Idiographic Methods: Important Alternative Research Methods for the Behavioral Sciences

### **Wayne Velicer**

*Cancer Prevention Research Center University of Rhode Island* 

Overview of Symposium 19th Annual Meeting of the for Prevention Research Washington DC May 31-June 3, 2011

This paper was partially supported by Grant CA11919 from NCI and Grant DA020112 from NIDA.

### Discussant

Colleen Redding Cancer Prevention Research Center Psychology Department University of Rhode Island

### **Idiographic Methods**

- Idiographic methods focus on timedependent variation within a single individual or unit (intra-subject variability)
- Nomothetic methods focus on group-level relationships (inter-subject variability)
- Idiographic methods are widely used in other disciplines, such as engineering, business, and economics but only recently are being employed in the behavioral sciences

### Advantages of Idiographic Methods

Address different research questions & may provide more insight into the data
 May be employed in applied settings, e.g., businesses, schools, clinics and hospitals

Ideal for investigating patterns of change over time Advantages of Idiographic Methods (continued)

Can be used to determine the generating function for a construct

Can address the relationship between variables over time

Can potentially produce larger effect sizes at the individual level

### **Ergodic Theorems**

- Equivalent results will occur only if the two conditions specified by the Ergodic Theorems are met:
  - (1) Each individual trajectory has to obey the same dynamic laws
  - (2) Each individual trajectory must have equal mean levels and serial dependencies.
- These theorems appear unlikely to be met in practice but we have seldom had data adequate to test them
- Available examples do not provide support

### Comparing Idiographic and Nomothetic: Example from Harm Reduction Study



**Reference:** 

Hoeppner, BB, Goodwin, MS, Velicer, WF, Mooney, ME, & Hatsukami, DK. (2008). Detecting Longitudinal Patterns of Daily Smoking Following Drastic Cigarette Reduction. *Addictive Behaviors, 33*, 623-639.

# Introduction

Original study focused on Harm **Reduction in Smoking** Harm Reduction Goal: Produce and sustain decreased smoking rates Primary Outcome Measure: Number of Cigarettes Smoked per day Group level analysis conclusion: Losses were successfully produced and were sustained

### Primary Analysis: Identifying Individual Trajectories

Primary Analysis: Pattern of change for 57 Individual **Studies (Time Series Analysis)** Level & slope fit for each participant **Secondary analysis: Comparisons across the 57** studies (Cluster Analysis)

### Time Series Analysis Results

Average daily smoking rate = 7.85)
 51.6% first order autoregressive parameters were significant (average r<sub>1</sub>=0.55, range = -.47 to 1.09)

- In 16.7% second order autoregressive parameters were significant (average r<sub>2</sub> =.03, range = -.54 to .73)
- Linear trends were significant for more than half of the sample (60.0%)

### Secondary Analysis: Grouping Trajectories into Similar Patterns

- Dynamic Cluster Analysis: Input is same variable measured on multiple occasions
- Input was standardized residuals from time series analyses
- Clustering Method: Squared Euclidean Distances and Ward's Method
- Ward's Method emphasizes "shape"
- Three cluster solution was selected
- Clusters are called "dynatypes"

### Results

Three Dynatypes were plotted to facilitate interpretation (Figure 1)
"Decreasing" maintenance smoking pattern (40.4%)
"Constant" maintenance smoking pattern (12.3%)
"Increasing" maintenance smoking pattern (47.3%)



# Interpretation

- Decreasing is ideal—smoker on path to abstinence, only real success
- Increasing is bad—benefit of harm reduction was temporary
- Constant rate—fits goal of harm reduction, still smoking but will produce improved longevity

# Image: New Research Question: Can Dynatype Membership be Predicted?

Tested dynatype differences at baseline using demographic, psychological, physiological, and smoking history characteristics No significant differences Tested dynatype differences using self-reported motivation and selfefficacy variables Significant differences found

### **Ergodic Theorem Results**

**Theorem 1. Does the trajectory of each** subject has to obey same dynamic laws **Answer: No** (Autocorrelations varied widely indicating different generating functions) Theorem 2. Does each trajectory have the same statistical characteristics (i.e., equal mean level and serial dependencies) **Answer: No** 

### Conclusions

Group analysis indicated misleading constant pattern Ergodic conditions not met Identifying which smokers will belong to different dynatypes is critical new research question **Can intervention influence** dynatype membership?



# Challenge I: Generalization Inductive approach: Individual to

- Inductive approach: Individual to general
- Individual or subgroup level may be most appropriate for most idiographic research questions
- Subgroups should meet test of Ergodic theorems
- Generalization across time is most appropriate type of generalization

# Alternative Generalization: Across Occasions

- Focus of idiographic is time
- Generalization should be across time instead of across subjects
- Autism example: Will the same set of reactions occur in future trials
- Will same reactions occur to other exemplars of stressors
- Will same reactions occur in different settings

### Challenge II: Missing Data

- Missing Data inevitable in longitudinal studies
- Solutions: Automate data collection (telemetrics)
- Statistical methods for missing data (ad hoc procedures inaccurate)
  - Multiple Imputation
  - Maximum likelihood estimation

**References:** 

Velicer, W.F., & Colby, S.M. (2005). *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 65*, 596-615.

Velicer, W. F., & Colby, S. M. (2005). In Maydeu-Olivares, A. & McArdle, J. J. (Eds.), *Contemporary Psychometrics. A Festschrift to Roderick P. McDonald* (pp. 509-535). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

# Challenge III: Identifying Generating Functions

 Examine autocorrelation structure to determine appropriate generating function
 Function can guide choice of intervention
 Underdeveloped area of research

**Reference:** 

Velicer, W.F., Richmond, R., Greeley, J., Seift, W., & Redding, C.R. (1992). A time series investigation of three nicotine regulation models. *Addictive Behaviors, 17*, 325-345.

# **Challenge IV: Develop Appropriate Measures**

Problems with traditional measures
 Recall bias
 Measure Reactivity
 Measure pollution
 Solution: Telemetrics

**Reference:** 

Goodwin, MS, Velicer, WF, & Intille, SS. (2008). Telemetric monitoring in the behavior sciences. *Behavior Research Methods, 40*, 328-341.

### **Challenge V: Ergodic Theorem Conditions**

- Example presented here suggest that ergodic conditions unlikely to be met
- Challenges assumptions of group level methods (i.e., additive constant)
- May account for low effect sizes in behavioral research
- Focus on individual rather than group critical for interventions development

#### **References:**

Choe, GH (2005). Computational ergodic theory. Berlin: Springer.

Molenaar, P.C.M. (2008). Consequences of the ergodic theorems for classical test theory, factor analysis, and the analysis of developmental processes. In: S.M. Hofer & D.F. Alwin (Eds.), 24 Handbook of cognitive aging. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 90-104.

## **Symposium Overview**

**Paper I (Babbin et al.) applies idiographic** methods to important issue of adherence for intervening in the area of sleep apnea Paper II (Goodwin) describes the application of idiographic methods to telemetric data from the area of autism Paper III (Molenaar) presents an example of a multivariate idiographic analysis for **Type 1 diabetes patients**