Qeios

Peer Review

Review of: "Development and Preliminary Psychometric Evaluation of the Height Dissatisfaction Scale"

Giampaolo Santi[1]

1. Independent researcher

Review of: Development and Preliminary Psychometric Evaluation of the Height Dissatisfaction Scale

For the Journal: Qeios

General Impression

The paper is well-written, and the introduction clearly outlines the theoretical background and the need for this scale. The results are also clearly discussed. There are, however, a series of concerns regarding the methodology and the terminology being used.

Major Concerns

1. Scale Development: The paper focuses on the “development and preliminary psychometric evaluation of the scale.” However, there is a lack of information regarding the development phase, as only one paragraph is dedicated to describing item generation. It seems that the authors developed the items deductively (i.e., adapting existing items from other measures) rather than inductively (i.e., extracting statements from interviews). This choice should be explicitly specified and justified. Furthermore, the authors should clarify how they selected the items from other scales. If an expert panel was used to evaluate the clarity, relevance, and/or specificity of the items, this process should be described, as it would significantly reinforce the content validity of the instrument.

2. Sample Representativeness: In my opinion, the statistical analyses provide sufficient validity evidence (e.g., exploratory factor analysis, internal consistency reliability, and relationships with other constructs) for a "preliminary psychometric evaluation." However, the sample is quite unbalanced regarding gender representation (73.2% women). The authors should, at the very least, acknowledge this as a limitation. I invite the authors to offer their rebuttal or clarification on this point.

doi.org/10.32388/EOASX1

3. Validity Terminology: A major concern regards the terminology used to describe validity evidence. I strongly encourage the authors to align their language with the modern framework of the AERA, APA, & NCME (2014) Standards. "Construct validity" should not be treated as a standalone, isolated concept, but rather as an overarching concept supported by multiple lines of evidence (e.g., internal structure, relations to other variables).

Specific Comments

INTRODUCTION

• 2nd paragraph: Please add a reference to support the statement: “However, height has recently emerged as another important, though less examined, dimension of body dissatisfaction.”

AIMS

• 3rd paragraph: To my knowledge, construct validity is an overarching framework supported by an adequate factor structure, relationships with other variables (convergent and discriminant properties), and concurrent/predictive evidence (see AERA et al., 2014; Zumbo & Chan, 2014; Tenenbaum et al., 2012). Here, the authors mention construct validity as a standalone concept. Could they please clarify their exact conceptualization?

METHODS

• Statistical Analysis: The authors state, “Construct validity was examined…”. To better align with AERA (2014) recommendations, I suggest rephrasing this to: “Relationships with other variables were examined using…”.

• Correlations: The authors should justify the choice of Spearman’s rank correlations over Pearson’s correlations (e.g., due to non-normal distributions or ordinal data).

• Measures: The authors describe variables such as “height” and “height discrepancy” in the results, but these are missing from the "Measures" section. Was height directly measured or self-reported? How was height discrepancy operationalized? Even though these are not psychological constructs, they are highly relevant to the validation process and must be described.

RESULTS

• Table 2: Three items (6, 7, and 8) show questionable uniqueness values. In particular, Item 6 should be considered for elimination given its very high uniqueness (.83) and a factor loading dangerously close to the .40 cut-off.

• Table 2 Placement: I suggest moving Table 2 further down into the section currently dedicated to relations with other variables.

• Section Titles: Please revise the titles of the “Construct and Concurrent Validity” sections to reflect the updated AERA (2014) terminology suggested above (e.g., "Evidence Based on Relations to Other Variables").

References used for this review:

• American Educational Research Association, AERA, American Psychological Association, APA, & National Council on Measurement in Education, NCME. (2014). Standards for educational and psychological testing. American Psychological Association.

• Tenenbaum, G., Eklund, R. C., & Kamata, A. (2012). Measurement in sport and exercise psychology. Human Kinetics.

• Zumbo, B. D., & Chan, E. K. H. (2014). Validity and validation in social, behavioral, and health sciences. Springer.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.