

Assessment, measurement and evaluation within public mental health

Citation for published version (APA):

Hoofs, H. M. (2018). *Assessment, measurement and evaluation within public mental health: methodological and psychometric challenges*. Ipskamp Printing BV.
<https://doi.org/10.26481/dis.20180507hh>

Document status and date:

Published: 01/01/2018

DOI:

[10.26481/dis.20180507hh](https://doi.org/10.26481/dis.20180507hh)

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Please check the document version of this publication:

- A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
- The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
- The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:

www.umlib.nl/taverne-license

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:

repository@maastrichtuniversity.nl

providing details and we will investigate your claim.

Assessment, Measurement and Evaluation within Public Mental Health

Methodological and Psychometric Challenges

1. “Measurement and assessment of public mental health that is subject to latent defects will hinder proper and valid evaluation.” (*This thesis*)
2. “The use of multiple indicators enable more stringent tests of specific hypotheses that should hold for a measurement instrument to be valid within a given context.” (*This thesis*)
An instrument with multiple indicators should therefore be favoured above a single-item instrument.
3. The finding that the trait of fatigue mainly predicts future sickness absence (*This thesis*) fully supports *Cole and Maxwell (2009)*: “Failure to disentangle time-varying and time-invariant components of an outcome (or risk) variable can lead to profound interpretational problems, which vary enormously depending on which component is the primary focus in a given study.”
4. “While measurement issues, in general, do not result in splashy findings being published in high impact journals, awareness of them can prevent publication of incorrect splashy findings in high impact journals.” (*This thesis*)
5. “The saddest thing that I’ve ever seen are smokers outside the hospital doors” (*Editors, 2007*), clearly reflects the ambiguous nature of public mental health which makes it a difficult topic to grasp or measure.
6. Dissemination of the generated knowledge within this thesis will be greatly enhanced by implementation of the BRMSEA within Mplus, a software package that is used by many researchers within the field of public mental health.
7. Models assessed in this thesis, or any study for that matter, will be imperfect in the real world, so the question always remain: “what’s in the box?” (*David Mills, 1995*)
8. “The BRMSEA can play an important role in the increased understanding of the quality of measurement instruments within the public mental health.” (*This thesis*)
9. Assessment of the quality of a measurement instruments is more than only judging fit statistics and coefficients. Feasibility and user-friendliness are at least as important for a successful implementation.
10. “If one set of measures means one thing to one group and something different to another group, a group mean comparison may be tantamount to comparing apples and spark plugs.” (*Vandenberg & Lance, 2000*) Testing measurement invariance is therefore a mandatory prerequisite for any valid comparison of scores between groups.
11. “Ohana means family. Family means nobody gets left behind or forgotten.” (*Stitch, 2002*)

Huub Hoofs

Maastricht, 7 mei 2018