

Example Research Methods Review

Your name Minnie Mouse

Complete reference for the specific type of material (article, web-based resource, YouTube, etc. in APA style

Walsh, C.A., MacMillan, H.L., Trocme, N., Jamieson, E. & Boyle, M.H. (2008) Measurement of victimization in adolescence: Development and validation of the Childhood Experiences of Violence Questionnaire. *Child Abuse and Neglect* 32(11), 1037-1057.

Make a LIST of Key Words relevant to research methods (not topic or results)

Reliability
Validity
Validation
Test-retest
Expert panel review
Pilot test

Make a LIST of Key Concepts or Ideas that you found in the material that are relevant to research methods (not topic or results)

Point 1. In general, longer, more detailed instruments provide more reliable and valid results. However, they also take longer for the respondent to complete, which makes them cumbersome, especially instruments used with youth. There are several instruments for evaluating victimization and violence, but most are long and many were developed for adults. The authors wanted to develop a more concise instrument appropriate for youth.

Point 2. The process of instrument development is lengthy and requires rigor and attention at every step – even in generating potential items for an instrument. The article provides a lot of insight into the actual process of instrument development – the details. They used existing instruments based on an extensive literature review and interviewed 12 national and international experts to generate questions for the instrument (a questionnaire). They then got youth to assess clarity of wording, whether the response options made “sense” to them, and whether the items were acceptable to youth – fit their circumstances. So even at phase 1 they tested the draft with a group representative of the ultimate users. They pilot tested the draft version two ways. They used a test-retest to determine reliability and focus groups of youths to evaluate acceptability, meaning and clarity.

Point 3. Even after pilot testing, they conducted four more tests during the instrument validation phase. They used test-retest again to make sure that reliability remained high, but most of the validation process deals with making sure that an instrument provides a valid measure of what it is “supposed” to measure. This is complex and probably isn’t done well enough with many instruments. They evaluated content validity, construct validity, and criterion validity. For construct validity, they used a panel of 11 experts, each of whom scored every items on a scale of 1 to 4 for relevancy. They say that an endorsement of at least 8 experts is generally considered adequate to establish content validity beyond the 0.05 significance level. For construct validity, they compared the results of youth who have selfreported violence or victimization to those that have not on both their new instrument and on previously well-tested instruments and compared the results. For criterion validity, 11 clinicians caring for the 93 youth

who completed the previous step, compared their clinical determination about victimization and violence with the results of the tests on the instrument – testing to see if the instrument correctly identified the youths that were diagnosed independently as suffering from violence.

Make a LIST of how the ideas you learned about in this material relevant to research design (1) reinforce or are similar to ideas in the required readings, (2) differ from the ideas in the required readings, or (3) build upon or extend the ideas in the required readings.

Similarities

These authors drop the idea of face validity altogether, but retain the concepts of construct, content and criterion validity. It seems to me this agrees with Swisher's comments about what validity means – and about not getting into a big issues of content versus face, versus criterion, etc.

They give good examples of ways of using focus groups and interviews in validation that are good examples to see concrete techniques that are related to Morse's call for rigor in qualitative research.

Differences

The authors stress the importance of testing for clarity, meaning and relevancy with people who are "like" or are actual members of the population of interest – youth in this case. They stress this even more than Swisher and Morse.

They seem to treat validity and reliability as unrelated concepts. Swisher argues that unreliable data are by definition invalid data. E.g. you have to have reliable data to have valid data.

Extensions

Builds on the concepts in Morse's discussion of rigor in qualitative research. Their specific steps are concrete examples of some of the techniques that Morse discusses.

Extends on the comments of Swisher that all research requires careful attention to reliability and validity.