficing vs. optimizing				
Satisficing				
Maximizing/Optimizing	\$Steiner 1972#			
Maximizing goal				
Optimizing goal				
Ouantitative vs. qualitative goal	\$Li 2004#			
Ouantitative goal				
<i>Qualitative goal</i>				
. Product	\$Li 2004#			
Physical product	•			
Intellectual product				
Decision/solution product				
. Task structure				
Task classifications based on task struct	ure			
Campbell (1988) task type based on ta	ask complexity \$Campbell 1988#			
Decision task	I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I			
Judgment task				
Problem task				
<i>Fuzzy task</i>				
Task clarity				
Assumptions agreed upon/not agreed	upon \$McMullin & Taylor 1984#			
Assumptions explicit/not explicit	\$McMullin & Taylor 1984#			
Given state clarity SReitm	an 1965 McMullin & Taylor 1984#			
Well-defined given state				
Ill_defined given state				
Goal clarity	\$Reitman 1965 Frost 1976#			
Well_defined goal	$\varphi (\cos (11) \cos (11)) = 0$			
Ill_defined goal				
Solution path clarity	\$Frost 1976#			
Rule usage	\$Hrehiniak 1974#			
ivuit usage	φ111 UIIIIαK 197 $π$			

DF: The degree to which a task performer should follow standard procedures or rules

		Prescribed process			
		Non-prescribed process			
		Task certainty, task predictability			
		. Given state certainty			
		. Goal certainty			
		. Solution path certainty	\$Campbell 1988#		
		DF: Presence of uncertainty or probab	ilistic linkages in the solution path		
		Number of unexpected events in the	task process		
•	•	Task diffuseness			
•	•	Task multiplicity			
•	•	Given state multiplicity			
•	·	Single given state			
·	•	Multinle given states			
•	•	Goal multiplicity	\$Campbell 1988#		
•	·	Single goal	\$Campbell 1988#		
•	·	Single goul Multiple goals			
•	•	Solution noth multiplicity	Compbell 1084 Show 1072#		
•	·	Sinclo path	\$Campbell 1984, Shaw 1975#		
•	·	Single pain			
•	·	Multiple paths			
•	·	Subtask structure	Φ11/1 · 1075 H 1 1000 M 11 · 2001//		
·	•	. lask stage	\$White 1975, Hersh 1999, Vakkari 2001#		
•	•	. The number of subtasks			
•	•	Interrelated and conflicting subtasks	\$Campbell 1988#		
·		. Task identity	SHackman & Oldham 1976#		
	DF: The degree to which a task requires completion of a "whole" and identifiable				
pi	ec	e of work; that is, doing a task from begin	ining to ending with a visible outcome.		
•	•	Task scope	\$Whitley & Frost 1972#		
•		. Task addressing local problems			
•		. Task addressing global problems			
•	Т	ask requirement and process			
		Task classifications based on task require	ement and process		
		. Carter et al. (1950) task type	\$Carter et al. 1950#		
		Clerical task			
		Discussion task			
		Intellectual construction task			
		Mechanical assembly task			
		Motor coordination and reasoning ta	ask		
		. McGarth (1984) task type	\$McGrath 1984#		
		Generate			
		Planning tasks			
		Creativity tasks			
		Choose			
		Intellectual task			
		Decision-making task			
-	-				

Negotiate	
Cognitive conflict task	
Mixed-motive task	
Execute	
Contests/Battle	
Performance	
Intellectual task type (Hackman 1968)	\$Hackman 1968#
Production task	
Discussion task	
Problem-solving task	
. Ability requirement	\$Hackman 1969#
Required knowledge/skill	
Required experience	
Required cognitive capabilities	\$Campbell 1988#
Skill variety	\$Hackman & Oldham 1976#
DF. The degree to which a task requires a	variety of different activities or the use
of a number of different skills and talents, in carry	ving out the task.
Behavior requirement	\$McGrath 1984, p. 54#
Intellectual-motor requirement	
. Materials requirement	\$Algon 1999, Bikson 1987#
Tasks interacting with objects	
Tasks interacting with people	
Tasks interacting with ideas	
Task feedback	\$Hackman & Oldham 1976#
DF: The degree to which carrying out work	activities required by the task results in
the task performer obtaining direct and clear info	ormation about the effectiveness of their
personal performance	
personai perrormanee.	
Extrinsic Task Characteristics	
. Locus of task	
Degree of local decision making on task	
. Imposition	\$Li 2004. McMullin & Taylor 1984#
. Internal imposition	+,,
External imposition	
. Task autonomy	\$Hackman & Oldham 1976#
DF: The degree to which a task provides	substantial freedom, independence and
discretion of the task performer in scheduling the	work and in determining the procedures
to be used in carrying it out	
Unity of control	\$Hrebiniak 1974#
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

- DF: The number of supervisors
- . . Closeness of supervision
 - DF: The degree to which a supervisor influences on the task \$Hrebiniak 1974#
- . . Closeness of control

DF: The degree to which a supervisor influences on the task performer's control over his subordinates

\$Hrebiniak 1974#

. Task significance	\$Hackman & Oldham 1976#			
DF: The degree to which a task has a substantial impact on the lives or work of other				
people				
. Task urgency	\$Li 2004#			
. Task frequency				
Quantitative frequency				
Qualitative frequency	\$Li 2004#			
Unique				
Periodical				
Routine				
. Task risk	\$McMullin & Taylor 1984#			
. Task reward	\$McMullin & Taylor 1984#			
T 1 D 4				
<u>Task Pertormer</u>	¢17,			
. Individual as task performer	\$Kraut et al. 1994#			
. Group as task performer	Φτ 11: 1000 <i>//</i>			
Cooperating/Mixed-motive groups	\$Laughlin 1980#			
Cooperating groups				
Intellective tasks				
Decision-making tasks				
Mixea-motive groups				
Iwo-person, two-choice tasks				
Bargaining and negotiation tasks				
Coalition formation				
Mixed-motive groups	PS4-in 1072//			
	\$Steiner 1972#			
\dots \bigcup <i>Unitary group</i>				
Divisible group	\$Stain on 1072#			
Group contribution pattern	\$Steiner 19/2#			
Disjunctive group				
Conjunctive group				
Discustion and				
Discretionary				
Tools interdemendence	Tuchmon 1079 Zoffang & Cul 1002#			
Task interdependence	5 Iushinan 1978, Zejjane & Gui 1995#			
DF: The degree to which individuals need to work with other individuals in order to				
Direction of interaction	¢Vicence du 10014			
. Difection of interaction	ariggunau 1981#			
Kecelve interaction				
Initiale interaction	$V_{\text{rout at al}} = 1004\%$			
Group integration DEt The degree to which a test were	priaul cl al. 1994#			
DF: The degree to which a task performer considered himself as part of a work				
group, and the ease of maintaining working relationships with work group members.				
ritendsnip opportunities	\$511115 et al. 19/0#			

Relationship between Task and Performer

- . Task familiarity
- . Task novelty
- . Task manageability

\$McMullin & Taylor 1984, Shaw 1973#

\$Hrebiniak 1974#

. Intrinsic interest

\$Shaw 1973#

DF: The degree to which the task in and of itself is interesting, motivating, or attractive to a task performer

- Goal acceptance \$Frost 1976# DF: The degree of a willingness to exert an effort sufficient to meet the goal
- . Belief for success
- . Salience of task

\$Li 2004#

Measurement of Task Performance

. Task productivity