

THE IMPACT OF METHODOLOGICAL CHANGES IN GERONTOLOGY*

K. WARNER SCHAIE

The Pennsylvania State University, University Park

ABSTRACT

The impact of methodological changes on gerontology is illustrated by discussing the example of the age-cohort-period problem as an innovation in research design, and examining the case of confirmatory factor analysis as an illustration of how methodological innovation informs theory.

The purpose of this article is to delineate how changes in research methodology have impact our field over the three decades or so that I have been privileged to be a member of the gerontological research community. Although I wish that I could be more inclusive, I will confine my discussion of progress in research methods to behavioral and social gerontology. I hope to point out that gerontologists in these areas have been in the forefront in both the development of novel research methodology and the early application of new methods particularly suited to the developmental sciences.

The methodological advances that I wish to focus on may be seen particularly clearly if one subscribes to a more or less dialectic view of scientific inquiry. This view specifies the dynamic interplay of empirically-derived inductive models that are then expanded or differentiated deductively and applied

*This article was presented as part of a symposium on "Generations of Gerontology: Aging, Continuity, and Change," M. Seltzer, Chair, at the Annual Meeting of the Gerontological Society of America, Boston, November 17, 1990. It is a condensation and update of a previously published chapter on "The Impact of Research Methodology on Theory Building in the Developmental Sciences." The present version was prepared while the author was a fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, California, with financial support from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. Preparation of this work was also supported in part by research grant R037 AG-08055 from the National Institute on Aging.

to new data sets. Revised models are then once again generated in an inductive fashion [1].

I will begin my review with some brief comments on how methodological innovation leads to different views of extant data bases and their subsequent impact in the revision of gerontological theorizing. As concrete illustrations of this process, I will then provide two rather different examples that illustrate the impact of methodological changes in social and behavioral gerontology. My first example involves the shift from a primary emphasis on cross-sectional data to more complex longitudinal inquiry. The second shows how the introduction of a new methodology, confirmatory factor analysis, influences work on adult development.

METHODOLOGICAL INNOVATION IN GERONTOLOGY

Important recent innovations in research methodology in gerontology have been of three major types: advances in instrumentation, research design, and techniques of analysis. The first involves the level of instrumentation and sophistication of measurement devices or scales. For example, introduction of computer-assisted tomography and direct measurements of blood flow led to the obsolescence of earlier indirect methods for assessing the integrity of cortical structures. Likewise, moving from an electro-encephalographic description of the resting brain to the analysis of evoked potentials has led to a paradigmatic shift in conceptualizing the role of the cortex and its structures as they interact with an active environment.

Advances in instrumentation also involve a shift from mere categorical description of the presence or absence of a phenomenon to the development of scales that have ordinal or interval properties. An advance of this kind was the realization that psychological scales could be developed for subjective properties; for example, by the method of comparative judgment and the more modern techniques of multi-dimensional scaling [2].

A second class of methodological innovations that has impacted gerontological research involves the specification of novel schemes for collecting data and evaluating the validity of theoretical constructs. For example, rules for determining the internal and external validity of experiments and quasi-experiments [3, 4] and the application of these concepts to gerontological studies [5-7] require researchers to define side conditions under which propositions derived from theory can be expected to hold. Methodological discussions that specify alternate models for the structuring of data collections in aging studies, moreover, will determine properties of any data set employed to test theory or provide bases for public policy formulations [8, 9].

Innovations in methods of analysis, finally, make it possible to conduct new tests of theory (e.g., estimation of complex causal models *a la* Jöreskog [10]), and lead to major paradigmatic shifts. An example of the latter

impact is the shift from theories based upon directly observable variables to theories that account for relationships among latent (unobserved) variables. Likewise, the introduction of methods of survival and event history analysis [11] has made it possible to examine the impact of time-varying predictors on the occurrences of physiological, social, and behavioral morbidity [12].

In each of the above instances, methodological advances permitted the testing of theoretical propositions that were previously not amenable to empirical testing. In addition, constraints were identified that required expansion of theoretical formulations, and led to the derivation of new models that explain and include the attributes of a phenomenon uncovered by methodological innovations. Nevertheless, there is no uniform path by which methodological innovation and modification of research practice interact. To obtain a better understanding, two specific instances of how methodological advances have impacted gerontological research will next be examined.

INNOVATIONS IN RESEARCH DESIGN: THE CASE OF THE AGE-COHORT-PERIOD PROBLEM

One of the prominent examples of the impact of research methodology in gerontology has been the introduction of appropriate methodologies for the study of change over time, commonly referred to as the age-cohort-period problem [5, 9, 13-19]. This case presents an illustration of the dialectic interaction between puzzling data sets, the examination of the appropriateness of standard research design, and the specification of alternate designs leading to the collection of new data sets that would fit the new paradigms.

My own work in this area began with the realization that data on the adult development of mental abilities showed wide discrepancies between cross-sectional and longitudinal data collected on the same subject population over a wide age range. In particular, it became evident that for some dependent variables, substantial age differences obtained in cross-sectional studies could not be replicated in the longitudinal data, while for other dependent variables, longitudinal age changes reflected more profound decrement than was shown in the comparable cross-sectional age difference patterns [20].

In an inductive effort to explain these discrepancies, I described a general model for the study of developmental change that explicated the relationships between the cross-sectional and longitudinal methods. This model showed that cross-sectional data involve the description of age differences at a single point in time; representing a separate samples design *a la* Campbell and Stanley [3]. Designs of this type suffer from the problem that maturational change (age) is confounded with cohort acting as a selection factor [17]. Longitudinal data, by

contrast, represent a time series assessing the same individuals at two or more points in time. Here, maturational change (age) is confounded with historical (secular) trends. The general model also specified a third approach to developmental data collections for which the term "time-lag" was coined [14]. The latter approach compares two samples at the same chronological age but at different calendar times, as would be the case, for example, in the comparison of SAT scores for successive classes of high school graduates. In this design cohort, differences are confounded with historical trends. Consideration was then given to the possibility of deducing more complex designs, termed "sequential methods," that permit estimates of the magnitude of specific components of developmental change by controlling for the confounds mentioned above [9].

The sequential designs were applied to empirical data sets obtained as part of the Seattle Longitudinal Study [12, 21]. From these applications, it became apparent that specific patterns of data acquisition lend themselves most readily to optimal utilization of the sequential analysis strategies [22]. It also became obvious that different sequential designs were appropriate for different developmental questions [16], and that design complications needed to be specified to control for some of the validity threats listed by Campbell and Stanley [3]. Design variations that permit controls for reactivity, practice, and experimental mortality were therefore explicated [5, 7].

Implications for Gerontological Research

At least three different aspects of these designs have had important implications: first, their use has influenced our understanding of the normative course of aging; second, they have impacted the structuring of data collections; and third, they have affected the manner in which researchers explain phenomena involving change over time and age.

Many theories of aging, whether involving wear and tear, accumulations of waste products, or successive loss of neurons, implicitly or explicitly include the assumption of irreversible decrement. The design specifications resulting from the general developmental model, however, clearly indicate that in behavioral data, irreversible decrement represents only one of a number of observable patterns of aging. The plausibility of the irreversible decrement model, as any other model, can be tested only under certain conditions; a multi-cohort longitudinal study is needed to protect against the possibility that adverse historical effects could either inflate or suppress maturationally determined change. A given theoretical model must therefore indicate under what conditions the predicted age effects can validly be observed [23].

In examining the contributions of aging research methodology, it is important to distinguish models that serve to help interpret the results of data acquisitions from models that explicitly specify how data should be acquired [24].

If alternative models of aging are to be tested, it becomes necessary to embed theory into data acquisition plans. Given the confounds described above, few theory-based questions are likely to be answerable by studying a single cross-sectional data set, or even a single sample followed longitudinally over time. A logical consequence, then, is to conceptualize data collection plans so that extensions of the initial acquisition can be suitably extended. This involves data acquisitions that are structured as cross-sectional or longitudinal sequences [24, 25].

One important derivative from the theoretical analysis of the general developmental model has been the recommendation for an optimal data collection approach that permits flexible application of sequential data analysis strategies, as well as the provision of controls to protect against major threats to the internal validity of developmental studies. Noting the fact that all longitudinal studies must begin somewhere with a single first measurement occasion, I have long been convinced that it is always prudent to commence with an age-comparative cross-sectional design. However, in those instances where such a design cannot answer the questions of interest, additional data must then be collected across time. A hypothetical data collection scheme which I have previously identified as the "most efficient design" is depicted in Figure 1 [9, 22].

Recent analyses of the age-cohort-period problem have also provided a better understanding of what needs to be done if the dependency of chronological age upon calendar time is to be broken in a meaningful manner. Models that contain parameters, one of which is wholly determined by the others, are well known in science (i.e., the attributes of volume, pressure, and temperature in physics). There are many reasons why one would want to examine the relative contributions of any of the three possible combinations of two developmental parameters. The recent literature on the analysis of sequential data matrices, moreover, would finesse the problem of invalid parametric assumptions by promoting regression models that simultaneously estimate the effects of age, period, and cohort under an additivity assumption that allows for no interaction among the factors [13, 26-29].

The concern with methodologies designed to separate age, cohort, and period effects, however, arose primarily from our preoccupation with the role of age as the independent variable of primary interest to students of development [30, 31]. It would seem, though, that cohort and period may have more interesting explanatory properties than age. When cohort effects and historical time are conceptually separated from calendar time, cohort becomes a selection variable that characterizes the common point of entry for a group of individuals into a given environment [32], and period becomes a measure of event density (for further elaboration see Schaie [17, 18]). Similarly, chronological age can be reconceptualized as a functional age dimension. In this approach, rather than serving as explanatory concepts, chronological age




Figure 1. Schaie's most efficient design. In 1960, four groups are tested (a cross-sectional study). They are retested in 1970 and 1980 (a longitudinal sequence with repeated measures). New groups from the same cohorts are first-tested in 1970 and in 1980 (cross-sectional sequences, independent samples). These new groups are later retested to form new longitudinal sequences.

and other age functions related to calendar time emerge as useful scalars that measure the amount of time elapsed within the lives of individuals over which developmental phenomena have occurred. The dependencies implicit in the age-cohort-model, moreover, can thus be resolved, and all three effects can be directly estimated whenever one of the dimensions is redefined in terms other than calendar time.¹

¹ Empirical examples of data sets that would allow direct estimation of age, cohort, and period effects, given the proposed reformulation of the general developmental model, are provided in Schaie [18].

METHODOLOGICAL INNOVATIONS THAT INFORM THEORY: THE CASE OF CONFIRMATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS

Most direct observations conducted by social and behavioral scientists are of interest only to the extent that such observations represent reliably measured markers of latent (unobserved) psychological constructs. Theory-guided research requires the specification of the psychological constructs of interest, as well as the observations that will be used to estimate the constructs. Early concerns in the study of aging were directed primarily to the estimation of change in performance level on directly observable measures [33]. More recent work has extended these concerns to the comparison of structure (i.e., the regression of observables upon latent constructs) across different age groups and within cohorts over time [34-39].

This work was made possible as a direct consequence of the methodological developments in restricted factor analysis most notably represented by the work of K. G. Jöreskog and his associates. Jöreskog [40] and other methodologists such as Bentler [41] demonstrated that hypotheses about the relationships among latent constructs that underlie empirically observed variables can be formulated as structural models. The original objective of confirmatory factor analysis was to permit the fitting of data to specific measurement models depicting the relationship between latent constructs and observed variables. It became soon apparent, however, that confirmatory factor analysis could also be used to test the equivalence of factor structure across and within groups [10].

Implications for Gerontological Research

An important role of confirmatory factor analysis in theory-guided research is the applicability of structural equation models to the demonstration of measurement equivalence [36, 42]. Structural equation models are of particular utility in aging studies because the unidirectionality of time permits sounder guides for the specification of causal paths than is possible in studies using single observation points only. Longitudinal factor analysis is particularly useful for the modeling of individual differences in intra-individual change, the central focus of any individual differences approach to aging [10, 37, 43]. Finally, methods of confirmatory factor analysis turn out to be the method of choice to test the stability of latent constructs under conditions of serendipitous or planned interventions in the aging process [38, 44].

Utilization of the same questionnaire or test apparatus does not guarantee measurement equivalence over time or different subject populations. Two fundamentally different aspects are at issue: the first is the traditional problem of reliability of measures across occasion, and regression to the mean when using fallible measures [45]. The second aspect concerns the fact that measurement equivalence would not be guaranteed, even if only perfectly reliable measures

were used, because of systematic but nonuniform changes occurring among individuals over time.

In cross-sectional studies, it is legitimate to ask whether a task that may be a good estimate of one construct in young adulthood remains so in later life, or in fact becomes a measure of some other construct. What must be demonstrated, then, is the invariance of factor structure across multiple groups or sub-populations [46]. When samples are followed longitudinally, we must demonstrate factorial invariance for the same individuals measured longitudinally. Structural equation analysis, consequently, is the approach of choice to assess measurement [36, 47].

Availability of explicit statistical models for testing construct equivalence has had profound effects for theory building and testing in aging research. For example, any discussion of a model that argues for the successive differentiation and dedifferentiation of human abilities must not only specify the constructs that are involved in such a process, but also must specify hypotheses on the manner in which the constructs may be represented by different abilities (or the same abilities weighted differentially) at different life stages [48]. The issue of equivalence of constructs will also impact future work in experimental gerontology. The experimental literature on age differences is largely an account of manipulations of single observable measures in the laboratory context [49]. For such data to become meaningful in understanding age-related behavior in real life contexts, complex structural models will need to be formulated and manipulations must be attempted at the latent variable level.

CONCLUSIONS

In this article I have examined some ways in which developments in research methodology have impacted the behavior of the gerontological research community. Methodological innovations require major changes in testing theories and demand the addition of new corollaries and boundary conditions to retain the viability of existent theories. Other methodological innovations can directly produce paradigm shifts either by permitting the direct investigation of phenomena that were not previously specifiable by a theoretical model, or by providing methods that allow investigation at different levels of conceptual specification. The impact of changing research methodology can be seen most clearly when investigators have been forced to abandon previous methods of measuring, designing, or analyzing data in favor of conceptually superior innovations. I hope the illustrations I have presented here have made that point.

REFERENCES

1. K. F. Riegel, *Psychology of Development and History*, Plenum, New York, 1976.

2. N. Cliff, What Is and Isn't Measurement, in *Statistical and Methodological Issues in Psychology and Social Science Research*, G. Keren (ed.), Erlbaum, Hillsdale, New Jersey, 1982.
3. D. T. Campbell and J. C. Stanley, Experimental and Quasi-experimental Designs for Research in Teaching, in *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, N. L. Gage (ed.), Rand McNally, Chicago, Illinois, pp. 171-246, 1963.
4. T. C. Cook and D. T. Campbell, *Quasi-experimentation: Design and Analysis Issues for Field Settings*, Rand-McNally, Chicago, Illinois, 1979.
5. K. W. Schaie, Quasi-experimental Designs in the Psychology of Aging, in *Handbook of the Psychology of Aging*, J. E. Birren and K. W. Schaie (eds.), Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York, pp. 39-58, 1977.
6. K. W. Schaie, External Validity in the Assessment of Intellectual Development in Adulthood, *Journal of Gerontology*, 33, pp. 695-701, 1978.
7. K. W. Schaie, Internal Validity Threats in Studies of Adult Cognitive Development, in *Cognitive Development in Adulthood: Progress in Cognitive Development Research*, M. L. Howe and C. J. Brainerd (eds.), Springer-Verlag, New York, pp. 241-272, 1988.
8. M. W. Riley, M. J. Johnson, and A. Foner, *Aging and Society: Vol. 3: A Sociology of Age Stratification*, Russell Sage, New York, 1972.
9. K. W. Schaie, A General Model for the Study of Developmental Problems, *Psychological Bulletin*, 64, pp. 91-107, 1965.
10. K. G. Jöreskog, Statistical Estimation of Structural Models in Longitudinal Developmental Investigations, in *Longitudinal Research in the Study of Behavior and Development*, J. R. Nesselroade and P. B. Baltes (eds.), Academic Press, New York, pp. 303-305, 1979.
11. P. D. Allison, *Event History Analysis: Regression for Longitudinal Event Data*, Sage, Beverly Hills, California, 1984.
12. K. W. Schaie, The Hazards of Cognitive Aging, *Gerontologist*, 29, pp. 484-493, 1989.
13. K. G. Mason, W. H. Mason, H. H. Winsborough, and W. K. Poole, Some Methodological Problems in Cohort Analyses of Archival Data, *American Sociological Review*, 38, pp. 242-258, 1973.
14. E. B. Palmore, When Can Age, Period, and Cohort be Separated?, *Social Forces*, 57, pp. 282-295, 1978.
15. N. B. Ryder, The Cohort as a Concept in the Study of Social Change, *American Review of Sociology*, 30, pp. 843-861, 1965.
16. K. W. Schaie, Methodological Problems in Descriptive Developmental Research on Adulthood and Aging, in *Life-Span Developmental Psychology: Methodological Issues*, J. R. Nesselroade and H. W. Reese (eds.), Academic Press, New York, pp. 253-280, 1973.
17. K. W. Schaie, Historical Time and Cohort Effects, in *Life-Span Developmental Psychology: Historical and Generational Effects*, K. A. McCloskey and H. W. Reese (eds.), Academic Press, New York, pp. 1-15, 1984.
18. K. W. Schaie, Beyond Calendar Definitions of Age, Time and Cohort: The General Developmental Model Revisited, *Developmental Review*, 6, pp. 252-277, 1986.
19. K. W. Schaie, The Impact of Research Methodology on Theory-Building in the Developmental Sciences, in *Emergent Theories of Aging*, J. E. Birren and V. L. Bengtson (eds.), Springer, New York, pp. 41-58, 1988.

20. K. W. Schaie and C. R. Strother, The Cross-Sequential Study of Age Changes in Cognitive Behavior, *Psychological Bulletin*, 70, pp. 671-680, 1968.
21. K. W. Schaie, The Seattle Longitudinal Study: A Twenty-one Year Exploration of Psychometric Intelligence in Adulthood, in *Longitudinal Studies of Adult Psychological Development*, Guilford Press, New York, pp. 64-135, 1983.
22. K. W. Schaie and S. L. Willis, *Adult Development and Aging*, (3rd Edition), Harper Collins, New York, 1991.
23. P. B. Baltes, S. W. Cornelius, and J. R. Nesselroade, Cohort Effects in Developmental Psychology, in *Longitudinal Research in the Study of Behavior and Development*, J. R. Nesselroade and P. B. Baltes (eds.), Academic Press, New York, pp. 61-87, 1979.
24. K. W. Schaie and P. B. Baltes, On Sequential Strategies in Developmental Research: Description or Explanation? *Human Development*, 18, pp. 384-390, 1975.
25. P. B. Baltes, Longitudinal and Cross-Sectional Sequences in the Study of Age and Generation Effects, *Human Development*, 11, pp. 145-171, 1968.
26. A. R. Buss, Methodological Issues in Life-Span Developmental Psychology from a Dialectical Perspective, *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 10, pp. 121-163, 1979/1980.
27. L. K. George, I. C. Siegler, and M. A. Okun, Separating Age, Cohort, and Time of Measurement: Analysis of Variance and Multiple Regression, *Experimental Aging Research*, 7, pp. 297-314, 1981.
28. J. L. Horn and J. J. McArdle, Perspectives on Mathematical-Statistical Model Building (MASMOB) in Research on Aging, in *Aging in the 1980s*, L. F. Poon (ed.), American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., pp. 503-541, 1980.
29. H. H. Winsborough, O. D. Duncan, and P. B. Read, *Cohort Analysis in Social Research*, Academic Press, New York, 1983.
30. D. L. Featherman, Individual Development and Aging as a Population Process, in *Individual Development and Social Change: Explanatory Analysis*, J. R. Nesselroade and A. von Eye (eds.), Academic Press, New York, 1985.
31. B. D. Slife, Psychology's Reliance on Linear Time: A Reformulation, *Journal of Mind and Behavior*, 2, pp. 27-46, 1981.
32. J. R. Nesselroade, Sampling and Generalizability: Adult Development and Aging Research Examined within the General Methodological Framework of Selection, in *Methodological Issues in Aging Research*, K. W. Schaie, R. T. Campbell, W. Meredith, and S. C. Rawlings (eds.), Springer, New York, pp. 13-42, 1988.
33. R. A. Dixon, D. A. Kramer, and P. B. Baltes, Intelligence: A Life-Span Developmental Perspective, in *Handbook of Intelligence: Theories, Measurements, and Applications*, B. B. Wolman (ed.), Wiley, New York, pp. 301-350, 1985.
34. W. R. Cunningham and J. E. Birren, Age Changes in the Factor Structure of Intellectual Abilities in Adulthood and Old Age, *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 40, pp. 271-290, 1980.
35. C. Hertzog and K. W. Schaie, Stability and Change in Adult Intelligence: I. Analysis of Longitudinal Covariance Structures, *Psychology and Aging*, 1, pp. 159-171, 1986.
36. K. W. Schaie and C. Hertzog, Measurement in the Psychology of Adulthood and Aging, in *Handbook of the Psychology of Aging*, (2nd Edition), J. E. Birren and K. W. Schaie (eds.), Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York, pp. 61-92, 1985.

37. K. W. Schaie and C. Hertzog, Toward a Comprehensive Model of Adult Intellectual Development: Contributions of the Seattle Longitudinal Study, in *Advances in Human Intelligence*, Vol. 3, R. J. Sternberg (ed.), Academic Press, New York, pp. 79-118, 1986.
38. K. W. Schaie, S. L. Willis, C. Hertzog, and J. E. Schulenberg, Effects of Cognitive Training upon Primary Mental Ability Structure, *Psychology and Aging*, 2, pp. 233-242, 1987.
39. K. W. Schaie, S. L. Willis, G. Jay, and H. Chipuer, Structural Invariance of Cognitive Abilities across the Adult Life Span: A Cross-Sectional Study, *Developmental Psychology*, 25, pp. 652-662, 1989.
40. K. G. Jöreskog, Simultaneous Factor Analysis in Several Populations, *Psychometrika*, 36, pp. 409-426, 1971.
41. P. M. Bentler, Multivariate Analysis with Latent Variables: Causal Modeling, *Annual Review of Psychology*, 31, pp. 332-456, 1980.
42. C. Hertzog, On the Utility of Structural Regression Models for Developmental Research, in *Life-Span Development and Behavior*, Vol. 8, P. B. Baltes, D. Featherman, and R. M. Lerner (eds.), Erlbaum, Hillsdale, New Jersey, 1986.
43. K. G. Jöreskog and D. Sörbom, Statistical Models and Methods for Analysis of Longitudinal Data, in *Latent Variables in Socioeconomic Models*, D. J. Aigner and A. S. Goldberger (eds.), North Holland Publishers, Amsterdam, pp. 285-325, 1977.
44. K. W. Schaie and S. L. Willis, Can Intellectual Decline in the Elderly Be Reversed?, *Developmental Psychology*, 22, pp. 223-232, 1986.
45. J. R. Nesselroade, S. M. Stigler, and P. B. Baltes, Regression towards the Mean and the Study of Change, *Psychological Bulletin*, 88, pp. 622-637, 1980.
46. D. F. Alwin and D. J. Jackson, Applications of Simultaneous Factor Analysis to Issues of Factorial Invariance, in *Factor Analysis and Measurement*, D. J. Jackson and E. F. Borgatta (eds.), Sage, London, pp. 249-278, 1981.
47. D. A. Rock, C. E. Werts, and R. L. Flaugher, The Use of Analysis of Covariance Structures for Comparing the Psychometric Properties of Multiple Variables across Populations, *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 13, pp. 403-418, 1978.
48. G. Reinert, Comparative Factor Analytic Studies of Intelligence throughout the Human Life-Span, in *Life-Span Developmental Psychology: Research and Theory*, L. R. Goulet and P. B. Baltes (eds.), Academic Press, New York, pp. 467-484, 1970.
49. T. A. Salthouse, *Adult Cognition: An Experimental Psychology of Human Aging*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1982.

Direct reprint requests to:

K. Warner Schaie, Ph.D.
 Dept. of Human Development and Family Studies
 Penn State University
 110 Henderson Building South
 University Park, PA 16802