Reliability and validity

Reliability and Validity: A Comparison-Contrast of Two Articles Word Count: 500 (2 pages) Compare and contrast the confirmatory factor analysis approaches in the Tarafdar, Tu, Ragu-Nathan, and Ragu-Nathan (2009) article, " The Impact of Technostress on Role Stress and Productivity," with the Towler and Dipboye (2003) article, " Development of a Learning Style Orientation Measure." Include detailed analysis on reliability and validity. What concerns would you have in applying each of these instruments for research in a new population? How would you address these concerns if you were to use either of these instruments in research? (500 words) There are two concepts which will be analyzed here comparing and contrasting the confirmatory factors of validity and reliability between two articles. The first article to be analyzed will be the Technostress article, with the second being the Development article. The definitions of validity and reliability will be examined with their relative application to the two articles being examined. A conclusion will be drawn about the research behind the articles. Validity basically is a test to see whether a test really functions effectively in order to garner results that it was designed to gather. According to Cherry (2011), " Validity is the extent to which a test measures what it claims to measure… results [must] be accurately applied and interpreted. Validity is… determined…by a body of research that demonstrates the relationship between the test and the behavior it is intended to measure" (pghs. 1-2). For example, in Tarafdar et. al.'s Technostress article, it is very clear that what was being measured was the effect of such stress and roles and productivity. The validity of that research would be that the research effectively measured what it set out to measure. In fact, according to Tarafdar et. al. (2007), there is a "…validation of the positive relationship between technostress and role

stress adds a new conceptual thread to literature analyzing the relationship between technology and organizational roles and structure…[this] evaluate[s] the extent to which technostress is present in an organization…" (pp. 301). The reliability, or soundness of the overall Technostress study, seemed to be very on-target. As has been remarked by Lindlof and Taylor (2010), " The question of reliability has to do with the consistency of observations…" (pp. 272). While evidence seemed to validate that technostress is real, the validity of the other study's research on Development was particular in its nature. According to Towler and Dipboye (2003), since "…previous attempts to develop learning style preference measures have not yielded reliable measures…[t]he authors conducted two studies…[to] validat[e]…a learning style orientation measure. Factor analyses revealed five distinct and reliable learning style orientations… Findings provided preliminary support of the convergent and discriminant validity of the measure" (pp. 216). Other evidence seemed to suggest that there were difficulties with the reliability of the research results published in the Development article. According to Walker (2011), " A number of basic qualities…are of value whenever reliability is an issue. These include: a) simplicity; b) redundancy…; c) margins of safety; d) modularity…; and e) conservativism (using conservative technology)" (pp. 1). The research that was written about in the Development article seemed to be too complex and lengthy to understand, and—while probably valid—its reliability was in question. In contrast, the Technostress research was easy to follow and well-prepared—not to mention well-implemented—thus making it reliable research. Since the research behind Technostress seemed to measure what it sought to measure—for that reason, that research was also considered

valid. The measurements of validity and reliability have been examined in the articles by Tarafdar, et. al. (2007), and Towler and Dipboye (2003).

REFERENCES Cherry, K. (2011). What is validity? Available: . Lindlof, T. R., & Taylor, B. C. (2010). Qualitative communication research methods. USA: Sage Publishing. Tarafdar, M., Tu, Q., Ragu-Nathan, B., and Ragu-Nathan, T. (2007). The impact of technostress on role stress and productivity. J. Manage. Inf. Syst. 24, 1 (July 2007), 301-328. Available: . Towler, A. J., & Dipboye, R. L. (2003). Development of a learning style orientation measure. Organizational Research Mthods April 2003 6: 216-235. Available: . Walker, I. R. (2011). Reliability in scientific research. UK: Cambridge University Press.