

1
2
3 **Development and psychometric evaluation of a new team effectiveness scale for all types**
4
5 **of community adult mental health teams: A mixed methods approach**
6
7
8
9

10 **Abstract**

11
12 Defining ‘effectiveness’ in the context of community mental health teams (CMHTs) has
13 become increasingly difficult under the current pattern of provision required in National
14 Health Service (NHS) mental health services in England. The aim of this study was to
15 establish the characteristics of multi-professional team working (MPTW) effectiveness in
16 adult CMHTs in order to develop a new measure of CMHT effectiveness. The study was
17 conducted between May and November 2010 and comprised two stages. Stage 1 used a
18 formative evaluative approach based on the Productivity Measurement and Enhancement
19 System to develop the scale with multiple stakeholder groups over a series of qualitative
20 workshops held in various locations across England. Stage 2 analysed responses from a cross-
21 sectional survey of 1500 members in 135 CMHTs from 11 Mental Health Trusts in England
22 to determine the scale’s psychometric properties. Based on an analysis of its structural
23 validity and reliability, the resultant 20-item scale demonstrated good psychometric
24 properties and captured one overall latent factor of CMHT effectiveness comprising seven
25 dimensions: improved service user well-being, creative problem solving, continuous care,
26 inter-team working, respect between professionals, **engagement with** carers, and therapeutic
27 relationships with service users. The scale will be of significant value to CMHTs and
28 healthcare commissioners both nationally and internationally for monitoring, evaluating and
29 improving team functioning in practice.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53
54
55 **Key words:** Community mental health care, teamwork, team effectiveness, Productivity
56 Measurement and Enhancement System, scale development.
57
58
59
60

What is known about this topic?

- Multi-professional team working (MPTW) in community mental healthcare is increasingly prevalent but highly challenging.
- Team types and functions of CMHTs in England have changed, rendering existing measures of CMHT effectiveness invalid.
- Definition and measurement of CMHT effectiveness needs to be representative of the unique emerging context and multiple stakeholder groups.

What this paper adds:

- Stakeholders agreed that CMHT effectiveness comprised seven dimensions, which are captured on a 20-item scale.
- These dimensions are: improved service user well-being, creative problem solving, continuous care, inter-team working, respect between professionals, engagement with carers, and therapeutic relationships with service users.
- The measure has proved to be psychometrically sound and can be used to evaluate and improve CMHT functioning nationally and internationally, and across a range of settings.

Introduction

Multi-professional team working (MPTW) in healthcare is characterised by close interdependent collaboration of health care professionals from different occupational groups to deliver an integrated care package (Jansen & Glasby, 2008). In a continuous quest to improve both the quality and integration of care (El Ansari, 2011), along with increased requirements for interdependence, skill specialisation and medical knowledge, the use of multi-professional teams in health services continues to grow (Nembhard & Edmondson, 2006). MPTW has a long history in English mental health care and has become even more pronounced in recent years, following publication of the UK Government's National Service Framework for Mental Health (NSF-MH) in 1999 and the Mental Health Policy Implementation Guide (MH-PIG) in 2001. Together these reports established that the bulk of National Health Service (NHS) mental health service provision takes the form of a community based service offered by a family of multi-professional teams. More recent changes in service configuration have led to some amalgamations and changes of team function. The range of community mental health team (CMHT) types and their core functions are summarised in Table 1.

Insert table 1 here

Nevertheless, regardless of team type and function, CMHTs face several distinct challenges in relation to MPTW. These include the generally complex environment in which they work (e.g., diverse and challenging service user needs, increased need for service user and carer involvement, relatively high caseloads and multiple demands from external constituents); the competing pressures and priorities they face (e.g., chronic lack of resources, competing interests around prioritising needs; Onyett, 2003); as well as the management of

1
2
3 team processes which are typically more difficult in diverse multi-professional CMHTs (e.g.,
4
5 Brown *et al.*, 2000; Dickinson *et al.*, 2007; Richards & Rees, 1998; Rees *et al.*, 2004).
6
7 Collectively, these characteristics mean that ‘effectiveness’ in the context of community
8
9 mental healthcare becomes multifaceted, difficult to define and subject to the diverse, and
10
11 often competing requirements of the stakeholders involved (El Ansari, 2003). Previous
12
13 measures of CMHT effectiveness include the Community Mental Health Team Effectiveness
14
15 questionnaire (CMHTEQ; Richards & Rees, 1998; Rees *et al.*, 2001), which covers 27
16
17 effectiveness criteria capturing three dimensions; meeting external requirements, internal
18
19 team processes, and evidence and feedback. While the CMHTEQ has provided service
20
21 managers with a useful means of monitoring team performance, its development focused
22
23 solely on generic CMHTs, and it is therefore less reflective of the current service
24
25 configuration in the NHS. Thus, there is a pressing need for a more comprehensive and
26
27 psychometrically sound measure of CMHT effectiveness that is representative of the unique
28
29 context, captures various types and functions of all teams, and is sensitive to the views of
30
31 multiple stakeholders (Lester & Glasby, 2012).
32
33
34
35

36
37 In this paper, we describe the development and psychometric testing of a
38
39 questionnaire scale that holistically captures the effectiveness of MPTW in CMHTs from the
40
41 perspectives of multiple stakeholders (i.e. service providers, users and carers). This scale was
42
43 developed using principles from the Productivity Measurement and Enhancement System
44
45 (ProMES) methodology. ProMES is based upon the development of effectiveness criteria
46
47 initially established in group discussions that involve all stakeholders with an interest in team
48
49 functioning. Variables derived from these criteria are then psychologically scaled to form a
50
51 common effectiveness measure that can subsequently be used to compare, monitor and
52
53 improve performance, and provide feedback. A detailed review of the theoretical background,
54
55 mechanics and research evidence related to ProMES are presented elsewhere (see Pritchard,
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1990; Pritchard *et al.*, 2008). As a generic approach to team working, ProMES has enjoyed
4
5 wide application as it enables the development of context specific measures that capture
6
7 multiple stakeholder perspectives. Thus, not only is it an approach capable of providing
8
9 insights into the MPTW of CMHTs, but in the course of doing so, it generates a new team
10
11 effectiveness scale.
12

13
14 Overall, the current study had two specific objectives. The first objective was to apply
15
16 the ProMES methodology to the development of a team effectiveness scale in the context of
17
18 community mental health care. The second objective was to assess the psychometric
19
20 properties of the new CMHT effectiveness scale in terms of its structural validity and
21
22 reliability.
23

24 25 26 27 **Methods** 28

29
30 This mixed-method study comprised two stages, detailed in turn below. Qualitative
31
32 and quantitative data for the study were collected between May and November 2010, and
33
34 both stages of the study (see below) were approved by the NHS Black Country Research
35
36 Ethics Committee (Ref. 09/H1202/118).
37

38 **Stage 1: Qualitative Scale Development** 39

40
41 **Design.** Stage 1 (scale development) was a three-phase qualitative study based on a
42
43 formative evaluative approach that employed an iterative process with various stakeholder
44
45 constituencies in order to develop a quantitative measure of CMHT effectiveness.
46

47
48 **Sample.** Trusts volunteered for inclusion in the study based on information submitted
49
50 to them on behalf of the research team by the Mental Health Research Network (MHRN),
51
52 part of England's National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). Fourteen English mental
53
54 health service provider Trusts expressed interest in taking part, of which 12 agreed to
55
56 participate. One subsequently withdrew its agreement before the study commenced, leaving
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 11 Trusts participating. Trusts were selected to represent a good cross-section nationally by
4
5 region, urban/rural setting, population demographics and performance. They covered the
6
7 southern part of North West England, East of England (predominantly rural but includes
8
9 major urban centres), East and West Midlands (includes three major cities), South West
10
11 England (includes major urban centres), South of England (south of London, includes mid-
12
13 sized urban centres), and London. Participating Trusts provided the research team with
14
15 contacts in their Research and Development (R&D) departments to negotiate access. Based
16
17 on strategic sampling to ensure the sufficient representation of all stakeholder groups,
18
19 individuals (N = 157) from the 11 Mental Health Trusts participated in 10 workshops to
20
21 develop an MPTW effectiveness measure in CMHTs. The sample comprised service users
22
23 and carers, and providers from all major professional groups (social work, psychiatry,
24
25 psychology, occupational therapy and nursing, administrators and unqualified support
26
27 workers) representing all types of CMHTs outlined in table 1.
28
29
30
31

32 **Procedure.** The 10 workshops were conducted as three phases. Prior to each
33
34 workshop phase, all participants were required to read an information sheet and sign a
35
36 consent form in order to provide their informed consent to take part. Table 2 provides the
37
38 details of the workshops' membership as well as tasks that were undertaken in each.
39
40 Following ProMES methodology, Phase 1 workshops established what the outcomes of
41
42 effective CMHTs are from consensus drawn out of two large workshops convened and
43
44 facilitated to explore such outcomes. Phase 2 workshops comprised structured discussions
45
46 that elicited participants' ideas about each of the indicators of effectiveness derived from
47
48 Phase 1, in terms of how participants would know whether or not the outcomes were
49
50 achieved, and how these outcomes could be measured using questionnaire items. In Phase 3,
51
52 participants examined the suitability and wording of the emerging questionnaire items to
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 ensure that questions were representative of their respective theme and appropriately
4
5 understood. Items were then amended accordingly by the research team.
6
7

8 -----
9
10 Insert table 2 here
11
12 -----
13

14 **Analysis.** Employing grounded theory as an inductive paradigm (Glaser & Strauss,
15
16 1967), data analysis and extraction of major themes or ‘objectives’ from the Phase 1
17
18 workshops were undertaken via thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Two members of
19
20 the research team immersed themselves in the qualitative data and discussed the content at
21
22 length. Then, initial codes were generated by highlighting appropriate text, before searching
23
24 for overall themes in the data. At this stage, seven major themes emerged and were given
25
26 names. The research team collectively reviewed these themes, revisiting the data to check
27
28 that nothing was missed.
29
30

31
32 Subsequently, three validity checks were undertaken. Firstly, following each Phase 1
33
34 workshop participants received a workshop summary report structured around the seven
35
36 derived themes. Participants were invited to comment on and correct anything felt to be
37
38 missing or not sufficiently captured. The research team received positive responses from all
39
40 stakeholder groups, and subsequent amendments to the themes were not deemed necessary.
41
42 Secondly, members of the research team presented the seven themes at a service user and
43
44 carer event held shortly afterwards, and participants collectively expressed their satisfaction
45
46 with the themes. Finally, at the beginning of each Phase 2 workshop, participants were
47
48 informed of the Phase 1 themes and were invited to comment on their face validity and
49
50 completeness. No major concerns were raised, leaving the research team confident that the
51
52 Phase 1 themes accurately represented all participating stakeholders’ perspectives.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 For phases 2 and 3, data analysis was largely conducted by the participants during the
4 workshops. The Phase 2 workshops generated 10 to 15 potential questionnaire items for each
5 of the themes identified in Phase 1. This resulted in a pool of 80 items, which was initially
6 reduced by the research team by removing unclear, overlapping and redundant items. Two
7 large full-day externally facilitated Phase 3 workshops were then conducted with service
8 providers, users and carers to enable further refining and cognitive testing of the items, with a
9 view to identifying the most suitable items for inclusion in the new scale.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 The resultant CMHT effectiveness scale comprised 20 items capturing the seven
19 themes. Twelve of the items were positively worded and eight were negatively worded, and
20 team members were asked to respond on a five-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree*; 5 =
21 *strongly agree*). Self-reported team member responses were then aggregated to the team level
22 of analysis to capture overall CMHT effectiveness.
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 **Stage 2: Quantitative Scale Evaluation**

30 **Design.** Stage 2 (scale evaluation) incorporated the newly derived CMHT
31 effectiveness scale in a quantitative questionnaire to team members of CMHTs in order to
32 assess its psychometric properties.
33
34
35
36
37

38 **Sample.** Stage 2 comprised a questionnaire of team members in the 11 Trusts
39 recruited in Stage 1. These Trusts were representative of all mental health trusts nationally
40 regarding the extent of their self-reported team working. According to the 2009 NHS
41 National Staff Survey (Care Quality Commission, 2010), which was the closest in time to
42 participation in the current study, 41% of staff in the participating Trusts reported working in
43 well-structured teams; the same percentage of staff in Trusts not participating in the study.
44 Teams were recruited with the help of local MHRN Clinical Studies Officers (CSOs). All
45 teams within each Trust were based in a single locality (usually coterminous with a primary
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

care Trust and/or local authority). We aimed to survey 10-15 teams per Trust, so that a cross-section of the different types of CMHT from each Trust could be included.

Procedure. Teams were invited to participate by their respective CSO directly. CSOs forwarded details of CMHT members to the research team, who then invited them by email to complete an online questionnaire. Before completing the questionnaire, team members were asked to read a cover sheet which provided information about the study and participation, and clarified that by completing and returning the questionnaire, respondents were providing their implicit informed consent to participate. In a few cases where information technology provision was not considered appropriate, CMHT members were invited to complete a paper-based questionnaire by post. Staff who were members of multiple teams could only respond to the survey once. In order to motivate Trusts' inclusion in the study, the research team offered to provide each participating team with a benchmarked feedback report detailing how their team compared with the wider sample on each dimension of the new CMHT effectiveness scale, along with more general team effectiveness dimensions applicable to all types of healthcare teams captured by the Aston Team Performance Inventory (ATPI; West *et al.*, 2005). The ATPI is a comprehensive diagnostic tool of team performance in healthcare comprising 100 items that capture distinct aspects of team inputs (e.g., task design, skills), team processes (e.g., leadership, conflict), and team outputs (e.g., team member satisfaction, innovation). The team-specific feedback reports provided by the research team suggested areas of strength and possible improvement for the participating teams. However, data from the ATPI items was not incorporated into the quantitative analysis presented in this paper.

Analysis. The reliability of the new scale was assessed in terms of Cronbach's alpha, intraclass correlations [ICC(2)] for inter-rater reliability, and inter-rater agreement mean [$r_{WG(j)}$] at the team level. Regarding structural validity, following standard practice for scale development (Hinkin, 1995), the sample (N = 1500) was initially split at random into two

1
2
3 halves. The first half was employed for exploratory factor analysis (EFA); the second half for
4
5 confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and reliability testing. As a first step, EFA on the 20
6
7 items was conducted using **IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 19 (2010)**, and
8
9 undertaken using principal axis factoring and a direct oblimin (oblique) rotation – considered
10
11 the most appropriate methods for organisational data where factors could be correlated
12
13 (Conway & Huffcutt, 2003). The EFA suggested four competing models. Then, CFA was
14
15 conducted in Mplus (version 6) to test the fit indices for each of the four competing models.
16
17 Generally, the standardised root mean residual (SRMR) should ideally be < 0.1 **for adequate**
18
19 **fit or < .05 for good fit**, the comparative fit index (CFI) > 0.90, the Tucker-Lewis index (TLI)
20
21 > 0.90, and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) < 0.08 (Hu & Bentler,
22
23 1998).
24
25
26

27 **Results**

28 **Stage 1: Qualitative data resulting in provisional measures of CMHT effectiveness**

29
30
31 **Phase 1.** Seven major themes inductively emerged from the analysis of Phase 1
32
33 workshop data (**see table 3**). These themes addressed a range of inter-related aspects relating
34
35 to the focus, relationships, engagement, creativity and attitudes of CMHTs. Themes
36
37 highlighted the need for an emphasis on service user well-being and recovery; the importance
38
39 of therapeutic relationships between staff and service users; the benefits attached to the
40
41 provision of continuous care; the necessity of effective inter-team working; the prerequisite
42
43 of engagement with carers; the value of creative problem solving in terms of developing
44
45 innovative solutions to service user problems; and, respect between the different disciplines
46
47 represented in CMHTs. Table 3 shows the seven major themes along with example
48
49 statements that emerged from the two Phase 1 workshops.
50
51
52

53 -----

54
55
56 Insert table 3 here
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 -----
4
5 **Phase 2.** This phase elicited participants' views of how an observer might detect the
6 presence or absence of the themes identified in Phase 1. There were separate workshops for
7 users and carers in this phase because, during Phase 1, these two stakeholder groups exhibited
8 different and often conflicting views about MPTW in mental health care, which at times
9 hampered an open exchange of views. Table 4 provides an illustration of some of the items
10 arising for each theme.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 -----
19
20 Insert table 4 here
21
22 -----
23
24

25 **Phase 3.** Based on the item pool generated in phase 2, two large full-day externally
26 facilitated workshops identified the 20 most suitable items for possible inclusion in the
27 questionnaire under development. These 20 items were then discussed at a user and carer
28 project advisory group meeting, which confirmed that they were appropriate and relevant for
29 inclusion in the questionnaire, subject to some minor amendments.
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Table 5 depicts the final CMHT effectiveness scale following Stage 1. In order to
37 reduce the probability of acquiescent bias (Hinz *et al.*, 2007), twelve items were positively
38 worded and eight negatively worded. Dimensions had differing numbers of items attached to
39 them, thus weighting them differently in a way that reflected the relative importance attached
40 to each dimension by the Phase 3 workshop participants. Items were also randomly presented
41 in the questionnaire rather than being grouped by dimension.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 -----
51
52 Insert table 5 here
53
54 -----
55

56 **Stage 2: Quantitative findings**

57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Response rates.** In total, 2233 questionnaires were dispatched and 1500 responses
4 were returned from staff contributing to 135 CMHTs from 11 Trusts in different localities
5 across England (120 teams completed the online survey, and 15 completed the postal survey).
6 The overall response rate was 67.2%, and Trust level response rates ranged between 50.4%
7 and 88.8%. The number of responses per Trust ranged between 42 respondents (representing
8 6 teams), to 236 respondents (representing 19 teams). The response rate for teams using
9 postal methods was significantly lower (34.0%) than those completing the survey online
10 (71.8%) (chi-square =154.6, 1 d.f., $p < 0.001$). See table 6 for a breakdown of response rates
11 by team type.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 -----
25 Insert table 6 here
26 -----
27
28

29 **Demographic profile.** Of the 1500 participants, 72.3% were female. About 7.0%
30 were < 30 years of age, 20.9% between 30 and 39, 37.6% between 40 and 49, 29.7% between
31 50 and 59, and 4.8% 60 or older. A total of 82.3% were White British. These characteristics
32 were congruent with the national profile of community-based staff in mental health trusts
33 according to the 2009 NHS National Staff Survey (Care Quality Commission, 2010), where
34 73.8% were female, 80.4% White British and the age profile was also very similar.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Occupational group profile.** The most common occupational group was community
44 psychiatric nurses (CPNs, 32.6% of sample). Administrative/clerical staff (11.4%) and social
45 workers (11.1%) came next, followed by psychiatrists (7.9%), occupational therapists (6.5%),
46 support time recovery workers (STRs, 5.5%), clinical psychologists and other nurses (each
47 5.1%), with 1.2% describing themselves as other medical practitioners, and 13.6% as other
48 occupational groups (which were largely joint roles or slight variations on the above labels).
49 These percentages were broadly similar to those for community based mental health staff in
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the 2009 NHS National Staff Survey (Care Quality Commission, 2010), with some slight
4
5 discrepancies because of the specific make-up of these teams. For example, social workers
6
7 are poorly represented in the NHS National Staff Survey as they are not necessarily employed
8
9 by NHS Trusts.

10
11 **Team participation profile.** The majority (73.9%) of the sample worked in only one
12
13 CMHT, but 17% worked in two teams, 4.8% in three, 2.6% in four, 0.6% in five and 1% in
14
15 more than five teams. Psychiatrists and clinical psychologists were most likely to work across
16
17 more than one team. Mean time spent in post was 7 years, with a mean team tenure of 5
18
19 years.

20
21
22 **Exploratory factor analysis.** The CMHT effectiveness scale (20 items) yielded a
23
24 potential three factor solution. The first factor accounted for 39.4% of the total variance; the
25
26 second a further 6.1%, the third 5.3%, with subsequent factors all explaining $\leq 4.6\%$
27
28 (eigenvalue < 1). This suggested that a single factor might adequately cover the effectiveness
29
30 domain, although a second factor may prove useful too, and possibly even a third (Table 7).
31
32

33
34
35
36 -----

37
38 Insert table 7 here

39
40
41 -----

42
43
44
45 The three factor solution added nothing useful to the two factor solution, as the third
46
47 factor had no high factor loadings, and the first two factors were almost identical to the two
48
49 factor solution. The two factor solution appeared to include the negatively worded items into
50
51 a separate factor (a method-related factor), rather than discriminate content in any way. Thus,
52
53 this offered no advantage over the one factor solution. Within the one factor solution, all
54
55 items had a loading of >0.4 apart from item 9 (*Service users rarely receive care from the*
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *same members of my team*'). This was possibly due to differing perceptions of the item
4 meaning, which could have been perceived by some respondents as a positively worded
5 statement, and by others as a negative one. Hence, four different solutions were tested by
6 CFA: single factor solution containing all items; single factor solution containing all items
7 except item 9; two-factor solution based on the EFA results; and, seven-factor solution based
8 on the original seven domains from the Stage 1 workshops.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 **Confirmatory factor analysis.** Table 8 depicts the fit indices for the four competing
17 models.
18
19

20 -----
21
22 Insert table 8 here
23
24 -----
25
26

27 There was little to choose between the models on the basis of fit. The two-factor
28 model appeared marginally better than the others, but this would not be so theoretically
29 meaningful, as the factors could only really be distinguished as “effectiveness” and
30 “ineffectiveness”, rather than being based on separate domains of effectiveness. The 7-factor
31 solution appeared to fit reasonably, but there were inadmissibly large correlations between
32 the factors and also a complete lack of discriminant validity (as well as parsimony) in the
33 model. Hence, we chose between the two single factor solutions: whilst dropping item 9
34 improved some fit indices, it worsened others, and all 20 items were therefore retained to
35 function as a single effectiveness construct. The reliability of the overall scale was excellent,
36 with Cronbach’s alpha = 0.91 (which was the same even if item 9 was excluded). Due to the
37 task-specific nature of some of the scale items, we repeated the analysis for each of the four
38 team types with sufficient responses (≤ 200 individuals) to enable such analysis. In each
39 instance, a single factor solution seemed to be better than a multiple-factor solution, with a
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

two-factor model representing a split between positive and negative items. The reliability of this single factor was 0.89 - 0.92 in each instance.

Overall, the results from Stage 2 suggested that the seven domains that emerged in Stage 1 are better thought of as components of the 'effectiveness' dimension, rather than separate dimensions in their own right. Further, the inter-rater reliability [ICC(2)] of the CMHT effectiveness scale was 0.57 (considered fair to good), and the inter-rater agreement mean [$r_{WG(J)}$] was 0.99, suggesting that the scale is suitable for use at the group level of analysis.

Discussion

Although the importance of team-based working in the delivery of healthcare is widely acknowledged (Manser, 2009), MPTW poses particular challenges for CMHTs and a reliable measure of CMHT effectiveness in the current context and service configuration of mental healthcare is lacking. Given our overall aim, the major contribution of this paper is the development of a new contextually specific measure of effective MPTW in community mental healthcare.

In relation to the first objective of the study, we applied the ProMES methodology to the development of a context specific scale, the CMHT effectiveness scale that captures multiple stakeholder perspectives, thus enhancing content and face validity. The new measure has two significant advantages over similar existing tools (e.g., Rees *et al.*, 2001; Richards & Rees, 1998). Firstly, its development took place in the era of specialist CMHTs, and it is therefore deemed to be valid across not only traditional generic CMHTs, but also Early Intervention, Assertive Outreach, Substance Misuse, Rehabilitation and Recovery, and Crisis Resolution/Home Treatment teams. This makes it applicable to a wide range of teams providing community mental healthcare, rendering it a highly relevant and powerful tool for

1
2
3 NHS Trusts. In comparing the dimensions of the new CMHT effectiveness scale with the
4
5 previously published CMHTEQ (Richards & Rees, 1998), which focused only on generic
6
7 CMHTs, a number of aspects appear to remain important for effective team working in this
8
9 context. These include the involvement of carers in the team, establishing trust and respect
10
11 between professional groups, and building therapeutic relationships with service users to
12
13 foster recovery and well-being. However, the CMHT effectiveness scale also captures new
14
15 and novel dimensions which are likely to reflect the range of team types examined as well as
16
17 the changing context of community mental healthcare since the CMHTEQ's publication over
18
19 fifteen years ago. These include the importance of providing continuity in the delivery of
20
21 care; the need for creative and flexible problem solving that puts the service user at the heart
22
23 of the team, and significance of effective inter-team working in order to ensure the smooth
24
25 referral and management of service users between different teams.
26
27
28

29
30 The second major advantage was the significant involvement of service users and
31
32 carers in the development process. The ProMES methodology (Pritchard, 1990) was
33
34 successful for the current research because it enabled the positive integration of major (and
35
36 often conflicting) stakeholder perspectives into the development of a comprehensive
37
38 measure. This process contributed considerably to the scale's psychometric robustness, face
39
40 validity and its suitability for the unique function of CMHTs in the current healthcare context
41
42 in England. The ProMES methodology ensured that the dimensions included in the final scale
43
44 captured the unique perspectives of these groups and particularly what they considered the
45
46 most important outcomes of the care process. The finalised measure incorporates three
47
48 dimensions which are highly pertinent to service users and carers - improved service user
49
50 well-being, therapeutic relationships with service users, and **engagement with** carers. The
51
52 new measure should therefore resonate not only with service providers, but also service users
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and carers in CMHTs. This resonance was evident in the reaction of study participants when
4
5 reviewing the final version of the scale.
6

7
8 An additional significant contribution of this paper is the method used for scale
9
10 development. Recognising that stakeholder involvement was crucial to the development of a
11
12 reliable and valid CMHT effectiveness measure, we adapted a well-validated development
13
14 approach, ProMES, to develop a new procedure that was a hybrid of this and other previous
15
16 approaches. The various steps outlined in our methodology demonstrate that it is possible to
17
18 use an adapted ProMES methodology for the purpose of developing measures of
19
20 effectiveness for health and social care teams. More specifically, we conducted a series of
21
22 workshops in three phases using a large number of diverse stakeholder groups. The
23
24 methodology enabled these groups firstly to identify the key dimensions of CMHT
25
26 effectiveness (Phase 1), before describing what these dimensions look like in practice (Phase
27
28 2), and finally refining and weighting items which represented them (Phase 3). The main
29
30 stages of ProMES that we omitted from our approach were defining contingencies, defining
31
32 the feedback system, giving and responding to feedback, and monitoring over time
33
34 (Pritchard, 1990) – steps which should lead to performance improvements if team members
35
36 bought into the CMHT effectiveness dimensions. Although the participating teams in Stage 2
37
38 did receive feedback in the form of a report (benchmarking all teams against one another),
39
40 resource limitations did not allow for more a detailed follow up with the teams. Nevertheless
41
42 we believe this would have been helpful and we have certainly demonstrated that our adapted
43
44 ProMES approach enables the development of effectiveness tools in mental health care, as
45
46 well as in other health and social care contexts.
47
48
49
50

51
52 Regarding our second objective, we assessed the psychometric properties of the newly
53
54 arising CMHT effectiveness scale using quantitative data from 135 teams based in 11 Mental
55
56 Health Trusts in England. Results demonstrated that a 20 item measure capturing a single
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 factor of CMHT effectiveness demonstrated good structural validity based on both EFA and
4
5 CFA. Overall, the new measure provides service providers, users and carers with an
6
7 important and relatively lean conceptual framework in the form of seven dimensions or
8
9 themes which capture what effectiveness constitutes in the context of community mental
10
11 health team performance.
12

13
14 **This CMHT effectiveness scale can be utilised in several ways.** First and foremost, it
15
16 can be used locally by CMHTs to self-assess their own effectiveness and performance. Using
17
18 repeated measures over time, teams can monitor and evaluate their progress, identify
19
20 discrepancies in their processes, and bring about positive change from within the team. The
21
22 measure could also be employed by service users and carers to review the services they
23
24 receive from teams. At the organisation level, the measure will be of interest to audit bodies
25
26 such as the Care Quality Commission to inform the criteria they use to evaluate the adequacy
27
28 of multi-professional team working in community mental healthcare; by commissioners of
29
30 services to monitor the effectiveness of the CMHTs they commission; and by both policy
31
32 makers and the general public to understand what is important in assessing the delivery of
33
34 community mental health care by multi-professional teams. By widely employing the
35
36 measure across NHS Trusts, it would be possible to generate ‘norms’ or national
37
38 ‘benchmarks’ of what adequate team working in CMHTs looks like, against which teams
39
40 could monitor and compare their own functioning. The seven dimensions identified in the
41
42 measure therefore provide important guidance to a range of interested stakeholders at
43
44 different levels.
45
46
47
48

49
50 This study has limitations. Firstly, given that this CMHT measure was developed
51
52 under the new era of specialist mental health teams in England, it is not specific enough to
53
54 indicate particular areas of effectiveness that would only be applicable to one type of team,
55
56 (e.g., Early Intervention for Psychosis). A second limitation concerns the representativeness
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of the sample. As team members (Stage 1) and teams (Stage 2) were drawn from only 11 self-
4 selecting mental health trusts across England, it could be argued that Trusts that chose to
5 participate in the research were better at developing well-structured CMHTs and so were
6 more willing to take part. Such self-selection may have influenced the nature and content of
7 the themes of CMHT effectiveness that emerged via ProMES in Stage 1, as well as the way
8 in which participants responded to the questionnaire in Stage 2. Nevertheless, the new
9 measure demonstrated good psychometric properties and the sample size, both at the team
10 and individual level, was relatively large in comparison to other scale development studies.
11
12 Further, establishing predictive validity is needed to ensure that the teamwork outcomes
13 identified by stakeholders map onto objective teamwork outcomes (e.g., team errors and
14 incidents, team member absenteeism, or service user readmission rates).
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27
28 Future research would also benefit from exploring the antecedents of CMHT
29 effectiveness in a broader Input-Process-Output model of team performance. The new
30 measure could be used to compare different specialist types of CMHTs, to examine which
31 team types score highest on the various effectiveness dimensions and why. Indeed, using an
32 existing team effectiveness framework (the Aston Team Performance Inventory; West *et al.*,
33 2005), later stages of this research project went on to examine which team inputs (e.g. task
34 design, composition, organisational support) and team processes (e.g. leadership, reflexivity,
35 participation) were most important for developing CMHT effectiveness in CMHTs, the
36 findings of which are currently being written up for future publication. Future research might
37 also examine possible item redundancy as a way of determining if the 20 item measure could
38 be shortened at all.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 In summary, the reliable and statistically confirmed scale of CMHT effectiveness
53 presented in this paper will be of significant value to both service providers and
54 commissioners as they work together to identify and finance appropriate services in years to
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 come. Further, the new measure provides a much-needed and unique way of generating
4
5 quantifiable data about the activities, processes and effectiveness of CMHTs which will serve
6
7 to guide decision makers as they plan resources for mental health services nationally and
8
9 internationally.
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
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

References

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research*
7
8 *in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101.
9
10
11
12 Brown, B., Crawford, P., & Darongkamas, J. (2000). Blurred roles and permeable boundaries:
13
14 the experience of multidisciplinary working in community mental health. *Health and*
15
16 *Social Care in the Community*, *8*(6), 425-435.
17
18
19
20 Care Quality Commission. (2010). Staff survey 2009. Retrieved September 24, 2009, from
21
22 <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110718105843/http://www.cqc.org.uk/about>
23
24 [tcqc/howwedoit/engagingwithproviders/nhsstaffsurveys/previous surveys.cfm](http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110718105843/http://www.cqc.org.uk/about)
25
26
27
28 Conway, J. M., & Huffcutt, A. I. (2003). A review and evaluation of exploratory factor
29
30 analysis practices in organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods*, *6*, 147–
31
32 168.
33
34
35
36 Department of Health. (1999). *National service framework for mental health: modern*
37
38 *standards and service models*. London: Department of Health.
39
40
41 Department of Health. (2001). *The mental health policy implementation guide*. London:
42
43 Department of Health.
44
45
46
47 Dickinson, H. E., Peck, E., & Davidson, D. C. (2007). Opportunity seized or missed? A case
48
49 study of leadership and organizational change in the creation of a Care Trust. *Journal of*
50
51 *Interprofessional Care*, *21*, 503–513.
52
53
54
55 El Ansari, W. (2003). Educational Partnerships for Health: Do Stakeholders Perceive Similar
56
57 Outcomes? *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice*, *9*, 136–156.
58
59
60

1
2
3 El Ansari, W. (2011). When meanings blur, do differences matter? Initiatives for improving
4 the quality and integration of care: conceptual matrix or measurement maze? *Journal of*
5 *Integrated Care*, **19**(3), 5–21.
6
7
8

9
10
11 Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for*
12 *Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.
13
14

15
16 Hinkin, T. (1995). A review of scale development practices in the study of organizations.
17 *Journal of Management*, **21**(5), 967–988.
18
19

20
21
22 Hinz, A., Michalski, D., Schwarz, R., & Herzberg, P. Y. (2007). The acquiescence effect in
23 responding to a questionnaire. *GMS Psycho-Social-Medicine*, **4**, 1–9.
24
25

26
27 Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1998). Fit indices in covariance structure modeling: Sensitivity to
28 underparameterization model misspecification. *Psychological Methods*, **3**, 424–453.
29
30

31
32
33 **IBM (2010). *SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 19.0*. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.**
34

35
36 Jansen, L., & Glasby, J. (2008). Collaborative and interdisciplinary health care teams: ready
37 or not? *Journal of Professional Nursing*, **24**(4), 218–27.
38
39

40
41
42 Lester, H., & Glasby, J. (2012). *Mental Health Policy and Practice* (2nd ed.). Hampshire:
43 Palgrave.
44
45

46
47 Manser, T. (2009). Teamwork and patient safety in dynamic domains of healthcare: a review
48 of the literature. *Acta anaesthesiologica Scandinavica*, **53**(2), 143–51.
49
50

51
52
53 Nembhard, I. M., & Edmondson, A. C. (2006). Making it safe: the effects of leader
54 inclusiveness and professional status on psychological safety and improvement efforts in
55 health care teams. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, **27**(7), 941–966.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Onyett, S. (2003). *Teamworking in Mental Health*. Hampshire: Palgrave.
4
5
6 Pritchard, R.D. (1990). *Measuring and improving organizational productivity: A practical*
7
8 *guide*. New York: Praeg.
9
10
11 Pritchard, Robert D., Harrell, M. M., DiazGranados, D., & Guzman, M. J. (2008). The
12
13 productivity measurement and enhancement system: A meta-analysis. *Journal of*
14
15 *Applied Psychology*, **93**(3), 540–567.
16
17
18
19 Rees, A., Stride, C., Shapiro, D., Richards, A., & Borrill, C. (2001). Psychometric properties
20
21 of the Community Mental Health Team effectiveness questionnaire (CMHTEQ).
22
23 *Journal of Mental Health*, **10**(2), 213–222.
24
25
26
27 Rees, G., Huby, G., McDade, L., & McKechnie, L. (2004). Joint working in community
28
29 mental health teams: implementation of an integrated care pathway. *Health and Social*
30
31 *Care in the Community*, **12**(6), 527-536.
32
33
34
35 Richards, A., & Rees, A. (1998). Developing criteria to measure the effectiveness of
36
37 community mental health teams. *Mental Health Care*, **2**(1), 14–17.
38
39
40
41 West, M. A., Alimo-Metcalf, B., Dawson, J. F., El Ansari, W., Glasby, J., & Hardy, G.
42
43 (2012). *Effectiveness of Multi-Professional Team Working (MPTW) in Mental Health*
44
45 *Care*. Final Report.
46
47
48
49 West, M. A., Markiewicz, L., & Dawson, J. F. (2005). *Aston Team Performance Inventory:*
50
51 *Management Set*. London: ASE.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
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
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

Table 1. CMHT typology

Team Type	Team Function
Community Mental Health (or Primary Care Liaison) teams	Serve needs of all mental health service users within their localities
Assertive Outreach teams (AOTs)	Work with 'hard to engage' people living in the community
Crisis Resolution and Home Treatment teams (CRHTs)	Work as an alternative to hospital admission for individuals experiencing acute crises in their mental health
Early Intervention (EI) teams	Work with young adults (14 - 35 years) who are either at risk of or currently experiencing a first episode of psychosis
Older adults (OA) teams	Work with older people (≥ 65 years), many of whom suffer from depression or dementia and may have comorbid physical disabilities and impairments
Substance Misuse (SM) teams	Provide specialist interventions for mental health service users with drug and alcohol misuse
Rehabilitation and Recovery (RR) teams	Provide care co-ordination for service users being resettled from inpatient rehabilitation units into less dependent settings

Source: West *et al.* (2012)

Table 2. Qualitative perspectives on CMHT effectiveness: Three phases of inquiry by stakeholder and location

Phase	Overall Aim	Workshop design	Location	Service providers	Service users	Carers	Details and examples
1	Researchers listen to participants' accounts of working in CMHTs	Two large full-day workshops facilitated by an external facilitator experienced in working with health care professionals. Workshops supported by research team.	Birmingham London	20 20	7 8	5 5	Each workshop had five sessions: <i>'What works for me?'</i> <i>'What we do to make a difference'</i> <i>'How do teams work to support good outcomes for service users?'</i> <i>'What are the challenges to effective team working?'</i>
2	Focus on three or four of the seven themes derived from Phase 1 (subject to time available and size of group)	Six workshops, facilitated by members of the research team. Each workshop began with a summary and discussion of Phase 1 outcomes, followed by two sessions.	Birmingham London Nottingham Birmingham Birmingham Gloucester	6 6 10 - - 6	- - - 8 - -	- - - 9 -	Session 1: One of the seven CMHT themes introduced, participants provided with quotes from Phase 1, then asked: <i>'If (theme name) was happening, how would we know?'</i> <i>'If (theme name) was not happening, what would we see?'</i> Session 2: Small groups (2-5 participants) to repeat session 1 exercise using a different theme.
3	Based on items from phase 2, phase 3 refined a final list of items for the CMHT effectiveness scale	Two large full-day workshops externally facilitated by the same Phase 1 facilitator. Workshops supported by research team.	Birmingham London	10 20	7 3	6 1	Participants worked in small groups, examining wording of items in one of the themes from Table 3. Each group was required to discuss evaluate and, if necessary, discard, refine or reword the proposed questionnaire items. Small groups then rotated to work on a different theme.

Table 3. CMHT effectiveness: Example stakeholder comments by theme (Phase 1)

Theme	Example stakeholder comments
Improved service user well-being	Putting the service user at the centre of the team. Working with people during and beyond recovery to improve longer term outcomes and opportunities. Team makes a positive impact on someone's quality of life.
Therapeutic relationships with service users	Providing a safe environment - compassion. Feel the pain with me; share my journey. Accept me, take me seriously and care about what happens.
Provision of continuous care	Having the same people visit you. Consistent medical advice - no conflicting messages.
Effective inter-team working	Cooperative interdependence between teams. Effective inter-team working over transition periods.
Engagement with carers	Transparency and openness with carers (confidentiality). Carer involvement in decision-making.
Creative problem solving	Positive risk taking - creative solutions. Setting challenging but realistic goals.
Respect between professionals	Shared culture/philosophy, trust, and shared responsibility. Respect and understanding for different professions. Having the right skills, knowledge and resources to hand.

1
2
3 **Table 4. CMHT effectiveness: Key outcomes for each theme (Phase 2)**
4

5	If 'improved service user well-being' is happening, what would we see?
6	Improved self-esteem and quality of life of service user (social functioning, relationships)
7	Service users empowered and supported in making choices to achieve their full potential
8	Observant teams that listen to service users, and help them to rebuild routines and plans
9	Regular meetings involving service users to discuss future support - increased efficiency
10	
11	If 'therapeutic relationships with service users' is happening, what would we see?
12	Time dedicated to listening to service users
13	Treating people holistically, rather than on basis of diagnosis alone
14	Relationships between service providers and service users that are based on support, trust, empathy and truth
15	Increased speed of recovery - clear expectations fewer complaints
16	
17	If 'provision of continuous care' is happening, what would we see?
18	Continuity in care planning, treatment, goal setting and goal achieving at each stage
19	Seamless and creative transition through service with effective clear communication
20	Gradual agreed preparation of service user for discharge
21	Awareness of and adaptability to service user needs to promote independence and recovery of service user
22	
23	If 'effective inter-team working' is happening, what would we see?
24	Collaborative working with other teams and services – administrative efficiency
25	Clarity of roles: everyone is aware of who is accountable/taking ownership
26	Demonstrating good practice leading to reduced risks; Improved well-being of team workers
27	Greater flexibility in roles where people are willing and motivated to go the extra mile
28	
29	If 'engagement with carers' is happening, what would we see?
30	Education about carers' role; Carers being treated as part of the team; Happy/satisfied carers
31	Service user updates - frequent feedback and open communication
32	Reciprocating carers - if providers know where carers are, carers know where providers are
33	Healthy caring - allowing service users freedom to make choices
34	
35	If 'creative problem solving' is happening, what would we see?
36	Learning to see the way through a problem and think outside of the box
37	Seeing service user as a whole person who's care plan is tailored to their needs
38	Recognition/acceptance that not everything is going to work, but there is a willingness to try
39	Reduced/flatter hierarchy which facilitates idea generation and sharing
40	
41	If 'respect between professionals' is happening, what would we see?
42	Mutual respect within hierarchies - healthy interdisciplinary conflict within an open culture
43	Culture of understanding and willingness to learn from/understand each other
44	'Seamless' services: collaborative, transparent, joint working between teams and services
45	Communication, a common understanding/language within the team – shared risk
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	

1
2
3 **Table 5. CMHT effectiveness: Final scale items (Phase 3)**
4
5

6 **Improved service user well-being**

- 7 1. Helping service users improve their sense of well-being is a major goal of my team
8 2. My team helps service users to build positive aspects of their lives
9 3. *My team does not involve service users in developing their own care plans*
10 4. My team encourages service users to take the next step on the path to their recovery
11 5. Taking service users' views into account is important in my team
-

12 **Therapeutic relationships with service users**

- 13 6. *Professional boundaries between service users and staff in my team are poorly defined*
14 7. In my team, relationships with service users are based on openness
15 8. In my team, we listen to service users and work collaboratively with them
-

16 **Provision of continuous care**

- 17 9. *Service users rarely receive care from the same members of my team*
18 10. When necessary, my team contacts other teams and agencies to share information
19 about service users
20 11. To help ensure continuity of care my team is flexible in managing its workload
-

21 **Effective inter-team working**

- 22 12. *My team's referral processes are unclear to many of us*
23 13. *My team does not communicate effectively with other mental health teams in the Trust*
-

24 **Engagement with carers**

- 25 14. *Carers are not seen as very important by my team*
26 15. My team offers information about services to carers.
-

27 **Creative problem solving**

- 28 16. My team acknowledges that one size does not fit all service users
29 17. My team explores new ways of providing service user care
30 18. *Sharing knowledge and experience of good practice is not a feature of my team's work*
-

31 **Respect between professionals**

- 32 19. *There is a lack of mutual respect between the members of my team*
33 20. Regardless of professional background, my team members are willing to learn from
34 one another
-

35 *Note. Negatively worded items are in italics; items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 =*
36 *strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree).*
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 6. Questionnaire responses by type of team (Stage 2)

Type of team	Number of teams	Number of respondents	Response rate (%)
Generic CMHT*	32	366	63.2
Assertive Outreach	18	163	69.7
Early Intervention	22	204	64.4
Crisis Resolution/Home Treatment	11	138	64.5
Rehabilitation & Recovery (R&R)	26	335	74.8
Older adults CMHT	20	230	66.3
Substance Misuse	3	30	55.6
Intensive Support	1	15	86.7
Liaison Psychiatry	1	7	85.7
Assertive Outreach/R&R	1	18	83.3

* Refers to those CMHTs without a specific service user profile or task, also sometimes referred to as 'primary care liaison teams'

Table 7. Factor loadings based on EFA of the CMHT effectiveness scale

Item	One factor	Two factors	Three factors			
Improved service user well-being						
1. Improved sense of well-being	0.68	0.70	0.01	0.69	-0.02	-0.18
2. Building positive aspects	0.73	0.83	0.11	0.81	0.07	-0.05
3. <i>No involvement in care plans</i>	-0.55	0.26	0.34	0.26	0.36	0.09
4. Next step on path to recovery	0.66	0.72	0.05	0.69	0.02	0.00
5. Servicer user views	0.77	0.76	-0.02	0.75	-0.03	0.08
Therapeutic relationships with service users						
6. <i>Poorly defined boundaries</i>	-0.41	0.02	0.50	0.03	0.52	0.10
7. Open relationships	0.59	0.62	0.03	0.61	0.01	0.06
8. Listen to service users	0.78	0.83	0.03	0.81	0.01	0.06
Provision of continuous care						
9. <i>Care from same rare</i>	-0.33	0.09	0.28	0.08	0.31	0.13
10. Contacts other teams	0.58	0.46	-0.15	0.45	-0.18	-0.20
11. Flexible workload	0.62	0.49	-0.16	0.49	-0.14	0.23
Effective inter-team working						
12. <i>Unclear referral processes</i>	-0.41	0.05	0.54	0.03	0.52	-0.02
13. <i>Ineffective communication</i>	-0.60	0.16	0.52	0.16	0.52	0.04
Engagement with carers						
14. <i>Carers not important</i>	-0.51	0.31	0.24	0.30	0.27	0.14
15. Offers information to carers	0.65	0.65	-0.01	0.64	-0.04	-0.13
Creative problem solving						
16. One size does not fit all	0.72	0.70	-0.04	0.68	-0.05	0.03
17. New ways of providing care	0.64	0.55	-0.11	0.57	-0.07	0.35
18. <i>No sharing of good practice</i>	-0.50	0.01	0.61	0.00	0.59	-0.13
Respect between professionals						
19. <i>Lack of mutual respect</i>	-0.46	0.04	0.49	0.03	0.49	-0.20
20. Willingness to learn	0.66	0.43	-0.27	0.42	-0.26	0.27

Note: EFA was conducted using principal axis factoring and a direct oblimin (oblique) rotation; actual wording of items has been abbreviated in table; negatively worded items in italics; factor loadings of magnitude ≥ 0.4 are bolded as they represent the items that most contribute towards respective factors.

Table 8. Confirmatory factor analysis of CMHT effectiveness scale

Model	Chi-square (df)	SRMR	CFI	TLI	RMSEA
1 factor (20 items)	687.4 (170)	0.044	0.904	0.893	0.068
1 factor (19 items)	634.6 (152)	0.043	0.909	0.897	0.069
2 factors	456.6 (118)	0.037	0.930	0.919	0.066
7 factors	548.5 (149)	0.040	0.926	0.906	0.064

Note: SRMR: standardised root mean residual (ideally < 0.1); CFI: comparative fit index (ideally > 0.90); TLI: Tucker-Lewis index (ideally > 0.90); RMSEA: root mean square error of approximation (ideally < 0.08)

For Peer Review