

NURSING RESEARCH REVIEW FORM
1st Review

Manuscript #: **2005/027**
Manuscript title: **Use of situation-specific Norbeck Social Support Questionnaire (NSSQ) items**
Manuscript type: **Brief report**
Number of text pgs: **8**
Number of figures: **1**
Number of tables: **4**
Reviewer: **JoAnne M. Youngblut**
Stat reviewer assigned? **Yes – you are the stat reviewer**

Please evaluate the following with these choices: (1) adequate, (2) inadequate (describe in written review) or (3) not appropriate (describe in written review)

Problem statement: **1**
Attention to relevant literature: **2**
Theoretical framework: **1**
Research design: **1**
Data analysis: **3**
Organization: **1**
Writing style: **1**

Please rate the following topics 1-5 (with 5 being the highest rating):

Value of topic: **4**
Probable reader interest in topic: **3 - 4**
Importance of present contribution to nursing: **2**
Priority of topic for publication: **3**
Rank this manuscript for its value: **3**

Reviewer's Recommendation (please type "X" after your choice):

Accept without revisions
Accept with revisions
Maybe accept with revisions **X**
Do not accept

Comments for Editor only:

Please provide a comprehensive and integrated review of this manuscript. Be sure to present a balanced view of the manuscript's strengths and weaknesses.

Manuscript #: 2005/027

The manuscript focuses on a topic that could be important for researchers interested in using the NSSQ. However, the weaknesses outweigh this potential importance. Although the purpose of the manuscript is to evaluate the psychometric properties of the version of the NSSQ used in the study, the analyses focus solely on factor analysis, ignoring the important construct validity and reliability portions of psychometric evaluation.

The literature review seems somewhat narrow. Only a few studies are cited, even though the NSSQ is a very widely used instrument. If there are really no other studies of this issue with the NSSQ, are there studies evaluating other social support instruments from this perspective. On p. 3 (assuming the omitted title page is page 1), the MSRS needs more definition or explanation of the intent of the scale. The reader doesn't find out until much later that this scale refers to the woman occupying both the mother and student role. Lines 8-16 on page 5 argue against combining general and situation-specific items, but then that is the model that is tested. Although two other models are suggested in the lit review section, neither is tested in the manuscript.

The procedure and sample sections should be reversed, with the sample section coming before the procedure section. In addition, there should be an instrument or measures section. Although the literature review contains much of the description of the scale, there is no description of the scale's reliability and validity in previous testing.

Some questions about the sample: How many women were also employed? How many were full-time students and part-time students? What were the ages of the children?

The analysis is somewhat limited. The model testing should include a higher-level concept (total social support). That may improve the model's fit. In any case, the chosen model violates the authors' argument against combining general and situation-specific items. Alternately, the authors should test one or both of the other two models implied in the literature review section. Line 1, page 8 – LISREL is not alive, so cannot evaluate anything. Adding the words, "was used to," would avoid this problem. Line 8, page 8 – $p = .0000$ is not possible; it would be better to state as $p < .0001$. Line 18, page 8 – need to use APA format for this type of statistical text. Again, the psychometric evaluation of the instrument should include both construct validity and reliability with the different scale structures.

The discussion section goes beyond the data. Lines 1-3, page 10 – the recommendation of situation-specific items is not justified based on the data presented. Lines 4 & 5, page 10 – recommendations to use situation-specific affect, affirmation, and aid items separately are not justified by the data presented. Lines 16 & 17, page 10 – The justification of the phrase "will serve to decrease response rate" is not provided and is not supported by the data presented.

Tables 1 and 2 – the text runs off the right edge of the page. Table 4 – only use two places after the decimal point to report correlations.