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|  | What do the authors argue? Explain in your own words how you understood the highlighted part. | Does the text present:   1. A procedure that improves reliability 2. Empirical evidence of reliability 3. A procedure that improves validity 4. Empirical evidence of validity   You can choose multiple options. Justify your opinion. | What are the key terms that the authors use? Provide definitions (i.e. quotes) based on DeVellis and cite page numbers. | Do you agree with the authors? Are they using the correct terminology? Justify your opinion. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1: "First, we pretested the survey with 10 executives of young ventures (two per sector) and asked them to closely review the survey. measures). We then revised any potentially confusing items. Following administration of the final survey, we called a random subset of 20 respondents to see if any problems with the instrumen ptersisted,but no problems were revealed" |  |  |  |  |
| 2: “In the instrument itself, we used previously validated measurement items wherever possible to help ensure the validity of our measures” |  |  |  |  |
| 3: “multiple-item measures were used for most constructs to enhance content coverage.” |  |  |  |  |
| 4: “All of our multiple-item constructs achieved Cronbach alphas of 0.71 or higher, indi-  strong internal consistency.” |  |  |  |  |
| 5: “We reduced the potential for common method problems by employing previously validated measures (Spector,1987). We examined the possibility of common method variance via Harman's one-factor test for all variables in the study (Podsakoff and Organ, 1986).” |  |  |  |  |
| 6: “We sought to ensure reliability and validity by using multiple, time-variant measures of our constructs.” |  |  |  |  |
| 7: “All the validation items correlate significantly with the original measures (correlations ranging from 0.31 to 0.57). Such consistency of responses after a 2-year time period provides further evidence of the reliability of our data and the validity of our measures” |  |  |  |  |
| 8: “In order to assess the predictive validity of our measure, we examined its relationship with sales growth, from 1996 to 2000, based on the logic that some sales benefits might accrue to products developed for the key customer, even if such a relationship would be somewhat weak.” |  |  |  |  |
| 9: “we expected sample firms to generally perceive themselves as having technology as a source of competitive advantage; therefore, the relatively high mean on the variable (4.83 on a 7-point scale) suggests some degree of face validity.” |  |  |  |  |
| 10: “To explore the relationship further, we regressed the number of patents on technological distinctiveness, while controlling for firm age, size, and industry, and found technological distinctiveness positively related to the number of patents (b = 0.36, p <0.001). This strong relationship provides evidence of the external validity of our technological distinctiveness construct.” |  |  |  |  |
| 11: “The standardized factor loadings are all above 0.57 (recommended minimum in the social sciences is usually0.40 (Ford, McCallum, and Tait, 1986)).” |  |  |  |  |
| 12: “The composite reliabilities, analogous to Cronbach alphav alues, are all above the recommended minimum of 0.70.” |  |  |  |  |
| 13: “The average variances extracted range from 0.49 to 0.76 (recommended minimum 0.50 (Fornell and Larcker, 1981)).” |  |  |  |  |
| 14: “The measurement model can be used to evaluate discriminant validity. Constructs demonstrate discriminant validity if the variance extracted for each is higher than the squared correlation between the constructs (Fornell and Larcker, 1981).” |  |  |  |  |
| 15: “Convergent validity is also evident: positive correlation sexist among the three social capital constructs, as is expected for constructs representing different dimensions of the same underlying concept.” |  |  |  |  |