

A '3 step' IRT strategy for evaluation of the use of sum scores in small studies with questionnaires using items with ordered response levels

Errata

Page 8, Table 1. Number persons in Study I, N=59
Study V, n= ~~151~~ 161 (Mania)

Page 9. Third part: 'Parscale4 by Eiji Muraki & Darrel Bock, 2003' should be included in the list of used computer programs.

Page 9. In the last sentence: ... artificial profiles into the sample and the population.

Page 15. Part two, row 1: 'item information' and 'person information' should be changed to 'item estimation information' and 'person estimation information'

Page 16. Under 'How large is a small sample', row 7:
... 'experimental stratification', should be 'experimental stratification and design'

Step 1. Page 25. Before the sentence 'This problem can ...', insert the following sentences ' It is doubtful to give any limit for strong pair scalabilities, but let us choose $H_{ij} > 0.7$. It can be viewed as an analogue to the fraction of explained variance $0.7^2 \approx 50\%$ when the Pearson correlation is considered.'

Step 3. The extended model

Page 33, row 3: before the sentence 'It can be argued...', the following sentence should be inserted: 'Furthermore, the desirable feature of IIO (Invariant Item Ordering) is now relaxed.'

Study I

In the article: Under the heading 'Method 1': 'location and difficulty' should be 'weight'.

Study II

Page 71. A scalability plot will virtuallyshould be: A scalability plot is virtually

Page 82. Table II.Psych.1.5. $i=1, \dots, 12$ should be $i=1, \dots, 23$

Study III

Page 95. The sentence: Some further considerations ... is related to a short version of the manuscript and should be deleted.

Int:

Page 136 Fig.III.Int.3.1. In the title: 'Scale corrected locations' should be 'Item locations'.

Page 137. Table III.Int.3.1. 'unrestricted' should be 'unconstrained'.

Study IV

p.142 'unexplained variance in the first contrast, >3 ' should be 'unexplained variance in the first contrast, with an eigenvalue >3 '

Appendix B.

p. 229 'one of the worst estimators', should be changed to 'of very limited usefulness'.

References: p.211. The following reference should be included:

Sijtsma Klaas. The misuse and the very limited usefulness of Cronbach's Alpha.
Psychometrika, Vol 74, No 1 p.107-120, March 2009.