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Even with the increased emphasis on the use of student teams in academia there is little-to-no research that makes use of instruments that show evidence of reliability and validity to quantify:

- how successful the teaming experience actually is for participating students;
- the impact of team training methods on the teaming experience;
- what team formation strategies best promote course learning objectives; and
- the types of intervention strategies that will improve overall team functionality.

**Developing a theoretical construct**

**Interdependency (9-items)**
I feel that everyone on the team worked together to complete our assignments.

**Potency (5-items)**
This team helped me realize that being able to work on a team is an important component to individual success.

**Goal-Setting (5-items)**
My team had clearly articulated long term goals for course assignments.

**Learning (5-items)**
From a learning standpoint, being a member of this team was very beneficial.

**Team Effectiveness Scale** - The scale is a 23-item measure of a student’s perception of his/her team’s functioning. The scale is based on theory and research (Campion, Medsker, & Higgs, 1993; Sundstrom, McIntyre, Halfhill, & Richards, 2000), and consists of four subscales: interdependency, learning, potency, and goal-setting. Investigations of the scale’s psychometric properties have shown that the instrument demonstrates evidence of reliability and validity. Based on student data from the Spring 2004 semester, internal reliability (i.e., Cronbach’s alpha) estimates of the overall and subscales exceed the desired level of .90 (Nunnally, 1978).

**Peer Evaluation** - The peer evaluation scale is a six-item measure of a student’s contribution to the team. The items correspond to the domains (i.e., Interdependency, Potency, and Goal-setting) comprised in the team scale. Investigations conducted over the past semester have indicated that the reliability of the scale exceeds the recommended criteria of .90 (Nunnally, 1978).

**Web-based implementation**