EDUR 8331 Applied Measurement
Activity 2: Validity

Purpose
This is a non-graded activity. The purpose of this activity is to help you understand better validity, both content and empirical, and the role it plays in scale development and validation. Please attempt to respond to each question before reviewing the provided answers.

To help demonstrate examples of content validity and empirical validity, the following study was annotated using the 10 steps outlined below. Here is a direct link to this sample annotated study.

https://www.bwgriffin.com/gsu/courses/edur8331/edur8331-activities/02-Validity/EDUR-8331-02-2017-Papadas-Content-Example-1.pdf

Note, this linked example is not the study used for Activity 2; this is an additional example showing how some authors present content and empirical validity evidence.

Activity 2

(a) Content Validity
Read the following publication.

> Haynes, S.N., Richard, D.C.S., & Kubany, E.S. (1995). Content validity in psychological assessment: A functional approach to concepts and methods. Psychological Assessment, 7, 238-247.

See especially Content Validation Guidelines starting page 244, and the summary in the Appendix.

The direct link appears below.

> http://www.bwgriffin.com/gsu/courses/edur9131/2018spr-content/07-validity/07-1995-Haynes-Content-Validity-Assessment.pdf

Note that the content validity guidelines they outline can be summarized in the following steps.

> 1. Define/describe construct to be measured

> 2. Identify domains, or dimensions, of construct

> 3. Describe item selection and/or generation – creating pool of items, using various approaches (e.g., logic, experience, theory, literature, other scales, experts, targeted population participants)

> 4. Describe item fit to construct/dimensions, and assess number of items to ensure adequate measurement of construct and dimensions

> 5. Address assessment of item suitability - wording clarity, appropriateness for targeted population (e.g., low reading level for young folks)

> 6. Employ expert and participant review of items (and scale itself, with instructions, etc.)

7. Review field test results and make revisions, if needed. This step should be repeated, along with expert and participant reviews, until a final scale is judge satisfactory.

After reviewing the material above, read the following study with particular attention to their development of the Cyber Incivility scale.

Lim, V. K., & Teo, T. S. (2009). Mind your E-manners: Impact of cyber incivility on employees' work attitude and behavior. Information & Management, 46(8), 419-425.

http://www.bwgriffin.com/gsu/courses/edur8331/edur8331-activities/EDUR-8331-01-2009-Lim-workplace-uncivil.pdf

Of the 7 content validation steps outlined above, how were each addressed by Lim and Teo when developing the Cyber Incivility scale? List each step and explain how it was, or was not, addressed.

(b) Empirical Validity
In my notes on validity, linked below, I explain that evidence for validity can take several forms. The most common are internal structure (i.e., assessing structure of scale items via factor analysis or similar procedures) and relational assessment (i.e., do scores from a scale correlate with other variables as hypothesized, do scores show mean differences as hypotheses among groups, do scale scores predict some future behavior as predicted, etc.).

http://www.bwgriffin.com/gsu/courses/edur7130/2018spr-chats/EDUR-7130-Chat-6b-Validity.pdf

Again, using the Lim and Teo study above, what evidence, if any, did they provide for empirical validity of the Cyber Incivility scale? Address this question by answering the following.

8. Reliability – for scores to demonstrate validity, they must demonstrate reliability. What evidence did Lim and Teo provide for the reliability of the Cyber Incivility scale?

9. Internal structure – my notes are incomplete on this form of validity assessment, so no need to explain whether this was addressed (p.s., they did address, to some extent, internal structure, see Table 1 factor analysis).

10. Relational validity evidence – what evidence, if any, did Lim and Teo provide of relational validity evidence for the Cyber Incivility scale? Remember, for validity evidence, there must be hypotheses about how scores from a scale will relate to other variables.