IDEA GROUP PUBLISHING



701 E. Chocolate Avenue, Suite 200, Hershey PA 17033-1240, USA Tel: 717/533-8845; Fax 717/533-8661; URL-http://www.idea-group.com

ITB9359

Chapter III

A Multitrait-Multimethod Analysis of the End User Computing Satisfaction and Computer Self-Efficacy Instruments

Michael J. Masterson United States Air Force, USA

R. Kelly Rainer, Jr. Auburn University, USA

ABSTRACT

Researchers are employing confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with multitraitmultimethod (MTMM) matrices to estimate parameters representing trait, method, and error variance, as well as parameters representing the correlations among traits (or factors). This study utilizes CFA with MTMM matrices to assess the convergent validity, discriminant validity, and the presence and effects of method variance in the end-user computing satisfaction instrument (EUCSI) and the computer self-efficacy instrument (CSE).

The results of the study indicate that, in these samples, the two instruments demonstrate adequate convergent and discriminant validity, but that method variance is present and accounts for a large proportion of the variance in both models. Further, the proposed factor structure of the EUCSI appears to be unstable as a result of the effects

This chapter appears in the book, *The Handbook of Information Systems Research*, edited by Michael E. Whitman and Amy B. Wosczynski. Copyright © 2004, Idea Group Inc. Copying or distributing in print or electronic forms without written permission of Idea Group Inc. is prohibited.

of multiple methods, while the proposed factor structure of the CSE remains stable in the presence of the methods.

INTRODUCTION

The development of constructs and instruments to operationalize them provide a theoretical basis for research in a discipline (Venkatraman & Grant, 1986). Indeed, concerns with management information systems as a cohesive research discipline have long included inadequate construct development and a lack of valid, reliable measurement constructs (see, e.g., Dickson, Benbasat, & King, 1980; Keen, 1980).

In the ongoing process of instrument validation, researchers are employing confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with multitrait-multimethod (MTMM) matrices to estimate parameters representing trait, method, and error variance, as well as parameters representing the correlations among traits (or factors; Bagozzi & Yi, 1990; Byrne, 1994; Schmitt & Stults, 1986; Widaman, 1985). Using CFA with Widaman's (p. 6) taxonomy of covariance structure models allows researchers to test for statistically significant differences between hierarchically ordered, or nested, models. These tests permit researchers to assess convergent validity, discriminant validity, and the presence and effects of method variance (Bagozzi & Yi; Widaman).

Two instruments (among others), widely used in MIS studies, have research streams devoted to assessing their validity and reliability: the end-user computing satisfaction instrument (Doll & Torkzadeh, 1988; see Table 1) and the computer self-efficacy instrument (Murphy, Coover, & Owen, 1989; see Table 2). The purpose of this study is to utilize CFA with multitrait-multimethod matrices to assess the convergent validity, discriminant validity, and the presence and effects of method variance in these two instruments.

BACKGROUND

Convergent validity occurs when a measure correlates highly with other variables that should measure the same construct (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955). Discriminant validity occurs when a measure fails to correlate highly with measures of different, distinct constructs (Cronbach & Meehl).

Cronbach (1946) described the concept of method variance by noting that test responses may be influenced by variables other than the one ostensibly tested. Method variance is that variance attributable to measurement method rather than to the constructs of interest (Bagozzi & Yi, 1990; Campbell & Fiske, 1959). Researchers have concluded that method variance is common and accounts for substantial variance in research data collected from studies using only self-report questionnaires (Bagozzi & Yi; Spector, 1987; Williams, Cote, & Buckley, 1989).

Ideally, method variance would not be present or, if present, would not be statistically significant. Method variance is undesirable for two reasons. First, method variance reduces the validity of item responses. Second, when significant method variance is present, researchers cannot be confident that the instrument actually 15 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage: <u>www.igi-</u> <u>global.com/chapter/multitrait-multimethod-analysis-end-</u> user/30341

Related Content

Diagnosing and Redesigning a Health(y) Organisation: An Action Research Study

Christoph Rosenkranz, Marcus Laumannand Roland Holten (2009). *International Journal of Information Technologies and Systems Approach (pp. 33-47).* www.irma-international.org/article/diagnosing-redesigning-healthy-organisation/2545

Improving Health Care Management Through the Use of Dynamic Simulation Modeling and Health Information Systems

Daniel Goldsmithand Michael Siegel (2012). *International Journal of Information Technologies and Systems Approach (pp. 19-36).* www.irma-international.org/article/improving-health-care-management-through/62026

Classification of Sentiment of Reviews using Supervised Machine Learning Techniques

Abinash Tripathyand Santanu Kumar Rath (2017). *International Journal of Rough* Sets and Data Analysis (pp. 56-74).

www.irma-international.org/article/classification-of-sentiment-of-reviews-using-supervisedmachine-learning-techniques/169174

Green Libraries on Cloud Computing Platform

Mayank Yuvaraj (2015). Encyclopedia of Information Science and Technology, Third Edition (pp. 3901-3911).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/green-libraries-on-cloud-computing-platform/112831

Modified LexRank for Tweet Summarization

Avinash Samueland Dilip Kumar Sharma (2016). *International Journal of Rough Sets and Data Analysis (pp. 79-90).*

www.irma-international.org/article/modified-lexrank-for-tweet-summarization/163105