

**Development of a Content Valid Interview Questionnaire for Hard of Hearing Adults
and their Communication Partners**

Researchers:

Stephen Roberts, Ph.D., Associate Professor
Department of Communicative Sciences and Deaf Studies, Fresno State

Nancy Delich, Ed.D., M.A.T.S., L.C.S.W., Assistant Professor
Department of Social Work Education, Fresno State

Cydney Danisi
Department of Communicative Sciences and Deaf Studies, Fresno State

Purpose of the Study: A well-designed questionnaire is a key data collection tool in qualitative research. As such, it is vital for a questionnaire instrument to be valid in order for the results to be accurately interpreted. When a survey instrument has face validity, the items selected to measure a particular construct appear to be reasonable on the “face” for whatever purpose the measure is being used. Conversely, when an instrument has content validity, the items selected provide a representative sample of the content area being measured. This poster session describes the steps involved in the development and content validity index (CVI) analysis of an interview questionnaire employed to gather information regarding the experience of the hearing loss-specific quality of life for both persons with hearing loss and their communication partners.

Steps in Developing a Content Valid Interview Questionnaire: There were three major steps involved in developing the questionnaire. First, the main research question and four related research questions were developed. Second, four major categories or constructs were derived from the research questions for the content domains of the questionnaire. Third, the items were developed within each of the four content domain categories of the questionnaire.

Panel of Experts: Face validity is determined by the judgment of a key stakeholder; whereas, content validity is usually determined by the judgment of a panel of experts. Sixteen researchers, clinicians, and professors in the fields of audiology, speech-language pathology, social work, deaf education, and rehabilitation counseling were contacted regarding the purpose of the investigation and invited to participate in the study. Fifteen (93.8%) consented to participate. Each expert was instructed to evaluate the relevance and clarity of each of the 41 items in the questionnaire. Responses were grouped into those items that were scored “yes” for content relevance and those items that were rated “no” for content relevance. Responses were also grouped into those items that were rated “yes” for content clarity and those items that were rated “no” for content clarity.

Results: There was 100% interrater reliability on the relevance for 37 questions and 93.3 % interrater reliability on the relevance for four questions. For content clarity, five of the 41 items were rated as having 100% agreement, nine items were rated as having 93.3% agreement, seven items were rated as having 86.7% agreement, nine items were rated as having 80.0% agreement, eight items were rated as

having 73.3% agreement, and three items were rated as having 66.7% agreement. A content validity ratio was computed for each of the 41 items on the interview protocol. The CVI was .99, suggesting a high level of interrater agreement amongst the 41 questions rated for content relevance in the interview questionnaire. The number of relevant items on the questionnaire was reduced from 41 to 40 questions and used in the research study, "Role of communication self-efficacy training on the hearing loss-specific quality of life for both persons with hearing loss and their communication partners." /