

Next Steps in Use of IRT in the Assessment of Health Outcomes

Ron D. Hays, Margaret Rothman,
Joe Lipscomb, Peter Fayers

June 25, 2004 3:30-5pm

=====

FOR FURTHER COMMENTS OR
QUESTIONS ABOUT THE CONFERENCE,

Email Bryce Reeve
reeveb@mail.nih.gov

Albert Einstein

"As far as the laws of IRT refer to reality, they are not certain; and as far as they are certain, they do not refer to reality."

(mathematics)

Further Work/Research

- **Absolute Model fit**
 - Model fit is important (Hambleton)
 - Chi square is not good
 - Graphical evaluation requires judgment—
"skilled data analysis judgment" (Thissen)
 - If logistic model assumptions are met
(monotonicity, unidimensionality, local
independence), model should fit (Reise)
- **Relative Model fit**
 - Effect size: if correlations between theta
estimates from one model or another are similar
(Wilson)

Further Work/Research 2

- **Sample size requirements**
- **Essential unidimensionality**
 - **General construct versus bloated specific (Reise)**
 - **Bi-factor model /TESTFACT (Reise)**
 - **Imputation required for some scales**
- **DIF**
 - **How big does DIF need to be to matter?**
- **Deriving fixed length short-form using IRT (Orlando)**
 - **How much better than IRT in predicting long-form or diagnostic criterion?**
 - **How much better than same number of items randomly selected?**

Further Work/Research 3

- **Does the 3-parameter model have a role in health outcomes research?**
 - **Avoidance of extremes (4-parameter model)**
 - **Socially desirable responding**
- **CAT**
 - **Item exposure**
 - **Communication telling older people how to “pass” cognitive screening measures (Crane)**
 - **Potential value of redundant (locally dependent item)**
 - **ML versus EAP**
 - **Method effects**
 - **Sequence effects, mode of administration (IVR, interviewer, web)**
 - **Usability studies to detect problems**

Further Work/Research 4

- **Constructs for which it is impossible to develop items to tap extreme levels of theta.**
 - High satisfaction with medical care (Hambleton)?
 - Item misfit more likely for very easy or hard items (Cella)?
- **Construct definition (Ware)**
 - Symptom presence/frequency versus bother/impact
- **Summary score**
 - IRT-based versus preference-based (Fine)
- **Person fit**
 - Ultimate DIF
 - Carelessness

Albert Einstein

“Do not worry about your difficulties in IRT. I can assure you mine are still greater.”

(Mathematics)

Educational Needs

- **Tutorials/workshops (live and web)**
- **Conferences**
- **Articles**
- **Books**
- **Newsletters (Bjorner & Ware, 1998)**
- **Email listserv**
- **Website dedicated to IRT**
 - **Continuation of NCI website:**
<http://outcomes.cancer.gov/conference/irt>

FAQs

- Aren't item parameter estimates dependent (not invariant) on the sample in which they were derived?
 - Wood (1976): “it is not correct to say that the latent trait models provide invariant item parameter estimates. Only if a common scale ... is used from group to group will this be true.”
- What does an information of 10 mean?
 - $SE = 1/\text{SQRT}(10) = 0.32$

Software Needs

“What software program is used to run IRT? I’m trying to learn how to do it and wanted to play around with it in an analysis”

- **Better software**
 - LISREL vs. EQS; Liscomp vs. MPLUS
 - Parscale-Equate-DFIT (Morales); SAS ML Mixed, GLAMM, Conquest (Wilson)
- **SBIR funding**

Challenges Ahead

- Integrating IRT into health outcomes field along with other standard methods (expert and stakeholder input, focus groups, cognitive interviews, readability, classical test theory analyses)
 - Fear of recurrence (“I do not worry about my illness returning.” *Strongly agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree*)
 - Renaissance researcher (IRT and survey expertise)

Challenges Ahead 2

- Common versus unique item banks
 - A common bank developed with collaboration by multiple investigators
 - Individual investigators who have unique and creative ideas encouraged to pursue this and push the envelope from another angle
- Collaboration among academia, government & industry; private versus public funded research
 - Kallich, J. D., & Hays, R. D. (1994). The benefits and pitfalls of health services research funded by proprietary firms. Quality of Life Research, 3, 231-233.

Challenges Ahead 3

- Demonstrating the value of IRT
 - Grant support of demonstration projects aimed at evaluating the usefulness of IRT in improving the assessment of health outcomes for research and clinical practice (including MID).
- Standards for use and reporting IRT
 - “Assessing health status and quality-of-life instruments: Attributes and review criteria” (Quality of Life Research, 2002)

Concluding Thought

“The most incomprehensible thing about IRT is that it is at all comprehensible.”

(the world)

