
Index

A

Ability, 279
Acquiescence bias, 44
Additive systematic error, 39
Affective (attitudes or emotions) domain, 78
AIDS item questions, 71
Ajzen, I., 106, 109, 110, 117
Algina, J., 93, 98, 175, 210
Alpha. *See* Coefficient alpha method
American Educational Research Association, 17, 212, 213, 214
American Psychological Association, 17, 212
ANOVA (analysis of variance): described, 15, 157–158; on difference between mean scale scores of two groups, 231–232*t*; interpreting a one-way, 158–161*t*; SPSS commands for one-way, 158, 159*t*. *See also* Variance
Aristotle, 3
Army Alpha (psychological test), 4–5

Assessment (verbal-probe method), 221, 222, 223*e*–224*e*
Avant, K. C., 120

B

Bandura, A., 106, 109, 110, 116, 118, 123, 127, 133, 216, 230, 238, 240
Bartlett's test of sphericity, 251–252*t*
Bassey, E. J., 34
Bernstein, I. H., 7, 10, 16, 53, 109, 121, 175, 181, 192, 198, 199, 211, 244, 247, 261, 275
Bias. *See* Response sets
Binet, A., 4, 39–40
Biobehavioral measures, 33–34
Bloom, B. S., 78, 79
Blueprint. *See* Concept-dimension matrix
Bollen, K., 31, 32, 274
Booth, A. L., 47
Bradburn, N. M., 60, 74, 220
Brennan, R. L., 36, 206, 207, 208, 210

Brett, J. M., 5, 152, 275
BRF (boundary response function), 286
British Association for the Advancement of Science, 6
Brown, W., 182
Buchanan, P., 48, 49
“Butterfly ballot” (2000 presidential election): as instrument-related errors example, 48–49; scoring of responses (votes) influencing errors of, 51–52

C

CAI (computer-assisted interviewing), 50
Camilli, G., 39, 40
Campbell, D. T., 233, 235
Carlson, L., 93, 98
Cattell, R. B., 261
Causality, 152–153
CCC (category characteristic curves), 281*fig*, 285–286
CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention), 79

- CDC Web sites, 79
- Celsius-Fahrenheit conversion, 12–14, 13*e*
- Central tendency (end aversion) bias: described, 44–45; measures of, 139; SPSS printout of, 143*t*
- CFA (confirmatory factor analysis), 273–274
- Chave, E. J., 26
- Chesney, M. A., 48
- Chi-square value, 262–263
- Chinese civil service examinations, 3
- Chinn, P. L., 120
- Civil service examinations, 3–4
- Clark, H. H., 60, 64, 68, 70
- Cline, M. E., 25
- Closed-ended questions, 20
- Coefficient alpha method: item analysis, 194*e*–197*e*, 197–199; reliability assessment using, 184–185, 186*t*, 188*e*; standards of reliability factor, 191*t*, 193; test adjustments to increase alpha, 191–193; test length and interitem correlation factors, 191
- Cognitive assessment: described, 220–221; evaluation made from, 222–223; evaluation using, 222–224*e*; procedures for, 221–222; think-aloud method of, 221–222; verbal-probe method of, 221, 222, 223*e*–224*e*
- Cognitive (knowledge) domain, 78
- Cohen, J., 201
- Common factor analysis (common FA): described, 253, 255; initial extraction, 255–256
- Communalities, 257–258, 260*t*
- Computer-administered surveys, 74
- Comrey, A. L., 244, 270
- Concept analysis: described, 115; identify antecedents and consequences of concept, 118; identify critical attributes of concept, 117; identify definitions and uses of concept, 114–116; identify dimensions of concept, 117; identify similar and different concepts, 117–118; state the variables, 119; steps in conducting, 115*fig*; write model case, 118–119
- Concept-dimension matrix: creating content-domain by, 123–124*t*; deciding how many items to include in, 124–125*t*; writing content-domain items in, 126
- Concepts: analysis of, 114–119; item development process role of, 122*fig*, 123–126; relational statements between, 106–107*fig*; selection of, 113–114; social cognitive theory, 104, 107*fig*; stated in form of variables, 119; subjective norms, 118. *See also* OE (outcome expectations); Statistical concepts
- Conceptual frameworks, 229
- Concurrent validity, 213, 226
- Conditions, 207
- Construct: validity of, 225, 229*fig*–233; validity of relationships to other variables, 224–236
- Content validity, 213, 214. *See also* Test content (content validity)
- Convergent validity, 213
- Cooper, W. H., 46
- Correlation coefficient: computing, 150; described, 146–147; graphic representation of, 146–147, 151*t*; ICC (intraclass correlation coefficient), 203–204*e*; interpretation of, 150; Pearson, 226; range and sign of, 151*fig*; reporting results of analysis of, 156; scatterplot used for, 147–148*fig*, 149*fig*; variance and, 154–156*fig*. *See also* Matrix; SPSS commands; Variables
- Correlation issues: causality, 152–153; group differences, 154; restriction of range, 154; sample size, 153–154
- Correlational systematic error, 39
- Couch, A., 44
- Coulson, D. B., 93, 98
- Cramer, J. A., 34
- Crane, G. R., 3
- Crick, J. E., 210
- Criterion validity, 224–227, 228*t*, 229
- Criterion-related validity, 213
- Crocker, L., 175, 210
- Cronbach, L. J., 5, 44, 187, 205, 225, 229, 230, 233
- Cronbach's alpha method, 186–189, 191*t*
- Cronk, B. C., 141, 162
- Crossed observations, 210
- Crowne, D. P., 43
- CTT (classical test theory): assumptions and characteristics of, 167–170; continued importance of, 276–277; definition of error score in context of, 166; definition of parallel tests in, 166; described, 6, 165–167; disadvantages of, 206, 210, 277–278, 288; reliability defined according to, 6, 165–170, 176–177; as test-based theory, 278. *See also* Theories
- CVI (content validity index), 218–219

D

- D (decision) study, 207, 210
- Dalosso, H. M., 34
- De Ayala, R. J., 289
- Decker, M. D., 47
- Delacretaz, E., 34
- DeVellis, R. F., 210
- Di Iorio, C., 241
- Diaries, 22–23
- DiClemente, C. C., 106
- Difficulty index, 98–100*t*
- Diffusion of innovation, 106
- Dillman, D. A., 50, 60, 70, 72, 74
- Discriminant validity, 213
- Dispersion measures, 139–140, 141*t*, 143*t*. *See also* Variance
- Domain-sampling model, 80, 83*fig*–84
- Dragow, F., 289
- DuBois, P. H., 3, 4
- Dulock, H. L., 107, 108*fig*

E

- Edwards, A. L., 42, 43
- EFA (exploratory factor analysis): conceptual basis of, 241–242*t*, 243–244; definition of, 238, 240–241; epilepsy stigma scale, 241*e*; physical activities formed by conceptual similarities, 242*t*–243; process/procedures of, 244–246

- Eigenvalues, 255, 256–257
 Electronic measures, 34
 Elliott, M. N., 74
 Embretson, S., 289
 Emerson, R. M., 115
 End aversion (central tendency) bias, 44–45
 EO (expected outcomes), 79
 Epilepsy Attitude Scale, 27*e*
 Epilepsy stigma scale, 241*e*, 243
 Equivalence approach to reliability, 177–178*t*
 Erdos, P. L., 51
 Error scores: correlations among true, parallel test, and, 169*t*–170; CTT (classical test theory) on, 165–170, 206; definition of, 166; descriptive statistics for, 168*t*–169; relationship among observed-, true, and, 170*fig*–172; standard error of measurement in, 168, 205–206; for ten attempts on research methods quiz, 167*t*–168. *See also* Measurement errors
 Euclid, 3
 Exercise hours-weight change relationship: correlation matrix showing, 151*t*; for fewer than five hours per week, 155*fig*; for 100 participants, 149*fig*; verbal probes used in assessment of, 223*e*–224*e*
 Exercise-VO₂ relationship: calculating correlation coefficient for, 149*t*; correlation matrix showing, 151*t*; scatterplot showing, 147–148*fig*
- F**
- FA (factor analysis): CFA (confirmatory factor analysis), 273–275; described, 213, 237–238; EFA (exploratory factor analysis) form of, 238–246; goal of, 261–262; Kaiser-Guttman rule for, 261, 262; two types of, 253, 255–263
 FA (factor analysis) steps: basic requirements for, 246–248*t*; diagram of, 246*fig*–273; initial assessment, 247–252; interpretation of factors, 269–273; number of factors, 261–262; rotation of factors, 263–269; selection of type of factor analysis, 253, 255–263; tests of sampling adequacy, 252*t*–253
 Face validity, 213
 Face-to-face interviews, 72–73
 Facet (source of error variance), 207, 210
 Fahrenheit-Celsius conversion, 12–14, 13*e*
 Fan, X., 278, 289
 Favre, O., 34
 Fidell, L. S., 162, 244, 246, 247, 252, 266, 267
 Fishbein, M., 117
 Fisher, R., 47
 Fiske, D. W., 233, 235
 Fitts, W. H., 117
 Five-point response scale (Freyd), 5
 Fixed facet, 210
 Flexibility, 8
 Folkman, S., 106
 Forced-choice responses, 20
 Frequency distribution: central tendency of, 44–45; described, 137–138*t*; graphic representation of, 138*fig*
 Freyd, M., 5, 24
 Fricker, R. D., 74
 Fridh, G., 109
- G**
- G (generalizability) study, 207*fig*–210, 209*t*
 Galton, Sir F., 4
 Gannon, K. M., 132
 Gaston-Johnson, F., 109
 General nutrition knowledge items, 281*t*
 Generic random error, 38
 GENOVA, 210
 Gibbs, J. P., 106, 107
 Gibb's model of research: as modified by Dulock, 107–109, 108*fig*; relational statements used in, 106–108, 107*fig*
 Gold standard, 226
 Gore, A., 48, 49
 GR (graded response) model, 285–286*fig*
 GRE (Graduate Record Examination), 54
 Green, S. B., 188
 Gronlund, N. E., 77, 78, 84
 Group differences, 154
 GT (generalizability theory): D (decision) study using, 206, 209; described, 206–207; G (generalizability) study using, 207*fig*–210, 209*t*
 Guillemin, F., 26
 Guttman, L., 5, 29, 261
 Guttman scale, 29–30, 128
- H**
- Halo effect, 46
 Hambleton, R. K., 93, 98, 278, 289
 Hand-hygiene practices survey, 56–57, 58*e*
 Harris, D., 289
 Health behavior research: concept analysis, 115*fig*–120; Gibb's model of, 106–109, 108*fig*; measurement process in, 1–3, 106*fig*; scale development in, 105*fig*, 111–115; theoretical and operational definitions used in, 109–111. *See also* Theories; Variables
 Health belief model, 106, 118
 Healthy eating OE scale: concept analysis of, 115*fig*–120; content validity assessment of, 216*e*–217*e*, 218; CVI (content validity index) for, 218–219; factor analysis diagram for, 238–239*fig*, 240; items on the, 134*t*; model case, 119; self-efficacy for behavior associated with, 230. *See also* OE (outcome expectations)
 Herman, J., 25
 Hipparchus, 23
 Histograms: on scores on health behavior theory test, 165*fig*; on scores on research methods test attempts, 164*fig*
 HIV knowledge test: domain-sampling model for, 80, 83–84; instrument-related errors in, 49*e*; item analysis of, 92–101; multiple choice, 85–90; objectives of, 78–79, 82*t*; specifications for,

- HIV knowledge test (*continued*)
 80, 81*t*; SPSS printout of KR20 results for, 190*e*; table of test specifications for, 80, 83*t*; true/false, 90–92, 95, 99*t*. *See also* Test/testing
- HIV knowledge test item analysis: average congruency percentage, 98; for college students, 95; difficulty index, 98–100*t*; item discrimination index, 101; item-objective congruency, 92–93, 96*e*–97*t*, 98; materials for review by content experts, 94*e*–95*e*; for true/false test, 99*t*
- Hockenberry-Eaton, M., 24
- Holzemer, W. L., 107
- Homogeneity of scale, 188–189
- How to Use SPSS* (Cronk), 141
- Hulin, C. L., 289
- Hypotheses: assessing instruments in case of unsupported, 232–233; generating and testing, 229–230; hypothesized relationships among variables, 230*fig*–231
- Hypothetical test items, 281*t*
- I**
- ICC (intraclass correlation coefficient), 203–204*e*
- ICC (item characteristic curve), 280, 281*fig*
- ICRF (item category response function), 286–288, 287*fig*
- ID (identification number), 168
- Idiosyncratic random error, 38
- Inaoka, T., 34
- Indexes: calculation of reliability, 174; CVI (content validity index), 218–219; described, 31–32*e*; difficulty, 98–100*t*; item discrimination, 101
- Instrument factors: butterfly ballot example of, 48–49, 51–52; HIV knowledge test example of, 49*e*; measurement rules to avoid errors due to, 53; overview of, 48–51; situational, 52–53; strategies to reduce errors during interviews, 51–52; strategies to reduce errors on self-report questionnaires, 50–51; types listed, 48
- Instruments: assessed in case of unsupported hypotheses, 232–233; defining, 278–279; errors related to, 48–53; evaluating responses to items on, 220–224*e*; FA (factor analysis) to assess validity of, 213, 237–275
- Internal consistency, 188–189
- Internal consistency reliability approach: coefficient alpha method, 184–185, 186*t*, 188*e*, 190–193; Cronbach's alpha method, 186–188, 191*t*; described, 181; Kuder-Richardson Formula 20, 181, 189–190*e*; split-half method, 181–184, 183*e*
- Internal consistency of scale, 187–188
- Interpersonal Relationship Inventory (IPR Inventory), 115
- Interrater reliability: described, 200; equation for, 200–201
- Interval scale, 12–14, 13*fig*, 15*fig*
- Interviewer-administered survey, 72–73
- Interviews: CAI (computer-assisted interviewing), 50; face-to-face, 72–73; measurements gathered from, 19–20; minimizing negative attitude toward, 41–42; qualitative, 126–127; strategies to reduce errors during, 51–52. *See also* Self-reporting measurements
- Intrater reliability: assessing, 200–202; described, 198–199
- IRT (item response theory): described, 5, 276; item parameters of, 282–283*e*, 284*fig*; items for two hypothetical tests using, 280, 281*t*; polytomous models of, 285–288; technical aspects of, 280, 288–289; terminology of, 278–279; as test development framework, 279–280
- Item analysis: coefficient alpha, 194*e*–197*e*, 197–199; knowledge test, 92–101
- Item characteristic curve, 281*fig*
- Item development process: create content-domain by concept-dimension matrix, 123–124*t*; decide how many items included in matrix cell, 124–125*t*; identify dimensions of concept, 123; literature review, 126; other instruments used in, 127–128; qualitative interviews, 126–127; state theoretical definition, 123; steps in, 122*fig*; write items for content-domain by concept-dimension cell, 126; write rules for scale scoring/administration, 128
- Item discrimination index, 101
- Item parameters, 282–283*e*, 284*fig*
- Item writing: development process for, 122*fig*–128; example of item characteristic curve, 281*fig*; knowledge test, 84–92; recoding negatively worded items, 144–145; survey, 59–70; test item analysis, 92–101; test item-objective congruency, 92–93, 94*e*–98; for two hypothetical tests, 281
- Item-based theory, 278
- J**
- James, L. R., 5, 152, 275
- Jones, R. W., 74, 278, 289
- Joreskog, K. G., 5
- Journals, 22–23
- K**
- Kaiser, H. F., 261
- Kaiser-Guttman rule, 261, 262
- Kappa formula, 201–203*e*
- Kashiwazaki, H., 34
- Keniston, K., 44
- Kerlinger, F. N., 110
- Kleinbaum, D. G., 162
- Kline, P., 244
- KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin) test, 248, 252*f*–253
- Knäuper, B., 132
- Knowledge test. *See* Test/testing
- Known group validity, 213
- Known-groups approach, 231
- Koch, G. G., 203
- Kramer, M. K., 120
- Krosnick, J. A., 41
- Kuder-Richardson Formula 20, 181, 189–190*e*
- Kupper, L. L., 162, 188

L

Lackey, N. R., 244, 247, 251, 252, 253, 261, 266, 267, 270, 272, 273
 Landis, J. R., 203
 Latent variable model for SEM analysis, 274*fig*
 Lazarus, R. S., 106
 Lee, H. B., 110, 244, 270
 Lennox, R., 32
 Lenz, E. R., 98, 215, 217, 218, 219
 Likert, R., 5, 28, 128–129, 130, 133
 Likert scale, 28–29, 128–134*t*
 Lissitz, R. W., 188
 Literature review, 126
 Lodge, M., 23
 Lord, F. M., 10, 101
 Lowe, T. R., 46
 Lynn, M. R., 217

M

MacCallum, R. C., 255, 261, 270
 McCarty, F., 276
 McGrath, P. A., 26
 Mail surveys, 73
 Mangione, T. W., 74
 Mann, J. M., 47
 Marlow, D., 43
 Martin, L. L., 71
 Maternal involvement scale: alpha coefficient for, 188*t*; correlation matrix for, 184–186, 185*t*; item analysis for, 194*e*–197*e*; variance-covariance for, 186*t*–187
 Matrix: concept-dimension, 123–126, 124*t*, 125*t*; description and functions of, 152; evaluation of the determinant of, 250–251; evaluation of, 248–250; for exercise hours, VO₂, and weight change, 151*t*; maternal involvement scale correlation, 184–186, 185*t*; multitrait-multimethod validity, 235*t*; reconfiguration of A factor matrix from correlation, 245*fig*; rotated pattern for SE scale using sort/suppression commands, 271*t*; scatterplot of factor loadings for SE scale unrotated factor, 264–265*fig*; SE scale correlation, 243–243*t*,

249–250*t*; SE scale scatterplot of rotated factor (pattern), 266*fig*; SE scale unrotated factor, 263–264*t*; test for identity, 251–252; variance-covariance, 186*t*–187. *See also* Correlation coefficient
 Mattson, R. H., 34
 May, B. A., 115
 Measurement: benefits of using, 8–9; conceptualization of, 6–7*fig*; defining, 6; definition of test in context of, 37; flexibility created through, 8; health education study of, 1–3; history of psychosocial, 3–6; linked to theory-based health practice/research, 104–111; objects of, 206; quantification element of, 7; reliability concept of, 5, 17; validity concept of, 17. *See also* Scales
 Measurement error classifications: random error, 38–39; systematic error, 39–40
 Measurement error factors: instrument, 48–55; respondent, 40–48
 Measurement errors: classifications of, 38–40; CTT (classical test theory) addressing issues of, 165–170; definition of, 37; factors of, 40–55; observed-, error-, and true-, 165–170; standard, 168, 205–206. *See also* Reliability; Variance
 Measurement rules, 53
 Measurement types: biobehavioral measures, 33–34; electronic measures, 34; observations, 33; self-reporting, 19–32
 Medication adherence/self-efficacy, 227–228*fig*, 229*fig*–233
 Meehl, P. A., 225, 229, 230, 233
 MEMS (medication monitoring system), 233
 Messick, S., 212, 213
 Metzger, D., 74
 Michell, J., 3, 6
 Model case, 119
 MSA (Measure of Sampling Adequacy) test, 252–253
 MTMM (multitrait-multimethod), 225, 233–235*t*

Mulaik, S. A., 5, 106, 119, 152, 153, 188, 244, 246, 251, 253, 255, 261, 266, 267, 269, 270, 274
 Muller, K. E., 162
 Multiple-choice test items: 1: measure relevant information, 85; 2: state single problem in stem, 85; 3: state stem in clear language, 85; 4: put as much of necessary wording in stem, 85–86; 5: state item in positive form, 86; 6: emphasize negative word which appears in stem, 86; 7: make certain intended answer is best answer, 86; 8: make all answers grammatically consistent with stem, 87; 9: avoid verbal clues that lead to correct answers, 87; 10: make distracters plausible and appealing, 87–88; 11: use “all of the above” and “none of the above” sparingly, 88; 12: use the two-layered response option sparingly, 88–89; 13: make each item independent, 89–90; 14: vary position of correct answer in random fashion, 90; 15: vary length of correct answer to eliminate length as clue, 90
 Multitrait-multimethod (MTMM), 225, 233–235*t*

N

National Council on Measurement in Education, 17, 212
 National Research Council, 4
 Nay saying, 44
 Negatively worded items, 28, 144–145
 Nelson, C. A., 115
 Nested observations, 210
 Nizam, A., 162
 Nominal scale, 9–10, 15*fig*
 Nomological networks, 229
 Norman, G. R., 42, 130, 131, 133, 162, 244
 Novick, M. R., 10, 101
 Nunnally, J. C., 7, 10, 16, 53, 109, 121, 175, 181, 192, 198, 199, 211, 244, 247, 261, 275

O

- Objectives: determining survey, 56–58*e*; HIV knowledge test, 78–79, 82*t*; stating the test, 78–79; three primary domains of, 78. *See also* Purpose
- Objects of measurement, 207
- Observations: cross-tabulations for agreement in, 202*t*; crossed or nested, 210; as measurement, 33; universe of admissible, 206
- Observed-scores: CTT (classical test theory) on, 165–170; relationship among true-, error-, and, 170*fig*; for ten attempts on research method quiz, 167*t*–168
- OE (outcome expectations): defining, 116; four primary sources of efficacy information in, 119; item development process on, 122*fig*–128; model case written for, 119; social cognitive theory concept of, 106, 107*fig*; three dimensions of, 117–118. *See also* Concepts; Healthy eating OE scale
- One-parameter logistic IRT model, 283*e*–284*fig*
- Open-ended questions, 20
- Operational definitions, 109–111
- Optimizing, 41
- Ordinal scale, 11*e*–12, 15*fig*
- Osgood, C. E., 30
- Osterlind, S. J., 78, 84, 92, 93
- Ostrom, T. M., 132

P

- Pain: operational definition of, 110; Wong-Baker faces pain rating scale for, 24*fig*
- Parallel tests: correlations among true-, error-, and, 169*t*; CTT (classical test theory) on, 166–170, 169*t*; descriptive statistics for, 168*t*; reliability estimated as correlation between, 177–178*t*
- Parsons, C. K., 289
- Participants. *See* Respondents
- Paul-Dauphin, A., 26

- PCA (principal components analysis): described, 253, 255; initial extraction, 255–256
- Pearson correlation, 226
- Pearson correlation coefficient, 150
- Pearson, K., 4
- Pedhazur, E. J., 16, 42, 51, 52, 175, 206, 225, 244, 249, 253, 256, 263, 274
- Percentage of agreement, 200–201*t*
- Personal Resource Questionnaire, 116
- Pett, M. A., 244, 247, 251, 252, 253, 261, 266, 270, 272, 273
- Polytomous item response models, 285–288
- Population, 207
- Positive skew bias, 45–46
- Preacher, K. J., 255, 261, 270
- Predictive validity, 213
- Predictors, 225*fig*–226, 227
- Price, D. D., 26
- Priori content validity*, 215
- Prochaska, J. O., 106
- Psychology Committee (National Research Council), 4
- Psychomotor (skills) domain, 78
- Psychosocial measurement history, 3–6, 267
- Purpose: for students' attitudes about exercise survey, 57; survey development and statement of, 55–56; test development and statement of, 76–78. *See also* Objectives

Q

- QOL (quality of life), 234–235*t*
- Qualitative interviews, 126–127
- Questionnaires: measurements gathered from, 20–22; optimizing approach to, 41–42; Personal Resource Questionnaire, 116; strategies to reduce errors on self-report, 50–51. *See also* Surveys
- Questions: open-ended and closed-ended, 20; for students' attitudes about exercise survey, 57; survey research, 56–58*e*
- Quigley, K., 47

R

- Random error, 38–39
- Random facet, 210
- Range restrictions, 154
- Rasinski, L. J., 41, 74, 220
- Ratio scale, 14, 15*fig*
- Recall (participant), 46–48
- Reise, S., 289
- Relational statements, 106–108, 107*fig*
- Reliability: CTT (classical test theory) and, 6, 165–170, 176–177; described, 5, 37, 164, 174–175; estimate of, 172–173; estimated as correlation between parallel test, 177–178*t*; GT (generalizability theory) and, 205–209; histograms to represent, 164*fig*–165*fig*; ICC (intraclass correlation coefficient), 202–203*e*; intrarater and interrater, 200–203; selection of procedures to assess, 17; standard error of measurement and, 204–205. *See also* Measurement errors; Variance
- Reliability assessment methods: equivalence, 177–178; internal consistency, 181–190*e*; stability, 178–181
- Reliability coefficient: calculation of reliability index, 174; calculation of variance due to true score, 173–174; described, 5, 170; estimating reliability, 172–173; theoretical equation for, 171–172
- Reliability index, 174
- Research. *See* Health behavior research
- Respondent factors: instrument, 48–55; overview of, 40–42; recall, 46–48; response sets or bias patterns, 42–46
- Respondents: recall of, 46–48; response set patterns of, 42–46; responses to items on instrument by, 220–224*e*; self-reporting by, 19–31, 41–42; survey development considerations of, 58–60

- Response processes: described, 220–221; evaluation using, 222–224*e*; procedures for, 221–222
- Response scales, 23*fig*–24, 25*e*
- Response sets: acquiescence and nay-saying, 44; described, 42; end aversion (central tendency), 44–45; halo effect, 46; options for, 45*fig*; positive skew, 45–46; social desirability, 42–44
- Restriction of range, 154
- Richardson, M. W., 188
- Rips, L. J., 74
- Rogers, E. M., 106
- Rogers, H. J., 278, 289
- Rosenberg, M., 109
- Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, 28–29*t*, 133
- Rosenstock, M., 106
- Russo, M. J., 235
- S**
- Salant, P., 50, 74
- Samejima's graded response (GR) model, 285–286*fig*
- Sample size, 153–154
- SAT (Scholastic Aptitude Test) scores, 225–226, 251
- Scale development: conceptualization issues in, 111–115; item development process, 122*fig*–128; steps in, 105*fig*
- Scale development issues: concept selection, 114–115; scoring/administration rules, 128; single-item versus multiple-item scales, 111, 113–114; survey versus scale, 111, 112*e*–113*e*
- Scale measurements: development of, 105*fig*, 111–115; historic development of, 5
- Scales: defining, 278–279; differences between surveys and, 110–111, 112*e*–113*e*; history of development, 5; internal consistency versus homogeneity of, 188–189; interval, 12–14, 13*fig*, 15*fig*; item analysis, 193–198; nominal, 9–10, 15*fig*; ordinal, 11*e*–12, 15*fig*; ratio, 14, 15*fig*; schema for levels of, 15*fig*; scoring and administration rules, 128; single-item versus multiple-item, 111, 113; statistics and levels of, 15–16; summated rating, 128–134*t*; types of, 9. *See also* Measurement
- Scaling methods: described, 24; Guttman scale, 29–30, 128; Likert scale, 28–29, 128–134*t*; Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, 28–29*t*, 133; SD (semantic differential scale), 30–31, 128; Thurstone scale, 26–27*e*, 128; VAS (visual analog scale), 24–26*fig*, 128
- Scatterplots: on factor loadings for rotated factor for SE scale, 266*fig*; on factor loadings for unrotated factor matrix for SE scale, 264–265*fig*; on medication adherence, 227–228*fig*; on rotated factor matrix for SE scale, 269*fig*
- Schaeffer, N. C., 132
- Schmelkin, L. P., 16, 42, 51, 52, 175, 206, 225, 244, 249, 253, 256, 263, 274
- Schober, M. F., 60, 64, 68, 70
- Schonlau, M., 74
- Schwartz, P., 24
- Schwarz, N., 74, 132, 220
- Scree plot (SE scale), 261–262*fig*
- SCT (social cognitive theory): concepts in, 106; example of relational statements in, 107*fig*; health eating OE scale development using, 216; hypothesized relationships among variables within, 229*fig*; self-efficacy as concept of, 104, 107*fig*, 229*fig*–230
- SD (semantic differential scale), 30–31, 128
- SE (condom-use self-efficacy) scale: anti-image correlation matrix, 254*t*; communalities table for, 260*t*; correlation matrix for, 243*t*–244, 249–250*t*; descriptive statistics, 247–248*t*; goodness of fit test for, 262*t*–263; initial solution for, 257–258*t*; rotated factor (pattern) matrix for, 266*t*; rotated factor/correlation matrix for, 268*t*–269*t*; rotated pattern matrix using sort/suppression commands, 271*t*; scatterplot of factor loadings for rotated factor (pattern) matrix for, 266*fig*; scatterplot of factor loadings for unrotated factor matrix for, 264–265*fig*; scatterplot of rotated factor matrix for, 269*fig*; scree plot for, 261–262*fig*; unrotated factor matrix for, 258–259*t*, 263–264*t*
- Self-efficacy: ANOVA on difference between two groups, 231–232*t*; medication adherence and, 227–228*fig*, 229*fig*–233; operational definition of, 109–110; social cognitive theory concept of, 106, 107*fig*, 229*fig*–230
- Self-efficacy theory, 229*fig*–230
- Self-esteem: as latent variable, 239; operational definition of, 110
- Self-reporting measurements: described, 19; indexes as, 31–32*e*; journals and diaries as, 22–23; questionnaires as, 20–22, 41–42, 50–51; response scales as, 23*fig*–24*fig*, 25*e*; scaling methods as, 24–31. *See also* Interviews; Surveys
- SEM analysis latent variable model, 274*fig*
- SEM (structural equation modeling), 5
- Shavelson, R. J., 210
- Shepard, L. A., 39, 40
- Silverman, I., 41
- Simon, T., 4, 39
- Situational factors: described, 51–53; measurement rules to avoid errors due to, 53
- Skip patterns, 72
- Social cognitive theory. *See* SCT (social cognitive theory)
- Social desirability bias, 42–44
- Social support scale variance, 209*t*
- Spearman, C., 5, 182
- Spearman-Brown formula, 182
- Spector, P. E., 23, 111, 129, 131
- Split-half method, 181–184, 183*e*

- SPSS 13.0 Base User's Manual* (SPSS), 141
- SPSS commands: for computing ICC (intraclass correlation coefficient), 203; for computing kappa, 202; computing total scale scores, 145–146; for extraction, 255–256; introduction to, 140–146; for item analysis, 193–198; for one-way ANOVA (analysis of variance), 158, 159*t*; options, 270*fig*; recoding negatively worded items, 144–145; rotation, 267*fig*. *See also* Correlation coefficient
- SPSS Data Editor Screen, 141, 142*fig*
- SPSS dialog box: Descriptives Command, 248–249*fig*; Extraction Commands, 255*fig*; for frequency, 142*fig*; Options Commands, 270*fig*; to request specific number of factors, 261; Rotation Commands, 267*fig*
- SPSS printouts: of alpha coefficient for maternal involvement scale, 188*e*; of ANOVA summary table, 160*t*; of anti-image correlation matrix for SE scale, 254*t*; of central tendency and dispersion, 143*t*; of communalities table for SE scale, 260*t*; comparing self-efficacy scale differences of two groups, 232*t*; of correlation coefficient between two forms of scale, 177–178*t*; of goodness of fit test for SE scale, 262*t*–263; of ICC (intraclass correlation coefficient), 204*e*; of initial solution for SE scale, 257–258*t*; of item analysis for maternal involvement scale, 194*e*–197*e*; of KR20 results for HIV knowledge test, 190*e*; of results of kappa, 202–203*e*; of results of split-half reliability assessment, 183*e*; of rotated factor (pattern) matrix on SE scale, 266*t*; of rotated factor/correlation matrix for SE scale, 268*t*–269*t*; of rotated pattern matrix for SE scale using sort/suppression commands, 271*t*; of scree plot for SE scale, 261–262*fig*; showing comparison among groups, 160–161*t*; of Test of Homogeneity of Variances, 159*t*; of twelve-item SE scale, 247–248*t*; of unrotated factor matrix for SE scale, 258–259*t*, 261, 263–264*t*
- Stability approach to reliability, 178–181, 179*t*
- Standard error of measurement, 168, 205–206
- Statistical concepts: central tendency (end aversion) bias, 44–45, 139; dispersion measures, 139–140; frequency distribution, 44–45, 137–138*t*; statistics and levels of measurement, 15–16. *See also* Concepts
- Stevens, S. S., 6, 9, 10, 15, 16
- Strack, R., 71
- Streiner, D. L., 42, 130, 131, 133, 162, 244
- Stress and coping theory, 106
- Strickland, O. L., 98, 109, 215, 217, 218, 219
- Subjective norms, 118
- Sudman, S. B., 60, 74, 220
- Sullivan, J. J., 244, 247, 252, 253, 261, 266, 270, 272
- Summated rating scales: use of adjectives, adverbs, or numbers, or combinations, 132–133; meanings of response option adjectives or adverbs, 132; number of response options, 130–131; odd or even number of categories, 131–132; positively and negatively worded items, 133; scoring, 133–134; types of response options, 128–130, 129*e*, 134*t*
- Survey development: considerations of respondents during, 58–60; diagram on steps in, 56*fig*; general principles of item writing during, 59–70; listing objectives/research questions for, 56–58*e*; statement of purpose, 55–56, 57; of survey administration, 72–74; of survey format, 70–72; Tailored Design Method (TDM) of, 50, 70. *See also* Questionnaires
- Survey item writing: the don'ts of, 68–70; the do's of, 60–68; overview of, 60
- Survey item writing don'ts: 1: avoid word “not,” 68–69; 2: avoid jargon or regional expressions, 69; 3: avoid ambiguous items, 69; 4: avoid value-laden or biased words, 69–70
- Survey item writing do's: 1: write item related to purpose, 60–61; 2: write items as complete sentences, 61; 3: write items that are short and concise, 61–62; 4: write open-ended items when requesting sensitive information, 62–63; 5: write mutually exclusive/exhaustive response choices, 63–64; 6: spell out acronyms, 64; 7: define unusual terms, 64–65; 8: write items that contain one idea, 65; 9: write items that are specific, 65; 10: use simple words, 66; 11: highlight terms that could be missed or important, 66; 12: allow specific time period for recall items, 66–67; 13: use ranges rather than precise values for sensitive items, 67; 14: use don't know and not applicable response options sparingly, 67–68; 15: make careful decision about including response options, 68
- Surveys: administration of, 72–74; basic principles of constructing, 55–60; definition of, 55; described, 20–22; differences between scales and, 110–111, 112*e*–113*e*; format of, 70–72; hand-hygiene practices, 56–57, 58*e*; students' attitudes about exercise, 57. *See also* Questionnaires; Self-reporting measurements
- Swaminathan, H., 93, 98, 278, 289
- Systematic error, 39–40

T

- Tabachnick, B. G., 162, 244, 246, 247, 252, 266, 267
- Table of test specifications, 79–80, 81*t*, 83*t*

- Tailored Design Method (TDM), 50, 70
- Telephone survey, 73
- Telescoping process, 47
- Test anxiety items, 281*t*
- Test construction: develop table of test specifications, 79–80, 81*t*, 83*t*; domain-sampling method, 80–84, 83*fig*; review content, 79; statement of purpose of test, 76–78; stating test objectives, 78–79; steps in development and, 77
- Test content (content validity): approaches to, 213; content validity index, 218–219; CVI (content validity index) for, 218–219; described, 212–213, 214–215; face validity, 219–220; face validity for, 219–220; procedures for, 215–218
- Test of Homogeneity of Variances, 159*t*
- Test item analysis: average congruency percentage, 98; described, 92; difficulty index, 98–100; HIV knowledge test example of, 99*t*; item discrimination index, 101; item-objective congruency, 92–93, 94*e*–98
- Test item types: multiple-choice, 85–90; overview of, 84; true/false, 90–92
- Test-based theory, 278
- Test-retest reliability method, 178–181, 179*t*
- Test/testing: Bartlett's test of sphericity, 251–252*t*; bias in intelligence, 39–40; construction of, 76–84; definition in context of measurement, 37, 278–279; item analysis, 92–101; items for two hypothetical, 281*t*; KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin), 252*t*–253; MSA (Measure of Sampling Adequacy), 252–253; parallel, 166–170, 168*t*, 169*t*, 177–178*t*; SAT (Scholastic Aptitude Test) scores, 225–226, 251; standard measurement of error for, 204–205; types of items included in, 84–92. *See also* HIV knowledge test
- Theoretical definitions: described, 109–111; item writing and statement on, 123
- Theoretical frameworks, 229
- Theories: example of relational statements in, 107*fig*; GT (generalizability theory), 206–210; health behavior research use of, 106; IRT (item response theory), 5, 276, 278–288; item-based, 278; planned behavior, 106; SCT (social cognitive theory), 104, 107*fig*, 216, 229*fig*–230; self-efficacy, 229*fig*–230; set of concepts in each, 106–107; stress and coping, 106; test-based, 278; theoretical and operational definitions, 109–111. *See also* CTT (classical test theory); Health behavior research
- Theta, 279
- Think-aloud method, 221–222
- Thorndike, E. L., 5
- Three-parameter logistic IRT model, 283*e*–284*fig*
- Thurstone, L. L., 26
- Thurstone scale, 26–27*e*, 128
- Tilden, V. P., 115
- Tourangeau, R., 41, 74, 220
- Trait, 279
- Transtheoretical model, 106
- True-saying, 44
- True-score: calculation of variance due to the, 173–174; correlations among parallel test scores, error scores, and, 169*t*–170; CTT (class test theory) on, 165–170; descriptive statistics for, 168*t*–169; relationship among observed-, error-score, and, 170*fig*; for ten attempts on research methods quiz, 167*t*–168
- True-score theory. *See* CTT (classical test theory)
- True/false test items: 1: include only one central significant idea, 90; 2: word statement precisely, 90; 3: keep statement short and language simple, 91; 4: use negative statements sparingly, 91; 5: avoid double negatives, 91; 6: attribute statements of opinion to a source, 91; 7: avoid extraneous clues to answer, 91; 8: randomly vary sequence of true/false statements, 92
- Turner, R. C., 93, 98
- Turner-Norvell, K., 109
- Two-parameter logistic IRT model, 283*e*–284*fig*
- ## U
- Universe of admissible observations, 207
- ## V
- Validity: additional issues of, 235–236; concurrent, 213, 226; construct, 225, 229*fig*–233; criterion, 224–227, 228*t*, 229; described, 17, 37, 211–212, 229, 236; MTMM (multitrait-multimethod), 225, 233–235*t*; new and old terminology for, 213–214*t*; relationships to other variables, 224–236; response processes, 220–224; test content, 212–213, 214–220; types of, 213
- Variables: causal relationships between two, 152–153*fig*; hypothesized relationships among, 230*fig*; levels of measurement and, 15–16; stating concepts in form of, 119; validity of relationships other, 224–236; Venn diagram showing shared variance of, 157*fig*; Venn diagram showing variance for two, 156*fig*. *See also* Correlation coefficient; Health behavior research
- Variance: calculating true score, 173–174; calculation of, 139–140, 141*t*; correlation coefficient and, 154–156*fig*; facet (source of error) of, 206, 209; GT (generalizability theory) to estimate error, 206–210; relationship among observed-, true, and error-score, 170*fig*–172; for the social support scale, 209*t*; Venn diagram showing, 156*fig*. *See also* ANOVA (analysis of variance); Dispersion measures; Measurement errors; Reliability

Variance-covariance matrix,
186*t*–187

VAS (visual analog scale), 24–26*fig*,
128

Venn diagrams: for P x O x I design,
209*fig*; showing shared variance
of variables, 157*fig*; showing
variance for two variables, 156*fig*

Verbal-probe method, 221, 222,
223*e*–224*e*

Viswanathan, M., 38, 39

VO₂-exercise relationship: calculating
correlation coefficient for, 149*t*;
correlation matrix showing, 151*t*;
scatterplot showing, 147–148*fig*

W

Walker, L. O., 120

Waltz, C. F., 98, 109, 215, 217, 218,
219

Webb, N. M., 210

Weight change-exercise hours rela-
tionship: correlation matrix
showing, 151*t*; for fewer than
five hours per week, 155*fig*; for
100 participants, 149*fig*; verbal
probes used in assessment of,
223*e*–224*e*

Weinert, C., 115

Weiss, R., 115, 117

Wilson, D., 24

Wilson, J., 114, 120

Winkelstein, M. L., 24

Wong, D. L., 24

Wong-Baker faces pain rating scale,
24*fig*

Y

Yea-saying, 44

Yerkes, R., 4

