**PSQF 6249 HW1: Background Check for your Instrument
8 points; due Friday 9/12/2022 by 11:59 PM via ICON as

Please submit this HW1 in an editable format (e.g., .docx or .rtf extension) using
this file-naming convention: PSQF6249\_Firstname\_Lastname\_HW1**

**Please also submit a copy of the source(s) you are referencing to the assignment,
as well as the actual items if possible (pdf format is fine for the sources).**

The goal of HW1 is for you to learn about the previous **psychometric evaluation of an existing instrument** used within your research area. Ideally you will have access to data using this instrument that you will then analyze for homeworks 3 and 5, so please choose an instrument with this goal in mind. These homeworks will require indicator-level data from six or more indicators measuring a single latent trait dimension (or at least eight indicators measuring two latent trait dimensions). There are no requirements for respondent sample size—use whatever data you have ready access to. If you don’t have individual-level data from your research area you can use, please contact me to help you find some!

Find the original article or other source for that describes that instrument’s development and psychometric properties. Note that this may include more than one source (e.g., a long form and a short form that were developed separately). Please read the source(s) carefully and answer the following questions about the work in the format I have provided (i.e., just type each response after “answer” below). Note that the source(s) may use models that you aren’t familiar with yet. If so, just answer the questions using the information provided as best you can (and you can ask me questions as part of your response). If information that is requested below was omitted in your sources, please report those omissions, too.

1. For what type of population is this instrument intended? What kind of sample was collected to examine the psychometric properties of this instrument, and how well does it correspond to the intended population? Was a reason or rationale given for any sampling discrepancy?

Answer:
2. How many latent trait or traits (e.g., construct, ability, or attitude) are supposed to be measured by this instrument, and what are they? Briefly, why was this new instrument developed (i.e., how does it differ from existing related instruments, or is this an entirely new construct that has not yet been measured)?

Answer:
3. How many indicators measure each latent trait? What is the format of the indicators (i.e., is there a common stem, does it use self-report or other report)? What are the indicators’ specific response options (i.e., numbers and their verbal labels)? Are these response options the same for all indicators?

Answer:
4. Did the authors provide indicator descriptive statistics and/or inter-correlations? If so, what these suggest about the level of item difficulty/severity and quality of item discrimination?

Answer:
5. What evidence was provided to support the expected trait dimensionality? Specifically:
	1. Was PCA or EFA used? What kind of extraction and rotation if so?

	Answer:
	2. Was a latent trait measurement model used (e.g., CFA, IFA, IRT)?
	What method of estimation was used? How was model fit assessed?

	Answer:
	3. If EFA or CFA was used, does it seem likely or reasonable (given the traits to be measured and the item descriptive statistics provided) that the indicator responses would be continuously and normally distributed?

	Answer:
6. Was evidence given for reliability? What kind(s)? What reliability coefficients were reported (type and numeric estimate of reliability, or function of test information)?

Answer:
7. Was evidence given for validity? What kind if so?

Answer:
8. After answering these questions, do you see any potential problems with the reported psychometric evaluation of this instrument or the content/format of the instrument?

Answer: