Bruce Mallory

RS755: CTT assignment

**A. Reverse-coding decisions**

Questions that I reverse coded:

Q6: I wanted to avoid a more complicated major

Q8: I like teachers' work hours

Q10: I like teachers' summer schedule

Q12: Teaching is a high-status profession

Q13: I did not get any other offer for admission to a different program

Q14: Teaching is good preparation for family life

Q17: My parents/ peers thought that this would be the right choice for me

Q19: I don't think of myself as an academic person

Q20: Requirements to become a teacher are more flexible than for other professions

To get a clearer understanding of the “adaptive” construct that the instrument is trying to measure, I looked at the articles by Sinclair, Dowson, and McInerney (2006) and Fokkens-Bruinsma & Canrinus (2012). In both of their descriptions of the “adaptive” construct they focused in on whether the motivation would “provide long-lasting engagement.” To determine if I was going to reverse-code, I focused on whether that motivation (eg. “Teaching is a high-status profession”) would have gotten me through February (the hardest month of the school year for me). If the sentence, “Bruce, you can do this - remember <Q12>!” would not have helped in February, then I reverse coded that motivation.

NOTE: There were several students who did not have answers for some of the questions. So in doing the reverse coding, I needed to pay attention to these “blanks” so that I didn’t end up with 5-0=5 as a question score, when it should have been “blank.”

I did not impute values for any of these “blank” question scores.

**B. Initial calculation of Crombach’s alpha**

After reverse-coding items, the calculated alpha for the 23 items was . This was a surprisingly low alpha. And the package flagged ten questions that were negatively correlated with the total scale. They were Q1, 2, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 19, and 20.

When I re-ran the alpha calculation with check.keys=TRUE (which ran the alpha calculation using reversed covariances for the ten questions noted above), Cronbach’s alpha increased to .

This difference was surprising, given that I believed that I had correctly coded and reverse-coded the questions. And looking at the ten questions that had been flagged, I couldn’t not ascertain a reason for those items to be reverse-coded. As a check, I calculated alpha on the raw data with none of the questions reverse coded. This time the calculated alpha was and with check.keys=TRUE.

**C. Culling instrument items**

In my first pass at eliminating some items, I focused on the face validity of individual items and groups of items.

I eliminated Q5(I am more of a doer than a thinker) and Q19(I don't think of myself as an academic person), because I didn’t believe that either of these are motivation for becoming a teacher. Rather, to my ears, these are both versions of the “those who can do, those who can’t teach” trope that is more of an insult than an explanation of why someone ends up in education.

I eliminated Q7(I don’t expect my salary to be the main source of income for my future family), because it involved two assumptions about living-style and family-status that are confounding the underlying concept. Mainly, is the financial reward of teaching motivational.

I did keep Q8(I like teachers’ workhours), even though it was ambiguous. Likeable “workhours” could be likeable because they are flexible, or they could be likeable because they are minimal. The first interpretation supports an adaptive motivation, while the second is more maladaptive.

My final face validity assessment involved the three questions:

Q2(I like working with adolescents)

Q9(I like working with small children)

Q22(I like working with special need students)
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