交互记忆系统项目(Heavey.C等2014)

（Transactive Memory Systems）

简介：

Wegner1985年提出交互记忆（transactive memory, TM）概念，指的是对来自不同知识领域的信息进行编码、储存、检索和交流活动的共享的认知劳动分工，它通常是在亲密关系基础上发展起来的。在工作群体中，当个体了解到其他成员的专长时，获取和编码与专长相关信息的责任就会通过内隐或外显的方式分配给最合适的专家成员，此时交互记忆就产生了。Wegner将交互记忆系统定义为每个成员所拥有知识的总和（知识存量），以及关于谁知道什么的集体意识

Lewis等（2003）为了评估交互记忆系统编制了交互记忆系统15项量表。本文中量表是经过Heavey.C ，Simsek.Z修订的（首先，考虑到执行工作的性质，我们将项目的描述从过去改为现在时；第二，改变了项目的语言，用工作代替项目）

信度与效度：

该量表显示可接受的评判间信度（α= .86），评判间一致性（Rwg（j）= .97）和同行间信度（ICC 1 = .36，ICC2 = .64，F = 2.79，p <.001）

量表：

•每个团队成员都具备与我们工作的某些方面相关的专业知识。(专业化)

•我已经具备我们的工作中某一个方面的知识,但是其他团队的成员不具备。(专业化)

•不同的团队成员负责不同领域的专业知识。(专业化)

•需要几个团队成员的专业知识来达到我们的目标。(专业化)

•我知道某一名团队成员在特定领域的专长。(专业化)

•我愉快的接受来自其他团队成员的建议。(可信度)

•我相信其他成员的知识是可靠的。(可信度)

•我相信依靠其他团队成员带来的信息讨论。(可信度)

•当其他团队成员提供信息时,我倾向于自己仔细检查它。(R)(可信度)

•我对其他团队成员的专业知识没有太多信心。(R)(可信度)

•我们的团队以协调的方式一起工作。(协调)

•我们的团队对该做什么的争执很小。(协调)

•我们的团队需要原路返回和重新开始的次数很多。(R)(协调)

•我们倾向于顺利、有效的完成工作。(协调)

•在如何完成我们的工作方面，经常有很多困惑。(R)(协调)

注意:(R)= 反向计分。

计分方法：

所有项目使用5点不同意-同意答题形式，其中1、非常不同意，2、不同意，3、中立，4、同意，5、非常同意。

量表出处：
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原始问卷：

**Transactive Memory System Scale Items**

**Specialization**

1. Each team member has specialized knowledge of some aspect of our project.

2. I have knowledge about an aspect of the project that no other team member has.

3. Different team members are responsible for expertise in different areas.

4. The specialized knowledge of several different team members was needed to complete the project deliverables.

5. I know which team members have expertise in specific areas.

**Credibility**

1. I was comfortable accepting procedural suggestions from other team members.

2. I trusted that other members’ knowledge about the project was credible.

3. I was confident relying on the information that other team members brought to the discussion.

4. When other members gave information, I wanted to double-check it for myself. (reversed)

5. I did not have much faith in other members’ “expertise.” (reversed)

**Coordination**

1. Our team worked together in a well-coordinated fashion.

2. Our team had very few misunderstandings about what to do.

3. Our team needed to backtrack and start over a lot. (reversed)

4. We accomplished the task smoothly and efficiently.

5. There was much confusion about how we would accomplish the task. (reversed)

**Note. All items use a 5-point disagree–agree response format, in which 1 strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 3 neutral, 4 agree, and 5 strongly agree.**