



University of Dundee

Using psychometric analyses to clarify and integrate concepts

Boehnke, Jan

Published in:
British Journal of Dermatology

DOI:
[10.1111/bjd.16802](https://doi.org/10.1111/bjd.16802)

Publication date:
2018

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication in Discovery Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Boehnke, J. (2018). Using psychometric analyses to clarify and integrate concepts. *British Journal of Dermatology*, 179(2), 244-245. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjd.16802>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in Discovery Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from Discovery Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

USING PSYCHOMETRIC ANALYSES
TO CLARIFY AND INTEGRATE CONCEPTS

Jan R. Böhnke

Dundee Centre for Health and Related Research and School of Nursing and Health Sciences,
University of Dundee, UK

Words: 495

References: 9

Author contact information:

Jan R. Böhnke

ORCID: 0000-0003-0249-1870

Senior Research Fellow in Evaluation Design and Research Methods

Dundee Centre for Health And Related Research School of Nursing and Health Sciences

University of Dundee

11 Airlie Place

Dundee DD1 4HJ, UK

j.r.boehnke@dundee.ac.uk

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Boehnke, J 2018, 'Using psychometric analyses to clarify and integrate concepts' British Journal of Dermatology, vol. 179, no. 2, pp. 244-245. DOI: 10.1111/bjd.16802

Successful research into subjectively defined constructs (such as addictions) relies on their clear definition in our theories, the selection of appropriate indicators (usually questions), and testable theories about how these constructs and indicators relate. The psychometric techniques applied in the paper on inter-individual differences in tanning addiction in this issue of the *BJD*¹ were developed to test exactly such theories. The development of the Bergen Tanning Addiction Scale (BTAS) starts with clinical addiction criteria (construct definition) and the derivation of indicators that represent the relevant aspects (content coverage). The authors then employ confirmatory factor analysis for categorical data to test (a) whether the BTAS' seven items are indicators of a single dimension of problematic tanning and (b) whether they unfairly discriminate between gender or age groups. The results are very encouraging.

Assessing inter-individual differences in tanning addiction based on single-symptom indicators and with a graduated and (according to the results) precise measure is important for research into correlates of this behaviour. But it also speaks to debates whether psychopathology should be represented rather by categories or dimensions^{2,3} and whether behavioural addictions are best conceptualised as addictions or impulse control disorders.⁴ Substance use disorders are frequently researched in this context,⁵ but work on behavioural addictions is still missing.⁶ Instruments developed in the outlined manner allow investigating the categorical/dimensional nature of behavioural addictions³ and how the symptoms of behavioural addictions can be integrated into broader (e.g., higher-order) models of psychopathology.^{2,5} Nevertheless, caution is necessary when translating categorical diagnostic criteria into dimensional measures: clinical diagnostic criteria of a disorder do not need to be unidimensional since they were developed for categorical diagnoses that characterise and identify (extreme) configurations. Approaches to the measurement of depression are one of the key examples for this.⁷

The authors review available instruments at the start of their paper, which is an important step to provide a benchmark for improvement and not to re-invent the wheel. Sometimes this type of narrative needs to be strengthened by a systematic review of the existing instruments and their validation results. The development of an instrument is not finished with a single study, but rather sets of studies accumulate evidence for the psychometric validity of an instrument, and often only for

specific purposes. Finding, analysing, and aggregating psychometric results from these studies is therefore an important task. Frameworks such as the COnsensus-based Standards for the selection of health Measurement INstruments (COSMIN)⁸ offer tools to consolidate knowledge about existing instruments. Additionally, to show that the BTAS is actually better in measuring individual differences and predicting relevant outcomes than other available instruments necessitates comparative studies, investigating incremental predictive validity as well as (a) whether the instruments measure the same construct and if so, (b) whether one does this better than another one.⁹

Andreassen and colleagues¹ present an instrument validation that evidences very good psychometric properties of the BTAS in a general population sample. Their study further provides several directions for future thinking and debate about the measurement of behavioural addictions.

REFERENCES

1. Andreassen CS, Pallesen S, Torsheim T, Demetrovics Z, Griffiths MD. Tanning addiction: Conceptualisation, assessment, and correlates. *Br J Dermatol.* in press;
2. Wright AGC, Krueger RF, Hobbs MJ, Markon KE, Eaton NR, Slade T. The structure of psychopathology: toward an expanded quantitative empirical model. *J Abnorm Psychol.* 2013;122:281–94.
3. Böhnke JR, Croudace TJ. Factors of psychological distress: Clinical value, measurement substance, and methodological artefacts. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol.* 2015;50:515–24.
4. Grant JE, Atmaca M, Fineberg NA, Fontenelle LF, Matsunaga H, Reddy YCJ, u. a. Impulse control disorders and “behavioural addictions” in the ICD- 11. *World Psychiatry.* 2014;13:125–7.
5. Soe-Agnie SE, Paap MCS, VanDerNagel JEL, Nijman HJM, Jong CAJ de. The generalizability of the structure of substance abuse and antisocial behavioral syndromes: A systematic review. *Psychiatry Res.* 2018;259:412–21.
6. Chamberlain SR, Stochl J, Redden SA, Grant JE. Latent traits of impulsivity and compulsivity: toward dimensional psychiatry. *Psychol Med.* 2018;48:810–821.
7. Fried EI. The 52 symptoms of major depression: Lack of content overlap among seven common depression scales. *J Affect Disord.* 2017;208:191–7.
8. Prinsen CAC, Mokkink LB, Bouter LM, Alonso J, Patrick DL, de Vet HCW, u. a. COSMIN guideline for systematic reviews of patient-reported outcome measures. *Qual Life Res.* in press; <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-018-1798-3>
9. Böhnke JR, Croudace TJ. Calibrating well-being, quality of life and common mental disorder items: psychometric epidemiology in public mental health research. *Br J Psychiatry.* 2016;209:162–8.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Thanks to Dr Muirne C. S. Paap (Department of Special Needs, Education, and Youth Care, Faculty of Behavioural and Social Sciences, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands) for a critical review and helpful feedback on this commentary.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The author has no current or past affiliations or other involvement in any organization or entity with an interest in this commentary. The author is co-editor in chief of "Quality of Life Research".