INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Medical Office Survey on Patient Safety
Authors (date)	AHRQ (2008)
Purpose	To obtain providers' and administrators' opinions about issues that affect the overall safety and quality of the care provided to patients in their office.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	58
Setting	Health Care: Outpatient - Other
Target respondent	Health Care Administrators, Health Care Providers (Unspecified)
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	No adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=6)	C4, C7, D11, F1, F5, F7
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=0)	
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=2)	D4, D12
Respectful interaction (n=6)	C2, C5, D1, D2, D4, D7
Heedful inter-relating (n=1)	C1
Commitment (n=0)	
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=8)	B1, B2, B3, B4, B5, D8, D10, D12
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=0)	
Conflict resolution (n=0)	
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=0)	
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency: Cronbach's α range 0.75 to 0.86.
Validity	

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Medical Office Survey on Patient Safety
Factor analysis	Yes - unspecified
Other development and testing methods	Items generated from review of literature, existing surveys and interviews; cognitively tested survey; input from researchers and stakeholders; pilot tested survey.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Medical Office Survey on Patient Safety. 2008; Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, Rockville, MD.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	Instrument link
Link to articles citing instrument	N/A

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Team Climate Inventory (TCI)
Authors (date)	Anderson & West (1998)
Purpose	To assess the climate for innovation within groups at work.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	61
Setting	Health Care: Inpatient
Target respondent	Health Care Administrators, Health Care Providers (Unspecified), LPNs, NPs, RNs
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	Minor adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=3)	43, 52, 54
Continuous learning (n=5)	33, 34, 45, 49, 50
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=16)	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 10, 12, 42, 43, 44, 46, 47
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=5)	24, 26, 27, 28, 31
Respectful interaction (n=13)	17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 29, 30, 32, 48, 53, 56, 57
Heedful inter-relating (n=3)	15, 41, 42
Commitment (n=2)	11, 14
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=9)	13, 16, 19, 51, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=8)	25, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 55
Conflict resolution (n=1)	23
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=0)	
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency: Cronbach's α range 0.84 to 0.94, scale correlations range 0.35 to 0.62.
Validity	Criterion: across scale average r range 0.67 to 0.98; also, in all but 3 of 25 cases the F value (ANOVA) was significant, indicating adequate discriminant and convergent validity because measure distinguished between different groups.

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Team Climate Inventory (TCI)
Factor analysis	Yes - exploratory and confirmatory
Other development and testing methods	Items generated via review of published measures.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Anderson NR, West MA. Measuring climate for work group innovation: development and validation of the team climate inventory. J Organ Behav 1998;19(3):235-258.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	N/A
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Untitled (Aubé & Rousseau 2005)
Authors (date)	Aubé & Rousseau (2005)
Purpose	To assess the relationships between team goal commitment and three criteria of team effectiveness (i.e., team performance, quality of group experience, and team viability).
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	15
Setting	Non-Health Care or Unspecified
Target respondent	Employees, Managers
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	No adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=0)	
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=3)	TP1, TP2, TP3
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=0)	
Respectful interaction (n=5)	QGE2, QGE3, SB3, SB4, SB5
Heedful inter-relating (n=3)	SB1, SB2, TV3
Commitment (n=1)	TV4
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=0)	
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=1)	TV1
Conflict resolution (n=1)	TV2
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=0)	
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency: Cronbach's α range 0.78 to 0.96. Inter-rater (within group): r range 0.72 to 0.83.
Validity	

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Untitled (Aubé & Rousseau 2005)
Factor analysis	
Other development and testing methods	Regression analyses.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Aubé, Caroline, and Vincent Rousseau. "Team Goal Commitment and Team Effectiveness: The Role of Task Interdependence and Supportive Behaviors." Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice. 2005;9(3):189.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	N/A
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Team Decision Making Questionnaire (TDMQ)
Authors (date)	Batorowicz & Shepherd (2008)
Purpose	To evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of a trans disciplinary team model on the quality of the teamwork process.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	19
Setting	Health Care: Outpatient - Other
Target respondent	AHPs, Health Care Administrators, Social Service Providers, Teachers and Educational Administrators
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	Major adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=1)	15
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=1)	3
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=0)	
Respectful interaction (n=0)	
Heedful inter-relating (n=0)	
Commitment (n=0)	
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=1)	9
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=0)	
Conflict resolution (n=0)	
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=0)	
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Test-retest reliability: interclass correlation for subscales range 0.52 to 0.94. Internal consistency: Cronbach's α for subscales range 0.83 to 0.91.
Validity	Construct validity: principal component analysis with a varimax rotation.

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Team Decision Making Questionnaire (TDMQ)
Factor analysis	Yes - principal component analysis with a varimax rotation
Other development and testing methods	Items identified in a focus group.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Batorowicz B, Shepherd TA. Measuring the quality of transdisciplinary teams. J Interprof Care 2008;22(6):612-620.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	PubMed abstract
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Team Fitness Test
Authors (date)	Bendaly (1996)
Purpose	N/A
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	25
Setting	Non-Health Care or Unspecified
Target respondent	Health Care Trainees and Students
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	No adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=0)	
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=7)	4, 7, 9, 10, 17, 19, 24
Evolving mental models of roles (n=1)	14
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=2)	08, 18
Respectful interaction (n=5)	01, 11, 12, 18, 20
Heedful inter-relating (n=1)	25
Commitment (n=5)	02, 03, 05, 06, 16
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=3)	15, 21, 22
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=0)	
Conflict resolution (n=0)	
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=0)	
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Inter-rater: reported by author to be highly reliable based on previous testing with overall reliability of 0.936.
Validity	
Factor analysis	

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Team Fitness Test
Other development and testing methods	
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Bendaly, L. Games teams play: Dynamic activities for tapping work team potential. New York: McGraw-Hill. 1996.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	Instrument link
Link to articles citing instrument	N/A

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Untitled (Campion et al 1993a)
Authors (date)	Campion et al (1993)
Purpose	To assess workgroup effectiveness by evaluating targeted workgroup characteristics.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	54
Setting	Non-Health Care or Unspecified
Target respondent	Employees
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	Major adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=3)	35, 36, 37
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=11)	01, 02, 03, 04, 08, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24
Evolving mental models of roles (n=3)	09, 25, 27
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=1)	43
Respectful interaction (n=4)	05, 06, 12, 47
Heedful inter-relating (n=12)	16, 17, 18, 28, 29, 41, 42, 48, 49, 50, 51, 54
Commitment (n=8)	10, 11, 32, 33, 34, 44, 45, 46
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=3)	40, 52, 53
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=2)	09, 30
Conflict resolution (n=0)	
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=2)	38, 39
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency: Cronbach's α 0.47 to 0.90; inter-rater: intraclass correlations 0.03 to 0.66.
Validity	Construct validity: average intercorrelations among scales (r=0.22).
Factor analysis	Yes - exploratory; principal components analysis with orthogonal and oblique rotations

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Untitled (Campion et al 1993a)
Other development and testing methods	
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Campion MA, Medsker GJ, Higgs AC. Relations between work group characteristics and effectiveness: Implications for designing effective work groups. Personnel Psych 2006;46(4):823-847.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	N/A
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Teamwork Effectiveness Assessment Module (TEAM)
Authors (date)	Chesluk et al (2012)
Purpose	To evaluate how physicians working as hospitalists or in other roles perform as part of an interprofessional patient care team.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	31
Setting	Health Care: Inpatient
Target respondent	Physicians
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	Minor adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=4)	23, 24, 26, 27
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=0)	
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=0)	
Respectful interaction (n=10)	5, 7, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21
Heedful inter-relating (n=5)	4, 14, 18, 22, 29
Commitment (n=0)	
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=7)	1, 2, 3, 6, 10, 11, 12
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=0)	
Conflict resolution (n=0)	
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=0)	
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	
Validity	
Factor analysis	

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Teamwork Effectiveness Assessment Module (TEAM)
Other development and testing methods	Developed assessment module from teamwork elements and existing tool; conducted exploratory cognitive interviews and revised assessment accordingly; pilot test of assessment.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Chesluk BJ, et al. A new tool to give hospitalists feedback to improve interprofessional teamwork and advance patient care. Health Affairs 2012;31(11):2485-2492.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	PubMed abstract
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Untitled (Copnell et al 2004)
Authors (date)	Copnell et al (2004)
Purpose	To assess doctors' and nurses' perceptions of interdisciplinary collaboration in two neonatal intensive care units (NICUs).
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	29
Setting	Health Care: Inpatient
Target respondent	Health Care Administrators, Physicians, RNs
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	Major adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=0)	
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=0)	
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=2)	4, 10
Respectful interaction (n=1)	23
Heedful inter-relating (n=5)	5, 8, 20, 21, 22
Commitment (n=0)	
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=3)	17, 27, 28
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=0)	
Conflict resolution (n=0)	
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=0)	
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	
Validity	Face validity: piloted with nurses in one hospital unit.
Factor analysis	

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Untitled (Copnell et al 2004)
Other development and testing methods	
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Copnell B, et al. Doctors' and nurses' perceptions of interdisciplinary collaboration in the NICU, and the impact of a neonatal nurse practitioner model of practice. J Clin Nurs 2004;13(1):105-113.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	PubMed abstract
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Interprofessional Collaborator Assessment Rubric (ICAR)
Authors (date)	Curran et al (2011)
Purpose	To assess individuals' competencies with respect to interprofessional collaboration.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	31
Setting	Health Care: Unspecified
Target respondent	Health Care Providers (Unspecified)
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	Major adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=3)	FUN1, FUN2, FUN3
Continuous learning (n=3)	COL2, PCC1, R&R3
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=6)	R&R1, R&R2, R&R4, R&R5, R&R6, R&R7
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=0)	
Respectful interaction (n=5)	COM1, CON1, CON2, PCC2, PCC3
Heedful inter-relating (n=2)	COL1, COL4
Commitment (n=1)	FUN4
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=13)	COL3, COM1, COM2, COM3, COM4, COM5, COM6, COM7, CON1, CON2, CON3, FUN5, PCC2
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=0)	
Conflict resolution (n=1)	CON4
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=1)	FUN3
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	
Validity	Content validity: two rounds of a Delphi survey of experts.

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Interprofessional Collaborator Assessment Rubric (ICAR)
Factor analysis	
Other development and testing methods	Competencies identified from literature; focus groups.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Curran VR, et al. Development and validation of the interprofessional collaborator assessment rubric ((ICAR)). J Interprof Care 2011;25(5):339-344.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	PubMed abstract
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	SafeQuest
Authors (date)	De Wet et al (2010)
Purpose	To measure perceptions of safety climate among primary care teams.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	30
Setting	Health Care: Outpatient - Primary Care
Target respondent	AHPs, Health Care Administrators, LPNs, NPs, Pharmacists, Physicians, RNs
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	No adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=1)	SAF 04
Continuous learning (n=4)	ERR 01, ERR 02, SAF 01, SAF 05
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=4)	COM 05, LDR 06, SAF 02, SAF 05
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=4)	COM 01, COM 02, LDR 02, LDR 05
Respectful interaction (n=6)	LDR 04, SAF 01, SAF 03, SAF 05, TWK 01, TWK 04
Heedful inter-relating (n=1)	TWK 02
Commitment (n=0)	
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=2)	COM 03, COM 04
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=0)	
Conflict resolution (n=1)	TWK 03
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=7)	COM 05, ERR 01, ERR 02, LDR 01, LDR 03, LDR 04, TWK 07
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency: overall reliability 0.94 (range: 0.60 to 0.90).
Validity	Content modified Delphi group (n=11 experts) with content validity index of 0.94 with all factors and items scoring >0.8.
Factor analysis	Yes - exploratory and confirmatory

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	SafeQuest
Other development and testing methods	Items generated from literature; interviews to explore questionnaire acceptability, clarity and validity.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	De Wet C et al. The development and psychometric evaluation of a safety climate measure for primary care. Qual Saf Health Care 2010;19:578-584.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	PubMed asbtract
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Untitled (Denison et al 1996)
Authors (date)	Denison et al (1996)
Purpose	To examine the effectiveness of cross-functional teams.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	67
Setting	Non-Health Care or Unspecified
Target respondent	Employees, Managers
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	Minor adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=1)	B1
Continuous learning (n=2)	EFY5, IC4
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=8)	B3, EFY1, EFY2, MAD4, R6, RFTP1, RFTP2, RFTP3
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=0)	
Respectful interaction (n=0)	
Heedful inter-relating (n=3)	B2, C3, GS3
Commitment (n=2)	EFT2, EFT3
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=1)	TIME1
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=1)	EFY6
Conflict resolution (n=1)	EFY2
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=0)	
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	
Validity	
Factor analysis	Yes - exploratory and confirmatory

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Untitled (Denison et al 1996)
Other development and testing methods	Items generated from content analysis of qualitative data from stories, interviews, written descriptions and observations; examined literature to refine measures; administered questionnaire to two samples to refine items.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Denison DR, Hart SL, Kahn JA. From chimneys to cross-functional teams: Developing and validating a diagnostic model. Acad Manage J 1996;39(4):1005-1023.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	N/A
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Untitled (Doolen et al 2003)
Authors (date)	Doolen et al (2003)
Purpose	To provide team-level assessments of nine organizational context variables, team processes, and team member satisfaction.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	78
Setting	Non-Health Care or Unspecified
Target respondent	Employees
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	Minor adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=3)	01, 60, 64
Continuous learning (n=6)	27, 46, 55, 57, 66, 76
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=15)	04, 07, 13, 17, 18, 21, 30, 34, 36, 37, 38, 47, 53, 60, 73
Evolving mental models of roles (n=2)	63, 38
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=1)	3
Respectful interaction (n=1)	33
Heedful inter-relating (n=13)	02, 11, 19, 24, 25, 40, 43, 49, 52, 61, 70, 75, 78
Commitment (n=12)	06, 12, 26, 35, 41, 45, 54, 59, 62, 67, 69, 77
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=8)	09, 10, 22, 42, 48, 51, 71, 72
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=0)	
Conflict resolution (n=0)	
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=12)	05, 08, 10, 15, 20, 28, 31, 32, 44, 56, 65, 74
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency: scale reliabilities range 0.733 to 0.946.
Validity	
Factor analysis	Yes - separate factor analyses performed; principal axis factor analysis with oblique rotation to determine final factor loading

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Untitled (Doolen et al 2003)
Other development and testing methods	Aggregation analysis to determine evidence for aggregating individual-level responses to group-level; path analysis to examine relationships between independent, mediating and dependent variables; regression analyses.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Doolen TL, Hacker ME, Van Aken EM. The impact of organizational context on work team effectiveness: A study of production team. Eng Manag IEEE Transactions 2003;50(3):285-296.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	N/A
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Untitled (Edmonson 1999)
Authors (date)	Edmondson (1999)
Purpose	To assess team psychological safety, or a shared belief held by members of a team that the team is safe for interpersonal risk taking, and its relationship to team efficacy in earning and performance.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	54
Setting	Non-Health Care or Unspecified
Target respondent	Employees, Managers
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	No adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=17)	7, 8, 13, 16, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 37, 39, 44, 45, 46, 48, 50, 54
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=10)	3, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 35, 36, 38, 41
Evolving mental models of roles (n=2)	40, 42
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=0)	
Respectful interaction (n=5)	18, 19, 20, 21, 53
Heedful inter-relating (n=6)	14, 17, 22, 23, 24, 47
Commitment (n=3)	43, 51, 52
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=2)	1, 3
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=2)	2, 15
Conflict resolution (n=1)	29
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=5)	4, 25, 26, 27, 28
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency: Cronbach's α 0.63 to 0.87 for group-level survey variables. Inter-rater: intraclass correlations for observer variables.
Validity	Construct: ICC range 0.27-0.39 for constructs meaningful at group level attributes and 0.03 and 0.04 for individual; multitrait multimethod (MTMM); convergence (correlations) between two instruments was good; discriminant validity established with factor

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Untitled (Edmonson 1999)
Factor analysis	Yes - principal components, varimax rotation
Other development and testing methods	Conducted interviews and observations; designed and administered two surveys and a structured interview instrument; interviewed and observed teams based on survey results; regression analyses and generalized linear model analysis.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Edmondson A. Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. Adm Sci Q 1999;44(2):350-383.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	N/A
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Teamwork Questionnaire
Authors (date)	Fernandez et al (2009)
Purpose	To assess the behavioral variables implied in the working dynamics of postgraduate student groups undertaking their first project.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	25
Setting	Non-Health Care or Unspecified
Target respondent	Non-Health Care Students
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	Major adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=1)	Q2 17
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=3)	Q2 01, Q2 02, Q2 12
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=0)	
Respectful interaction (n=0)	
Heedful inter-relating (n=4)	Q2 08, Q2 11, Q2 21, Q2 23
Commitment (n=4)	Q2 10, Q2 13, Q2 20, Q2 22
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=1)	Q2 07
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=0)	
Conflict resolution (n=3)	Q2 06, Q2 09, Q2 19
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=0)	
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency: Cronbach's α for all items was > 0.70.
Validity	Content validity: expert input. Criterion (predictive); Construct (discriminant): item-total-correlation with correlation index > 0.25 and factor analysis
Factor analysis	Yes - exploratory

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Teamwork Questionnaire
Other development and testing methods	Items and constructs generated from literature; ordinal regression analyses.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Fernandez JLC, et al. An assessment of behavioural variables implied in teamwork: an experience with engineering students of Zaragoza University. Eur J Engineering Ed 2009;34(2):113-122.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	N/A
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Work Relationships Scale (WRS)
Authors (date)	Finley et al (2013, unpublished)
Purpose	To assess the relationship between clinical team member relationships on quality of care in primary care clinics.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	15
Setting	Health Care: Outpatient - Primary Care
Target respondent	Health Care Administrators, LPNs, NPs, Physicians, RNs
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	No adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=2)	10, 12
Continuous learning (n=6)	1, 2, 3, 6, 10, 13
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=1)	12
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=1)	4
Respectful interaction (n=4)	1, 8, 13, 14
Heedful inter-relating (n=1)	5
Commitment (n=0)	
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=4)	4, 6, 7, 9
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=1)	2
Conflict resolution (n=2)	9, 11
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=1)	15
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency: Cronbach's α = 0.95. Inter-item correlations range 0.29 to 0.80.
Validity	Face validity tested in pilot project. Construct validity: Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient and congruence of instrument results with qualitative results.
Factor analysis	Yes - principal component analysis

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Work Relationships Scale (WRS)
Other development and testing methods	Items generated from literature and related studies; administered survey; observation; semi-structured interviews; Rasch analysis.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Finley EP, et al. Relationship quality and patient-assessed quality of care in VA primary care clinics: development and validation of the Work Relationships Scale. 2013. Unpublished manuscript.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	N/A
Link to articles citing instrument	N/A

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Communication and Teamwork Skills (CATS) Assessment
Authors (date)	Frankel et al (2007)
Purpose	To assess communication and other team skills of health care providers in a variety of real and simulated clinical settings.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Observational Checklist (Field or Simulation)
Total number of items	21
Setting	Health Care: Inpatient
Target respondent	Health Care Providers (Unspecified), Surgeons and Other Surgical Staff
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	Major adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=0)	
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=0)	
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=0)	
Respectful interaction (n=0)	
Heedful inter-relating (n=1)	COORD4
Commitment (n=0)	
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=8)	COMM3, COMM4, COOP2, COOP3, COOP5, COORD2, COORD3, COORD4
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=1)	SIT2
Conflict resolution (n=0)	
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=0)	
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	
Validity	

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Communication and Teamwork Skills (CATS) Assessment
Factor analysis	
Other development and testing methods	Elements generated, in part, from existing military and aviation and other instruments. Developed through many rapid-cycle improvement cycles; piloted through observation of simulations, real-time surgical procedures and multidisciplinary rounds.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Frankel A, et al. Using the communication and teamwork skills (CATS) assessment to measure health care team performance. Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf 2007;33(9):549-558.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	PubMed abstract
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Untitled (Friesen et al 2008)
Authors (date)	Friesen et al (2008)
Purpose	To evaluate factors associated with fatigue among resident interns, including work hours, perceived stress, quality of sleep, and perceptions of teamwork functioning.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	17
Setting	Health Care: Outpatient - Primary Care
Target respondent	Health Care Trainees and Students
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	Major adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=1)	4
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=2)	6, 7
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=0)	
Respectful interaction (n=7)	3, 5, 10, 11, 15, 16,
Heedful inter-relating (n=2)	2, 12
Commitment (n=6)	1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=0)	
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=0)	
Conflict resolution (n=0)	
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=1)	14
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency: Cronbach's α for scales range 0.68 to 0.95.
Validity	

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Untitled (Friesen et al 2008)
Factor analysis	Yes - unspecified
Other development and testing methods	Items generated from focus groups; Spearman correlations; multivariate linear regression.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Friesen LD, et al. Factors associated with intern fatigue. J Gen Intern Med 2008;23(12):1981-1986.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	PubMed abstract
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Relational Coordination Scale
Authors (date)	Gittell et al (2010)
Purpose	To assess relational coordination among care providers.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	7
Setting	Health Care: Inpatient
Target respondent	Health Care Providers - Pysicians, Nurses, Physical Therapists, Social Workers and Case Managers
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	Minor adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=0)	
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=2)	RC04, RC05
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=1)	RC03
Respectful interaction (n=2)	RC04, RC07
Heedful inter-relating (n=2)	RC02, RC06
Commitment (n=0)	
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=4)	RC01, RC02, RC03, RC04
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=0)	
Conflict resolution (n=0)	
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=0)	
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency; Cronbach's α=0.86
Validity	Construct (convergent): item-to-total correlations > 0.40.
Factor analysis	Yes - exploratory

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Relational Coordination Scale
Other development and testing methods	ANOVA; intra-class correlations.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Gittell JH, Seidner R, Wimbush J. A relational model of how high-performance work systems work. Organ Sci 2010;21(2):490-506.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	N/A
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Resuscitation Team Leader Evaluation
Authors (date)	Grant et al (2012)
Purpose	To measure all elements of pediatric resuscitation team leadership competence.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Observational Checklist (Simulation)
Total number of items	12
Setting	Health Care: Inpatient
Target respondent	Health Care Providers (Unspecified)
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	Major adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=2)	8, 9
Continuous learning (n=0)	
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=0)	
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=0)	
Respectful interaction (n=2)	7, 10
Heedful inter-relating (n=1)	12
Commitment (n=0)	
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=3)	4, 6, 12
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=1)	11
Conflict resolution (n=0)	
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=7)	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency: Cronbach's alpha for instrument α = 0.818, and for α = 0.827 and α = 0.673 for two subscales. Inter-rater: total scores had correlations of 0.617, 0.489, and 0.453 for the three rater combinations.
Validity	Content validity: Delphi rounds of expert ratings. Construct validity: high strength of correlation between global scores and scores for overall performance (r = 0.733), subscales (r = 0.718 and r = 0.662).

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Resuscitation Team Leader Evaluation
Factor analysis	Yes - unspecified
Other development and testing methods	Items generated from literature and brainstorming session; generalizability analysis (G-study); D-study.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Grant EC, et al. The development and assessment of an evaluation tool for pediatric resident competence in leading simulated pediatric resuscitations. Resuscitation 2012;83(7):887-93.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	PubMed abstract
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Patients' Insights and Views Observing Teams (PIVOT) Questionnaire
Authors (date)	Henry et al (2013)
Purpose	To assess patients' perceptions of teamwork-related behaviors they encountered during an emergency department visit.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	21
Setting	Health Care: Inpatient
Target respondent	Patients
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	No adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=0)	
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=2)	3, 10
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=0)	
Respectful interaction (n=7)	7, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19
Heedful inter-relating (n=4)	1, 4, 5, 11
Commitment (n=0)	
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=8)	2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 17, 20, 21
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=0)	
Conflict resolution (n=2)	7, 15
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=0)	
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	
Validity	Content validity: participant ratings of internal structure- feasibility (inter-item consistency Cronbach's α = 0.87) and utility (inter-item consistency Cronbach's α = 0.84).

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Patients' Insights and Views Observing Teams (PIVOT) Questionnaire
Factor analysis	
Other development and testing methods	Items generated from literature; pilot tested; multiple round cognitive interviews; Rasch analysis.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Henry BW, et al. What patients observe about teamwork in the emergency department: Development of the Pivot Questionnaire. J Participatory Med 2013; 5.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	N/A
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Untitled (Hoegl & Gemunden 2004)
Authors (date)	Hoegl & Gemuenden (2004)
Purpose	To assess interteam coordination, project commitment, and teamwork in multiteam R&D projects.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	40
Setting	Non-Health Care or Unspecified
Target respondent	Employees
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	Minor adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=1)	MUT 03
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=3)	CMT 01, EFF 01, MUT 04
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=0)	
Respectful interaction (n=1)	MUT 02
Heedful inter-relating (n=7)	BAL 03, COO 01, COO 02, COO 03, ITC 01, ITC 02, ITC 03
Commitment (n=10)	BAL 01, BAL 02, CMT 02, CMT 03, CMT 04, CMT 05,COH 01, COH 02, EFF 02, EFF 03
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=6)	COM 01, COM 02, COM 03, COM 04, COM 05, MUT 03
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=1)	ITC 05
Conflict resolution (n=2)	ITC 04, MUT 01
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=1)	PER 05
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency: Cronbach's α for teamwork quality using 2 to 5 items was 0.70 to 0.89. Cronbach's α = 0.90, 0.89 and 0.78 for overall performance, quality, and adherence to budget, respectively; Inter-rater: 0.90, 0.91 and 0.93 for constructs
Validity	

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Untitled (Hoegl & Gemunden 2004)
Factor analysis	Yes - exploratory
Other development and testing methods	Longitudinal, multi-informant design; correlation; multivariate regression analyses.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Hoegl M, Weinkauf K, Gemuenden HG. Interteam coordination, project commitment, and teamwork in multiteam R&D projects: A longitudinal study. Org Sci 2004;15(1):38-55.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	N/A
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Clinical Staff Questionnaire (CSQ)
Authors (date)	Jaén et al (2010) Instrument 1
Purpose	To assess clinicians' perceptions of their work environment in a patient-centered medical home (PCMH) setting.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	81
Setting	Health Care: Outpatient - Primary Care
Target respondent	Health Care Providers (Unspecified)
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	No adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=2)	45, 54
Continuous learning (n=19)	01, 02, 04, 05, 11, 15, 25, 31, 33, 38, 46, 53, 57, 60, 64, 67, 74, 80, 81
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=7)	10, 13, 17, 29, 50, 71, 77
Evolving mental models of roles (n=2)	07, 78
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=7)	12, 21, 27, 28, 43, 51, 64
Respectful interaction (n=5)	03, 18, 40, 46, 53
Heedful inter-relating (n=5)	28, 34, 41, 58, 65
Commitment (n=1)	30
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=7)	09, 24, 27, 57, 66, 79, 80
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=5)	19, 39, 47, 63, 67
Conflict resolution (n=2)	08, 40
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=6)	06, 11, 18, 32, 37, 76
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency: Cronbach's α = 0.97 for adaptive reserve factor, 0.82 for community knowledge, 0.73 for health information technology integration, 0.68 for cultural sensitivity, 0.81 for patient safety culture.
Validity	

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Clinical Staff Questionnaire (CSQ)
Factor analysis	Yes - principal components factor analysis
Other development and testing methods	Least square means ANOVA.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Jaén CR, et al. Methods for evaluating practice change toward a patient-centered medical home. Ann Fam Med 2010;8(1):S9-S20.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	PubMed abstract
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Shorter Adaptive Reserve Measures
Authors (date)	Jaén et al (2010) Instrument 2
Purpose	To assess clinicians' perceptions of their practice's "adaptive reserve (i.e., capacity for change)" within the context of a patient-centered medical home (PCMH).
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	14
Setting	Health Care: Outpatient - Primary Care
Target respondent	Health Care Providers (Unspecified)
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	No adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=2)	06, 13
Continuous learning (n=7)	01, 02, 03, 05, 06, 08, 10
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=0)	
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=0)	
Respectful interaction (n=2)	07, 09
Heedful inter-relating (n=1)	12
Commitment (n=1)	12
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=1)	4
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=0)	
Conflict resolution (n=0)	
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=3)	05, 11, 14
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency: set of 14 items had a Cronbach's α = 0.96, set of 3 items had a Cronbach's α = 0.86.
Validity	

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Shorter Adaptive Reserve Measures
Factor analysis	Yes - principal components factor analysis
Other development and testing methods	
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Jaén CR, et al. Methods for evaluating practice change toward a patient-centered medical home. Ann Fam Med 2010;8(1):S9-S20.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	PubMed abstract
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Nursing Teamwork Survey (NTS)
Authors (date)	Kalisch & Lee (2011)
Purpose	To assess individual staff members' perceptions of teamwork among nursing staff in a hospital setting.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	33
Setting	Health Care: Inpatient
Target respondent	Administrators, Practitioners
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	No adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=3)	23, 24, 31
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=2)	01, 09
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=2)	07, 33
Respectful interaction (n=5)	11, 12, 16, 18, 22
Heedful inter-relating (n=11)	3, 6, 14, 15, 20, 21, 26, 28, 29, 30, 32
Commitment (n=0)	
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=3)	10, 24, 25
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=0)	
Conflict resolution (n=3)	05, 13, 17
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=4)	02, 08, 19, 27
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Test-retest: overall test-retest coefficient with 33 items was 0.92 and range of 0.74 to 0.85 for subscales. Internal consistency: overall Cronbach's α = 0.94, range 0.74 to 0.85 for factors; the ICC1 values all in range, ICC2 values > 0.84.
Validity	Content: input from experts, content validity index was 91.2%; Predictive (concurrent): one-way ANOVA; Construct (discriminant): comparison of results for different teams; (convergent): correlation 0.76 with existing instrument (p=0.01).

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Nursing Teamwork Survey (NTS)
Factor analysis	Yes - exploratory (principal components, varimax orthogonal rotation); confirmatory
Other development and testing methods	Items generated from theory and informed by an existing teamwork model.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Kalisch BJ, Lee KH. Nurse staffing levels and teamwork: A cross-sectional study of patient care units in acute care hospitals. J Nurs Scholar 2011;43(1):82-88.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	PubMed abstract
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Comprehensive Assessment of Team Member Effectiveness (CATME)
Authors (date)	Loughry et al (2007)
Purpose	To evaluate individual team members' investment in and contributions to the team.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	93
Setting	Non-Health Care or Unspecified
Target respondent	Non-Health Care Students
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	Minor adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=10)	CON 17, CON 18, KEE 04, KEE 05, KEE 06, KEE 07, KEE 08, KEE 09, KEE 22, KEE 23
Continuous learning (n=15)	INT 23, INT 24, INT 25, INT 26, INT 27, KEE 02, KEE 10, KEE 11, KEE 12, KEE 24, KNO 01, KNO 02, KNO 07, KNO 08, KNO 09
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=8)	EXP 01, KEE 15, KEE 16, KEE 17, KEE 18, KEE 21, KEE 22, KEE 23
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=0)	
Respectful interaction (n=12)	INT 10, INT 11, INT 12, INT 16, INT 17, INT 18, INT 19, INT 20, INT 21, INT 23, INT 24, INT 26
Heedful inter-relating (n=25)	CON 16, CON 22, CON 23, CON 24, INT 04, INT 05, INT 06, INT 07, INT 08, INT 09, INT 17, INT 18, INT 19, INT 20, INT 21, INT 28, INT 29, INT 30, KEE 01, KEE 02, KEE 03, KEE 19, KNO 04, KNO 05, KNO 06
Commitment (n=29)	CON 01, CON 02, CON 03, CON 04, CON 05, CON 06, CON 07, CON 08, CON 09, CON 10, CON 11, CON 12, CON 13, CON 14, CON 15, CON 19, CON 20, CON 21, EXP 02, EXP 03, EXP 04, EXP 05, EXP 06, INT 12, INT 13, INT 14, INT 15, KEE 13, KEE 14
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=19)	CON 17, CON 18, INT 01, INT 02, INT 03, INT 04, INT 05, INT 06, INT 08, INT 09, INT 10, INT 11, INT 30, KEE 10, KEE 11, KEE 12, KEE 16, KEE 17, KEE 18,
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=0)	
Conflict resolution (n=0)	
Leadership Domain	

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Comprehensive Assessment of Team Member Effectiveness (CATME)
Leadership (n=5)	INT 20, KEE 20, KNO 01, KNO 02, KNO 03
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency: average Cronbach's α = 0.76 for categories, for short version of instrument Cronbach's α range 0.90 to 0.96.
Validity	Content validity: feedback from seven experts.
Factor analysis	Yes - exploratory and confirmatory
Other development and testing methods	Items generated from the literature and peer evaluation forms; revised items and had students critique and rank items; chi-square statistics and goodness of fit.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Loughry ML, Ohland MW, Moore DD. Development of a theory-based assessment of team member effectiveness. Educ Psych Meas 2007; 67(3):505-524.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	N/A
Link to articles citing instrument	N/A

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Team Development Measure (TDM)
Authors (date)	Mahoney & Turkovich (2010)
Purpose	To indicate the degree to which a team possesses and uses components associated with highly effective teamwork (specifically, cohesion, communication, clarity of team roles, and clarity of team goals).
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	31
Setting	Non-Health Care or Unspecified
Target respondent	Unspecified
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	No adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=0)	
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=5)	12, 15, 16, 19, 24
Evolving mental models of roles (n=1)	17
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=3)	05, 06, 29
Respectful interaction (n=6)	03, 04, 07, 11, 25, 26
Heedful inter-relating (n=1)	27
Commitment (n=3)	14, 18, 20
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=5)	01, 02, 09, 10, 28
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=2)	13, 31
Conflict resolution (n=2)	08, 30
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=0)	
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency: overall Cronbach's α = 0.97, real person reliability was 0.95 and model reliability was 0.96.
Validity	

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Team Development Measure (TDM)
Factor analysis	Yes - exploratory
Other development and testing methods	Rasch analysis
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Salem-Schatz S, Ordin D, Mittman B. Guide to the Team Development Measure. 2010; Center for Implementation Practice and Research Support.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	Instrument link
Link to articles citing instrument	N/A

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Mayo High Performance Teamwork Scale (MHPTS)
Authors (date)	Malec et al (2007)
Purpose	To assess a team's high performance teamwork and crisis resource management (CRM) skills in a simulation setting.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	16
Setting	Health Care: Inpatient
Target respondent	Health Care Trainees and Students, NPs, RNs
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	No adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=0)	
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=2)	03, 07
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=0)	
Respectful interaction (n=0)	
Heedful inter-relating (n=7)	04, 08, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16
Commitment (n=0)	
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=4)	05, 06, 11, 12
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=1)	10
Conflict resolution (n=1)	9
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=2)	01, 02
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency: for all ratings Cronbach's α = 0.85, for pretraining ratings Cronbach's α = 0.83, for ratings in first post-training scenario Cronbach's α = 0.83, and rating of second post-training scenario Cronbach's α = 0.81.
Validity	Construct validity: Rasch (person reliability = 0.77, person separation = 1.85, item reliability =0.96, item separation = 5.04).

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Mayo High Performance Teamwork Scale (MHPTS)
Factor analysis	
Other development and testing methods	Rasch analysis; paired t-tests.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Malec JF, et al. The Mayo high performance teamwork scale: reliability and validity for evaluating key crew resource management skills. Simulation in Healthcare 2007;2(1):4-10.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	PubMed abstract
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	The Team Survey
Authors (date)	Millward & Jeffries (2001)
Purpose	To measure a series of competencies associated with the cognitive-motivational model of team effectiveness.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	47
Setting	Health Care: Unspecified
Target respondent	Health Care Providers (Unspecified)
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	Minor adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=3)	TP1. TP4, TP5
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=8)	1, 2, MCG1, MCG2, MCG3, MCG4, TI8, TP6
Evolving mental models of roles (n=4)	SMM1, SMM12, SMM13, SMM2
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=1)	TP3
Respectful interaction (n=5)	CM6, PER1, PER2, VAL1, VAL2
Heedful inter-relating (n=11)	3, 4, SMM3, SMM4, SMM5, SMM8, SMM9, SMM10, SMM11, TP7, TP8
Commitment (n=7)	TI1, TI2, TI3, TI4, TI5, TI6, TI7
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=7)	CM1, CM2, CM3, CM4, CM5 , SMM6, SMM7
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=2)	SMM11,TP2
Conflict resolution (n=0)	
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=0)	
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency: Cronbach's α range 0.70 to 0.93. Inter-rater: split-half coefficient = 0.93.
Validity	Content validity: expert input. Criterion (concurrent) - bivariate correlations across variables. Construct validity (factor analysis).
Factor analysis	Yes - confirmatory (principal components)

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	The Team Survey
Other development and testing methods	Items generated from literature; regression analysis.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Millward LJ, Jeffries N. The team survey: a tool for health care team development. J Adv Nurs 2001;35(2):276-287.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	PubMed abstract
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Oxford Non-Technical Skills Scale (Oxford NOTECHS)
Authors (date)	Mishra et al (2009)
Purpose	To assess a team's ability to demonstrate a series of non-technical skills in the operating theatre.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Observational Checklist (Field)
Total number of items	16
Setting	Health Care: Inpatient
Target respondent	APRNs, Surgeons and other Surgical Staff
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	Major adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=5)	01, 10, 11, 12, 16
Continuous learning (n=3)	01, 11, 13
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=1)	3
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=0)	
Respectful interaction (n=2)	04, 06
Heedful inter-relating (n=7)	02, 05, 06, 07, 08, 14, 15
Commitment (n=0)	
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=0)	
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=0)	
Conflict resolution (n=1)	9
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=1)	4
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Test-retest: acceptable with no differences in scores during pre-intervention and post-intervention periods. Inter-rater: within group reliabilities range 0.68 to 0.97, totals range 0.95 to 0.99.
Validity	Content: expert input, adapted existing system; Criterion (concurrent, predictive); inverse correlation between scores & errors (r= - 0.267, p=0.046), with another instrument (r=0.886, p=0.046); Construct (convergent): agreement with existing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Oxford Non-Technical Skills Scale (Oxford NOTECHS)
Factor analysis	
Other development and testing methods	
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Mishra A, Catchpole K, McCulloch P. The Oxford NOTECHS System: reliability and validity of a tool for measuring teamwork behaviour in the operating theatre. Qual Saf Health Care 2009;18(2):104-108.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	PubMed abstract
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Survey of Organizational Attributes for Primary Care (SOAPC)
Authors (date)	Ohman-Strickland et al (2007)
Purpose	To assess individual team members' perceptions of resources for change, including relationships among practice members, leadership and decision-making approaches, communication, and perception of competing demands in a primary care setting.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	21
Setting	Health Care: Outpatient - Primary Care
Target respondent	Health Care Administrators, Health Care Providers (Unspecified), Physicians, NPs, RNs
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	No adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=6)	05, 06, 12, 19, 20, 21
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=1)	11
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=0)	
Respectful interaction (n=1)	7
Heedful inter-relating (n=1)	2
Commitment (n=1)	4
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=0)	
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=0)	
Conflict resolution (n=2)	01, 03
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=3)	08, 09, 10
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency: Cronbach's α = 0.81, 0.88 and 0.85 for three factors, and 0.73 for fourth factor.

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Survey of Organizational Attributes for Primary Care (SOAPC)
Validity	
Factor analysis	Yes - unspecified
Other development and testing methods	Items generated from existing instruments and revised items with expert panel; multiple correlation; one-way ANOVA.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Ohman-Strickland, PA., et al. Measuring organizational attributes of primary care practices: development of a new instrument. Health Serv Res 2007;42(3):1257-1273.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	PubMed abstract
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Assessment of Interprofessional Team Collaboration Scale (AITCS)
Authors (date)	Orchard et al (2012)
Purpose	To assess interprofessional team collaboration.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	37
Setting	Health Care: Unspecified
Target respondent	AHPS, NPs, Pharmacists, Physicians, RNs, Social Service Providers
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	Minor adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=2)	06, 34
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=4)	07, 11, 32, 33
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=2)	04, 19
Respectful interaction (n=5)	02, 04, 05, 26, 35
Heedful inter-relating (n=4)	03, 15, 16, 28
Commitment (n=2)	08, 31
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=6)	12, 13, 20, 31, 23, 24
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=0)	
Conflict resolution (n=2)	09, 14
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=3)	21, 28, 30
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency: subscale Cronbach's α range = 0.80 to 0.97, overall = 0.98.
Validity	Content validity: input from 24 experts.
Factor analysis	Yes - exploratory and confirmatory; principal components

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Assessment of Interprofessional Team Collaboration Scale (AITCS)
Other development and testing methods	
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Orchard CA, et al. Assessment of Interprofessional Team Collaboration Scale (AITCS): Development and testing of the instrument. J Contin Educ Health Prof 2012;32(1):58-67.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	PubMed abstract
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Untitled (Pearce & Sims 2002)
Authors (date)	Pearce & Sims (2002)
Purpose	To evaluate vertical versus shared leadership as it relates to the effectiveness of management teams.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	94
Setting	Non-Health Care or Unspecified
Target respondent	Employees
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	Minor adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=2)	45, 46
Continuous learning (n=10)	20, 42, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=24)	07, 08, 09, 10, 11, 22, 23, 24, 25, 30, 34, 35, 37, 53, 54, 55, 59, 71, 74, 75, 80, 81, 83, 92
Evolving mental models of roles (n=2)	63, 64
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=1)	3
Respectful interaction (n=12)	01, 02, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 39, 40, 47, 48, 49
Heedful inter-relating (n=2)	51, 52
Commitment (n=13)	29, 31, 37, 41, 69, 70, 82, 88, 89, 90, 91, 93, 94
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=8)	04, 05, 06, 16, 84, 85, 86, 87
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=12)	32, 33, 44, 56, 57, 58, 60, 72, 73, 76, 78, 79
Conflict resolution (n=3)	27, 76, 77
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=64)	01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 08, 09, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency: Cronbach's α = 0.98 for managerial ratings, 0.98 for internal customer ratings, and 0.85 for team self-ratings. Inter-rater: within group range 0.80 to 0.96 across sources and all three significantly correlated.

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Untitled (Pearce & Sims 2002)
Validity	
Factor analysis	Yes - exploratory; principal components analysis with varimax rotation
Other development and testing methods	Items generated from existing instruments and researchers in the field; correlations; hypothesis testing; multiple regression analysis.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Pearce CL, Sims Jr. HP. Vertical versus shared leadership as predictors of the effectiveness of change management teams: An examination of aversive, directive, transactional, transformational, and empowering leader behaviors. Group Dynamics: Theory, research, and practice 2002;6(2):172.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	N/A
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Group Emotional Intelligence Individual Regulation (GEIQ–IR)
Authors (date)	Peterson (2012)
Purpose	To assess the individual regulation component of group emotional intelligence.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	22
Setting	Health Care: Outpatient - Other
Target respondent	Health Care Providers (Unspecified), Psychiatrists, Social Service Providers
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	No adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=0)	
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=7)	12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=0)	
Respectful interaction (n=10)	01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 08, 09, 10
Heedful inter-relating (n=0)	
Commitment (n=0)	
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=1)	18
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=0)	
Conflict resolution (n=3)	16, 17, 22
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=0)	
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency: Cronbach's α for three factors range 0.91 to 0.97. Inter-rater: average percent agreement on item classification was 89% and Fleiss K for the scale overall was 0.71 and average item agreement was 0.83.

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Group Emotional Intelligence Individual Regulation (GEIQ–IR)
Validity	Content validity: expert input and clarity index (average of 95% of respondents indicated clarity). Construct validity (convergent): correlations between instrument subscales ($p < 0.01$).
Factor analysis	Yes - exploratory; principal axis factor with an oblimin rotation
Other development and testing methods	Items generated from existing instrument and definitions; correlations.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Peterson, CH. The individual regulation component of group emotional intelligence: Measure development and validation. J Spec Group Work 2012;37(3):232-251.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	N/A
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Untitled (Quinlan & Robinson 2010)
Authors (date)	Quinlan & Robinson (2010)
Purpose	To assess nurse practitioners' views of the knowledge exchange within their primary health care team.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	12
Setting	Health Care: Outpatient - Primary Care
Target respondent	NPs
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	No adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=0)	
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=0)	
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=2)	07, 11
Respectful interaction (n=2)	08, 12
Heedful inter-relating (n=0)	
Commitment (n=0)	
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=8)	05, 06, 07, 08, 09, 10, 11, 12
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=0)	
Conflict resolution (n=0)	
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=0)	
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	
Validity	The survey was developed in accordance with standard survey design principles appropriate for collecting data concerning subjective experience and was pilot tested by two nurse practitioners.
Factor analysis	

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Untitled (Quinlan & Robinson 2010)
Other development and testing methods	
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Quinlan E, Robertson S. Mutual understanding in multi-disciplinary primary health care teams. J Interprof Care 2010;24(4):565-578.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	PubMed abstract
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	TFP Questionnaire
Authors (date)	Rebollar et al (2010)
Purpose	To identify and evaluate factors associated with teamwork failure.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	6
Setting	Non-Health Care or Unspecified
Target respondent	Employees, Managers
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	No adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=1)	4
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=1)	2
Evolving mental models of roles (n=1)	5
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=0)	
Respectful interaction (n=0)	
Heedful inter-relating (n=2)	03, 06
Commitment (n=0)	
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=0)	
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=0)	
Conflict resolution (n=0)	
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=0)	
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency: found that items formed as single-dimension variable with a high internal consistency with Cronbach's α =0.804.
Validity	
Factor analysis	

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	TFP Questionnaire
Other development and testing methods	Logistic regression
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Rebollar R, Lidon I, Cano JL, Gimeno F, Qvist P. A tool for preventing teamwork failure: the TFP Questionnaire. Int J Eng Educ 2010;26(4): 784-794.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	N/A
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Simulation Team Assessment Tool (STAT)
Authors (date)	Reid et al (2012)
Purpose	To assess a team's ability to address key components associated with successful pediatric resuscitation during a simulation.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Observational Checklist (Simulation)
Total number of items	26
Setting	Health Care: Inpatient
Target respondent	Health Care Providers (Unspecified)
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	No adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=0)	
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=0)	
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=0)	
Respectful interaction (n=2)	01, 25
Heedful inter-relating (n=2)	19, 20
Commitment (n=0)	
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=4)	08, 22, 23, 26
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=1)	21
Conflict resolution (n=1)	9
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=16)	02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 08, 09, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Inter-rater: intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC) = 0.81 for overall score and range of 0.30 to 0.76 for domain scores.
Validity	Content validity: input from seven experts. Construct validity: assessed expected variation in performance between residents and experts (significant for overall score and three of four domains).

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Simulation Team Assessment Tool (STAT)
Factor analysis	
Other development and testing methods	Items generated from existing instruments; repeated measures of ANOVA.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Reid J, et al. The Simulation Team Assessment Tool (STAT): Development, reliability and validation. Resuscitation 2011;83(7):879-86.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	PubMed abstract
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Team Learning Behaviors Instrument
Authors (date)	Savelsbergh et al (2009)
Purpose	To assess behaviors associated with team learning and their influence on team performance.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	28
Setting	Non-Health Care or Unspecified
Target respondent	Employees, Managers
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	Minor adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=11)	1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 18, 19
Continuous learning (n=20)	9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=0)	
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=0)	
Respectful interaction (n=3)	4, 6, 7
Heedful inter-relating (n=0)	
Commitment (n=0)	
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=3)	15, 16, 17
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=3)	26, 27, 28
Conflict resolution (n=0)	
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=0)	
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency: Cronbach's α for scales range 0.71 to 0.87.
Validity	Face validity: input from 3 experts; Criterion (predictive): Pearson's product-moment between team performance as assessed by team members and their leaders and by supervisors ($r = 0.50$, $n=19$, $p< 0.01$). Construct (convergent/discriminant): satisfactory.

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Team Learning Behaviors Instrument
Factor analysis	Yes - confirmatory; principal component analysis using oblique rotation
Other development and testing methods	Items generated from definitions, literature, and instruments; correlations; linear regressions.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Savelsbergh, CMJH, van der Heijden BIJM,, et al. The development and empirical validation of a multidimensional measurement instrument for team learning behaviors. Small Group Res 2009;40(5):578-607.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	N/A
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Untitled (Schippers et al 2007)
Authors (date)	Schippers et al (2007)
Purpose	To measure aspects of reflexivity in non-healthcare teams, with a focus on team capacity for reflection.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	33
Setting	Non-Health Care or Unspecified
Target respondent	Employees, Managers
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	No adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=8)	EVAL 01, EVAL 05, EVAL 10, EVAL 11, EVAL 12, EVAL 15, EVAL 16, EVAL 19
Continuous learning (n=11)	EVAL 02, EVAL 06, EVAL 08, EVAL 14, EVAL 17, EVAL 18, EVAL 19, FEED 02, FEED 03, FEED 04, FEED 05
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=7)	ADAP 03, ADAP 04, ADAP 05, DISC 01, DISC 04, EVAL 07, EVAL 13
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=1)	ADAP 02
Respectful interaction (n=0)	
Heedful inter-relating (n=1)	FEED 01
Commitment (n=0)	
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=5)	DISC 02, DISC 03, EVAL 03, EVAL 04, EVAL 09
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=2)	ADAP 01, EVAL 03
Conflict resolution (n=1)	EVAL 04
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=0)	
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency: Cronbach's α range 0.68 to 0.91. Inter-rater: intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC) for team-level variables range 0.17 to 0.35.
Validity	Construct (convergent, discriminant): composite reliabilities were 0.90, 0.76 and 0.86 for the scales.

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Untitled (Schippers et al 2007)
Factor analysis	Yes - exploratory (oblique factor solution) and confirmatory;
Other development and testing methods	Items generated from literature and interviews; revised based on experts.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Schippers MC, Den Hartog DN, Koopman PL. Reflexivity in teams: A measure and correlates. Appl Psychol 2007;56(2):189-211.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	N/A
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Teamwork Survey (TWS)
Authors (date)	Senior & Swailes (2007)
Purpose	To assess levels of teamwork in management teams.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	49
Setting	Non-Health Care or Unspecified
Target respondent	Employees, Managers
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	Minor adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=0)	
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=9)	11, 15, 32, 39, 40, 43, 45, 46, 49
Evolving mental models of roles (n=3)	47, 48, 49
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=1)	01,
Respectful interaction (n=12)	02, 03, 04, 05, 07, 08, 09, 13, 18, 22, 26, 42
Heedful inter-relating (n=4)	06, 12, 16, 17
Commitment (n=4)	10, 20, 21, 44
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=2)	14, 23
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=0)	
Conflict resolution (n=1)	19
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=13)	24, 28, 29, 30, 21, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 41
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency: Cronbach's α for final scales range 0.76 to 0.90.
Validity	Content: previous study; Construct (convergent): comparison with another instrument; Criterion and discriminant: assess correlations between scales range 0.45 to 0.81 ($p<0.01$), and confirm non-significant correlations between scales and variables.

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Teamwork Survey (TWS)
Factor analysis	Yes - exploratory
Other development and testing methods	Items generated from interviews; inter-scale correlations.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Senior B, Swailes S. Inside management teams: Developing a teamwork survey instrument. Br J Manage 2007;18(2):138-153.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	N/A
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Safety Attitudes Questionnaire (SAQ)
Authors (date)	Sexton et al (2006)
Purpose	To measure individual staff members' perceptions of the safety climate in their primary care practice.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	27
Setting	Health Care: Outpatient - Primary Care
Target respondent	AHPs, Health Care Administrators, Health Care Trainees and Students, Pharmacists, Physicians, RNs
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	Minor adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=2)	19, 20
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=2)	18, 22
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=4)	02, 07, 17, 23
Respectful interaction (n=2)	01, 09
Heedful inter-relating (n=4)	03, 04, 13, 14
Commitment (n=1)	8
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=8)	02, 07, 10, 11, 12, 17, 20, 23
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=0)	
Conflict resolution (n=1)	5
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=4)	24, 25, 26, 27
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency: composite scale reliability assessed via Raykov's pcoefficient was 0.90.
Validity	

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Safety Attitudes Questionnaire (SAQ)
Factor analysis	Yes - confirmatory; exploratory in previous studies
Other development and testing methods	Construct validity explored in previous study.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Sexton J, et al. The Safety Attitudes Questionnaire: psychometric properties, benchmarking data, and emerging research. BMC Health Serv Res 2006;6(1):44.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	PubMed abstract
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Program of All-Inclusive Care for the Elderly (PACE) Survey
Authors (date)	Temkin-Greener et al (2004)
Purpose	To assess interdisciplinary team performance and perceived effectiveness in long-term care settings.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	49
Setting	Health Care: Inpatient
Target respondent	AHPs, Physicians, RNs, Social Service Providers
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	Minor adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=2)	D01, D16
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=10)	A07, B02, B04, C01, C11, C13, D02, D06, D11, D13
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=5)	C02, C03, C05, C06, C08
Respectful interaction (n=3)	C07, D14, D16
Heedful inter-relating (n=5)	C04, C10, C14, D04, D14
Commitment (n=5)	B01, B03, B06, B09, C15
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=11)	B05, B07, B08, C02, C03, C04, C06, C08, C09,C12, C14
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=1)	D08
Conflict resolution (n=6)	D03, D05, D09, D10, D12, D15
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=11)	A01, A02, A03, A04, A05, A06, A07, A08, A09, D05, D10
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency: Cronbach's α range 0.73 to 0.91 for all domains and respondent groups.
Validity	Face and content validity: input from 12 experts then pilot tested; Construct validity: regression analysis showed leadership, communication, coordination, and conflict management positive ($p < 0.001$) predictors of team cohesion & effectiveness.

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Program of All-Inclusive Care for the Elderly (PACE) Survey
Factor analysis	
Other development and testing methods	Instrument adapted from existing instrument.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Temkin-Greener H, et al. Measuring interdisciplinary team performance in a long-term care setting. Med Care 2004;42(5):472-481.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	PubMed abstract
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Measures of Trust Scale
Authors (date)	Tseng & Ku (2011) Instrument 1
Purpose	To identify and evaluate the relationship between the level of trust, performance, satisfaction, and teamwork development progressions among online virtual teams.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	9
Setting	Non-Health Care or Unspecified
Target respondent	Non-Health Care Students
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	No adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=0)	
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=0)	
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=5)	1, 2, 5, 6, 9
Respectful interaction (n=2)	4, 7
Heedful inter-relating (n=0)	
Commitment (n=0)	
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=0)	
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=0)	
Conflict resolution (n=0)	
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=1)	3
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency: Cronbach's α = 0.92.
Validity	

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Measures of Trust Scale
Factor analysis	
Other development and testing methods	Adapted from existing scale.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Tseng H, Ku HY. The relationships between trust, performance, satisfaction, and development regressions among virtual teams. Quart Rev Distance Educ 2011;12(2):81-94.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	Instrument link
Link to articles citing instrument	N/A

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Teamwork Activities and Behavior Scale
Authors (date)	Tseng & Ku (2011) Instrument 2
Purpose	To identify and evaluate teamwork development progressions among online virtual teams.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	24
Setting	Non-Health Care or Unspecified
Target respondent	Non-Health Care Students
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	No adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=0)	
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=8)	FO 02, FO 05, NO 01, NO 02, PE 01, ST 02, ST 03, ST 05
Evolving mental models of roles (n=1)	FO 03
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=1)	FO 01
Respectful interaction (n=3)	NO 04, PE 02, PE 03
Heedful inter-relating (n=1)	ST 01
Commitment (n=2)	FO 06, PE 05
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=3)	FO 04, NO 03, ST 06
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=0)	
Conflict resolution (n=4)	NO 05, NO 06, PE 04, ST 04
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=0)	
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency; The Cronbach's α for four of the developmental stages were 0.79 (forming), 0.81 (storming), 0.82 (norming), and 0.89 (performing), respectively.
Validity	

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Teamwork Activities and Behavior Scale
Factor analysis	
Other development and testing methods	Bivariate correlations.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Tseng H, Ku HY. The relationships between trust, performance, satisfaction, and development regressions among virtual teams. Quart Rev Distance Educ 2011;12(2):81-94.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	Instrument link
Link to articles citing instrument	N/A

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Healthcare Team Vitality Instrument (HTVI)
Authors (date)	Upenieks et al (2009)
Purpose	To assess the team vitality of nurses as well as other licensed and unlicensed personnel working as part of health care teams in inpatient hospital units.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	10
Setting	Health Care: Unspecified
Target respondent	Health Care Providers (Unspecified), NPs, RNs
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	Major adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=1)	8
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=0)	
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=2)	05, 06
Respectful interaction (n=3)	03, 04, 08
Heedful inter-relating (n=0)	
Commitment (n=0)	
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=4)	02, 03, 07, 09
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=0)	
Conflict resolution (n=0)	
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=0)	
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	
Validity	Construct (convergent): moderate to strong correlation (range 0.52 - 0.72) between 10 (of the 20) original items in the instrument and one of two other existing instruments.

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Healthcare Team Vitality Instrument (HTVI)
Factor analysis	Yes - exploratory and confirmatory; principal factor analysis.
Other development and testing methods	Items generated from existing instrument; revised by cognitive interviews.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Upenieks VV, et al. Healthcare Team Vitality Instrument (HTVI): developing a tool assessing healthcare team functioning. J Adv Nurs 2010;66(1):168-176.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	PubMed abstract
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Nurse-Physician Collaboration Scale (NPCS)
Authors (date)	Ushiro (2009)
Purpose	To assess the relationship between collaboration and quality of hospital care, and to analyze factors that promote collaboration.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	25
Setting	Health Care: Inpatient
Target respondent	Physicians, RNs
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	Major adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=0)	
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=4)	JOI 11, JOI 14, SHA 01, SHA 03
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=0)	
Respectful interaction (n=5)	COO 05, JOI 02, JOI 07, JOI 09, JOI 10
Heedful inter-relating (n=5)	COO 03, COO 04, COO 06, JOI 08, JOI 12
Commitment (n=0)	
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=11)	COO 01, COO 02, JOI 01, JOI 03, JOI 04, JOI 05, JOI 06, JOI 12, JOI 13, JOI 15, SHA 02
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=0)	
Conflict resolution (n=2)	JOI 01, JOI 02
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=0)	
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Test-retest: r values all > 0.70. Internal consistency: Cronbach's α > 0.80.
Validity	Criterion (concurrent): significant negative correlations between responses and another instrument ($p < 0.01$). Construct (convergent): factor analysis and significant positive correlations with results of another instrument ($p < 0.01$).

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Nurse-Physician Collaboration Scale (NPCS)
Factor analysis	Yes - exploratory (principal factor method with promax rotation) and confirmatory.
Other development and testing methods	Items generated from literature, observation, interviews.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Ushiro R. Nurse–Physician Collaboration Scale: development and psychometric testing. J Adv Nurs 2009;65(7):1497-1508.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	PubMed abstract
Link to articles citing instrument	Link to articles citing instrument

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Leiden Operating Theatre and Intensive Care Safety (LOTICS) Scale
Authors (date)	Van Beuzekom et al (2007)
Purpose	To measure system factors contributing to adverse events in the operating theatre and intensive care unit, and identify specific areas of concern by comparing staff perceptions of system factors across units and medical disciplines.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	48
Setting	Health Care: Inpatient
Target respondent	Surgeons and Other Surgical Staff
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	Major adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=0)	
Continuous learning (n=0)	
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=4)	PRO 01, PRO 03, PRO 04, PRO 05
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=1)	INS 03
Respectful interaction (n=0)	
Heedful inter-relating (n=5)	SIT 01, SIT 02, SIT 03, TEA 03, TEA 04
Commitment (n=1)	TEA 01
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=8)	COM 01, COM 02, COM 03, COM 04, INS 01, INS 02, SIT 04, TRA 02
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=1)	TEA 02
Conflict resolution (n=0)	
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=5)	PLA 01, PLA 02, PLA 03, TRA 01, TRA 04
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency: Cronbach's α range = 0.75 to 0.88.
Validity	Construct validity:; Criterion: included work-related safety goals as a criterion measure

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Leiden Operating Theatre and Intensive Care Safety (LOTICS) Scale
Factor analysis	Yes - unspecified
Other development and testing methods	Bivariate correlations; one-way ANOVA.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Van Beuzekom M, Akerboom SP, Boer F. Assessing system failures in operating rooms and intensive care units. Qual Saf Health Care 2007; 16(1):45-50.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	PubMed abstract
Link to articles citing instrument	N/A

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Team Diagnostic Survey (TDS)
Authors (date)	Wageman et al (2005)
Purpose	To identify and assess the strengths and weaknesses of work teams, and describe the relationship between team behavior and team performance.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	82
Setting	Non-Health Care or Unspecified
Target respondent	Unspecified
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	Minor adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=2)	32, 59
Continuous learning (n=8)	42, 43, 44, 52, 62, 63, 75, 77
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=16)	06, 09, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 25, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 60, 65
Evolving mental models of roles (n=5)	01, 02, 03, 04, 05
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=1)	8
Respectful interaction (n=5)	37, 38, 54, 61, 76
Heedful inter-relating (n=7)	06, 07, 26, 35, 57, 59, 62
Commitment (n=12)	13, 14, 27, 5, 56, 66, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=6)	7, 32, 39, 40, 41, 54
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=6)	15, 28, 29, 42, 58, 76
Conflict resolution (n=4)	53, 64, 67, 68
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=6)	36, 37, 38, 47, 50, 51
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	Internal consistency: enabling conditions Cronbach's α range 0.31 to 0.81 (individ. level) and 0.64 to 0.94 (team), for coaching measures 0.43 to 0.92 (individ.), 0.75 to 0.98 (team), criterion measures 0.66 to 0.84 (individ.) and 0.89 to 0.93 (team).
Validity	Construct (discriminant): intraclass correlations range 0.24 to 0.63, correlations among enabling conditions range 0.19 to 0.59.

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Team Diagnostic Survey (TDS)
Factor analysis	
Other development and testing methods	Items generated from existing instruments and literature; intraclass correlation to determine if can aggregate at group level.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Wageman RJ, Hackman R, Lehman E. Team Diagnostic Survey: Development of an instrument. J Appl Behav Sci 2005;41(4):373-398.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	Instrument link
Link to articles citing instrument	N/A

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Untitled (Wauben et al 2011)
Authors (date)	Wauben et al (2011)
Purpose	To assess surgical team members' differences in perception of non-technical skills.
Instrument Characteristics	
Type of instrument	Survey
Total number of items	62
Setting	Health Care: Inpatient
Target respondent	APRNs, Health Care Trainees and Students, Surgeons and Other Surgical Staff
Degree of adaptation needed for primary care	Major adaptation required
Mediator Constructs (# of items)	***Specific items***
Cognitive Domain	
Sense-making (n=1)	27
Continuous learning (n=4)	08, 09, 32, 34
Shared explicit goals and accountability (n=6)	17, 18, 19, 29, 42, 55
Evolving mental models of roles (n=0)	
Affective/Relational Domain	
Trust (n=6)	10, 13, 14, 24, 26, 34
Respectful interaction (n=8)	06, 07, 15, 16, 18, 39, 40, 60
Heedful inter-relating (n=6)	26, 35, 36, 39, 40, 61
Commitment (n=8)	46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53
Behavioral Domain	
Communication (n=23)	02, 03, 04, 05, 08, 09, 10, 11, 12, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 37, 38, 41
Adaptable to context and needs, improvisation (n=3)	54, 58, 59
Conflict resolution (n=0)	
Leadership Domain	
Leadership (n=8)	11, 12, 56, 57, 58, 59, 62, 63
Psychometrics, Development and Testing	
Reliability	
Validity	

INSTRUMENT TITLE:	Untitled (Wauben et al 2011)
Factor analysis	
Other development and testing methods	Items generated from existing rating systems; Mann-Whitney U-test, Bonferroni adjustment was applied for multiple comparisons.
Abstracts and Citation	
Instrument citation	Wauben LS, et al. Discrepant perceptions of communication, teamwork and situation awareness among surgical team members. Int J Qual Health Care 2011;23(2):159-166.
PubMed abstract or instrument link	PubMed abstract
Link to articles citing instrument	N/A