

JOINT EVENT

49th International Congress on Nursing Care Plan & Health & 50th World Congress on Men in Nursing

July 16-18, 2018 | Rome, Italy

Preliminary investigation of the affective domain questionnaire based on Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia's (1964) taxonomy

Dale Hilty, Jody Gill-Rocha, Kathryn Ross, Anne Hinze and Kali Clark
Mount Carmel College of Nursing, USA

Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia's (1964) Taxonomy:

Responding	
2.1	Appreciation in responding
2.2	Willingness to respond
2.3	Satisfaction in response
Valuing	
3.1	Acceptance of a value
3.2	Preference of a value
3.3	Commitment
Organization	
4.1	Categorization of a value
4.2	Organization of a value system
Characterization by a value	
5.1	Generalized set
5.2	Characterization

METHODS:

Study 1: The purpose of this study was to analyze the factor structure of the Affective Domain Questionnaire: Second Edition (ADQ-SE). The participants were approximately 500 Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN) students in an undergraduate program.

Hypothesis 1: Using SPSS 25, the exploratory principal axis factor analysis (EPAFA) was used to determine if the ADQ multi-dimensional construct (i.e., two or more common factors).

Hypothesis 2: Determine if the reliability estimate(s) would be greater than .80 for engagement common factors.

Study 2: Based on the factor structure found in the initial study, the psychometric qualities of the common factors would be subject to evaluation. The participants (N=111) were senior level BSN students in an undergraduate program.

Hypothesis 1: There would be a difference between the Hilty (2017) competitive greatness (high and moderate-low scoring groups) when compared to the ADQ common factors (SPSS 25, Independent t-test).

RESULTS:

Study 1:

Hypothesis 1. The EPAFA found three common factors accounting for 58% of the variance. The first factor combined the questions measuring the Krathwohl et al (1964) theoretical categories of 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 3.1. The second factor groups the questions measuring the theoretical categories 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, and 4.2. The third common factor assembled the questions measuring the 5.1 and 5.2 categories.

Hypothesis 2: The coefficient alpha reliability estimates were greater than .80 (First Factor, .895; Second Factor, .931; Third Factor, .896).

Study 2:

Hypothesis 1: The competitive greatness (CG) scale was used to divide the nursing student sample into two groups. The high scoring CG group (N=62) and the moderate-low scoring group (N=49) had comparable numbers of students. Independent t-test (N=111) analyses found significant differences between the two CG groups and the second factor ($p=.032$) and the third factor ($p=.001$). There was no significant difference between the two CG groups and the first factor ($p=.141$).

Biography

Dale M. Hilty, Associate Professor, received his PhD in counseling psychology from Department of Psychology at the Ohio State University. He has published studies in the areas of psychology, sociology, and religion. Between April 2017 and April 2018, his ten research teams published 55 posters at local, state, regional, national, and international nursing conference.

dhilty@mccn.edu