**Abstract**

With the rise in efforts to evaluate the quality of mental health care and its outcomes, the measurement of change has become an important topic. This paper tracks the creation of a new instrument designed to assess psychotherapy outcome. The Outcome Questionnaire (OQ) was designed to include items relevant to three domains central to mental health: subjective discomfort, interpersonal relations, and social role performance. This study describes the theoretical development and psychometric properties of the OQ. Psychometric properties were assessed using clinical, community, and undergraduate samples. The OQ appears to have high reliability and evidence to suggest good concurrent and construct validity of the total score. The data presented show that it distinguishes patient from non-patient samples, is sensitive to change, and correlates with other measures of patient distress.

Lambert, M. J., Burlingame, G. M., Umphress, V., Hansen, N. B., Vermeersch, D. A., Clouse, G. C., & Yanchar, S. C. (1996). The reliability and validity of the Outcome Questionnaire. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, *3*(4), 249-258.

1. Before you start:
   1. Do you have a large enough sample size by just looking at the number of participants?
   2. What does the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin statistic tell you about sampling adequacy? Give number and interpretation.
   3. What does Barlett’s test tell you? Give number and interpretation.
2. Number of factors:
   1. Theory suggests three factors.
   2. How many does the Kaiser criterion suggest? Include the eigenvalues.
   3. How many does the scree plot suggest?
   4. How many does the parallel analysis indicate? Include the parallel analysis.
   5. Examine if the theory and parallel analyses are correct.
3. Simple structure:
   1. Use maximum likelihood as the fitting estimation and direct oblimin for the rotation.
   2. Include the loadings for round 1.
   3. What, if any questions were bad?
   4. Exclude those questions in round 2. Include the loadings for round 2.
   5. Continue this process until you achieve simple structure. Be sure to include loadings and indicate what questions were “bad” in each round.
4. Adequate solution:
   1. Include the fit indices.
   2. Are the fit indices excellent, good, or mediocre?
   3. Include the reliabilities.
   4. Are the reliabilities any good?
   5. Label the factors based on the questions.
5. Write up:
   1. Short description of the scale.
   2. List the type of analysis – rotation, fitting estimation, program used.
   3. Values on why you had enough people and an adequate set of correlations.
   4. Number of factors suggested you choose and why (scree, eigenvalues, parallel analysis)
   5. What questions you eliminated – why did you eliminate them? Go through the rounds one at a time.
   6. Simple solution table of the last round of loadings.
   7. Interpretation of the factors.
   8. Description of adequacy of solution – fit indices, reliabilities.