

9-2008

Clarifying the Use of Formative Measurement in the IS Discipline: The Case of Computer Self-Efficacy

Andrew M. Hardin

University of Nevada, Las Vegas, andrew.hardin@unlv.edu

Jerry Cha-Jan Chang

University of Nevada, Las Vegas, jchang@unlv.nevada.edu

Mark A. Fuller

University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/met_fac_articles



Part of the [Business Commons](#), and the [Systems and Communications Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Hardin, A. M., Chang, J. C., Fuller, M. A. (2008). Clarifying the Use of Formative Measurement in the IS Discipline: The Case of Computer Self-Efficacy. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 9(9), 544-546.

https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/met_fac_articles/5

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Management, Entrepreneurship and Technology at Digital Scholarship@UNLV. It has been accepted for inclusion in Management, Entrepreneurship and Technology Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@unlv.edu.

This article originally appeared in the *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 9 (9), 544-546.

Used with permission from the Association for Information Systems, Atlanta, GA; 404-413-7444;
www.aisnet.org. All rights reserved.

Journal of the Association for Information Systems

J AIS 

IS Research Perspective

Clarifying the Use of Formative Measurement in the IS Discipline: The Case of Computer Self-Efficacy

Andrew M. Hardin

College of Business
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
andrew.hardin@unlv.edu

Jerry Cha-Jan Chang

College of Business
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
jchang@unlv.nevada.edu

Mark A. Fuller

College of Business
Washington State University
mark@wsu.edu

Volume 9, Issue 9, pp. 544-546, September 2008

Clarifying the Use of Formative Measurement in the IS Discipline: The Case of Computer Self-Efficacy

1. Introduction

The spirited nature of the Marakas et al. reply speaks volumes about the importance of continuing the debate on how best to measure computer self-efficacy (CSE), as well as on the proper application of formative measurement in the IS discipline. While we believe that formative measurement can be appropriately applied in very specific situations, we also continue to witness the misapplication of formative measurement in our discipline, including (in our opinion) the formative specification of CSE.

We believe the potential exists (given the natural constraints of time) for researchers in any discipline to necessarily rely on oft-cited papers when drawing conclusions on how to properly employ formative measures. In preparing our original comment on Marakas et al. (2007), we reviewed more than three decades' worth of work on formative measurement, and when conflicting opinions were discovered, looked to well-known psychological methods experts for clarification. Given the large quantity of methodological work that has spanned multiple disciplines across extended periods of time, we believe synthesizing this research—and applying it to the particular context of CSE in the information systems discipline—can help us better understand not only CSE, but also formative measurements in general. Such an understanding allows us to appropriately and systematically advance knowledge in our discipline.

2. Computer Self-Efficacy as a Formative vs. Reflective Construct

Rather than attempting to address all of the points raised in the Marakas et al. reply, we will focus our response on four specific issues related to CSE and formative measurement: 1) the use of formative measurement to measure psychological constructs, 2) the incorporation of previously reflective items as part of a new formative measure, 3) the effect of employing different endogenous measures on formative measurement results, and 4) the change in conceptual meaning resulting from formative measurement.

To the first point, CSE is a psychological construct, and psychological constructs have been consistently suggested as unsuitable for formative measurement (Diamantopoulos and Winklhofer 2001). For example, one central criterion for identifying formative constructs is that changes in the construct do not cause changes in the indicators (see Jarvis et al. 2003 for more on this issue). CSE as a psychological construct appears to fall short in this respect, as it seems clear that changes in a person's CSE would naturally cause changes in the indicators used to measure the concept.

To the second point, for two of the formative CSE measures developed by Marakas et al. (2007), (i.e., spreadsheet CSE and GCSE), the item pool consisted solely of indicators taken from two previously validated reflective CSE measures. We believe this may inadvertently send the (incorrect) message to IS researchers that it is acceptable to simply re-specify existing reflective indicators as formative without carefully considering the substantive theory underlying the construct.

To the third point, the formative CSE indicators proposed by Marakas et al. (2007) were in many cases dependent on the endogenous variable used to estimate them. Thus, many of the indicators that were retained represented the "best" predictors of the endogenous variable used for their estimation, and, as we illustrated empirically in our response, are not necessarily the best predictors when employed in a different context. While we understand that some indicators were retained in Marakas et al. based on the authors' collective belief that they were instrumental to the construct, we suggest that this criteria is too subjective, and that different researchers would quite possibly make different decisions in this regard.

Finally, because formative indicator weights are dependent on the nomological net in which they are estimated, and formative indicator weights are used to determine the conceptual meaning of constructs, the conceptual definitions of CSE formative constructs will likely differ as they are employed in different research models and contexts, impeding development of a cumulative CSE

research tradition.

3. Conclusion

The main focus of our comment is to caution researchers on the danger of misapplying formative measures in the IS domain, in this case as it pertains to CSE. As Marakas et al. point out in their reply to our comment, formative measurement is here to stay, so we believe it is critical that (as a discipline) we understand when, and when not, to use it. Without the appropriate application of the tools in our scientific toolkit, our ability to move knowledge forward in a systematic fashion is limited. We think there is no greater contribution to any discipline than to be sure that the processes used to conduct research are appropriate to the context.

We would like to express our sincere gratitude to Marakas et al. for their continued contribution to the CSE literature, and for raising the opportunity to discuss the relative merits of formative vs. reflective measurement. We would also like to thank the three anonymous reviewers and senior editor for their constructive feedback on preparing our comment, as well as a number of methodological experts who graciously took the time to discuss this issue with us. Given the frequent application of the CSE construct in IS research, and the inherent difficulty of interpreting the large body of literature surrounding both the concept of self-efficacy and formative measurement, further discussion regarding these issues is clearly justified.

References

- Diamantopoulos, A., and Winklhofer, H.M. "Index construction with formative indicators," *Journal of Marketing Research*, (38) 2001, pp 269-277.
- Jarvis, C.B., MacKenzie, S.B., and Podsakoff, P. "A critical review of construct indicators and measurement model mis-specification in marketing and consumer research," *Journal of Consumer Research*, (30) 2003, pp 1999-1216.
- Marakas, G., Johnson, R., and Clay, P. "The Evolving Nature of the Computer Self-Efficacy Construct: An Empirical Investigation of Measurement Construction, Validity, Reliability and Stability Over Time," *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, (8:1) 2007, pp 16-46.



Editor
Kalle Lyytinen
 Case Western Reserve University, USA

Senior Editors			
Robert Fichman	Boston College, USA	Dennis Galletta	University of Pittsburgh, USA
Varun Grover	Clemson University, USA	Rudy Hirschheim	Louisiana State University, USA
Robert Kauffman	University of Minnesota, USA	Frank Land	London School of Economics, UK
Jeffrey Parsons	Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada	Suzanne Rivard	Ecole des Hautes Etudes Commerciales, Canada
Ananth Srinivasan	University of Auckland, New Zealand	Bernard C.Y. Tan	National University of Singapore, Singapore
Michael Wade	York University, Canada	Ping Zhang	Syracuse University, USA
Editorial Board			
Steve Alter	University of San Francisco, USA	Kemal Altinkemer	Purdue University, USA
Michael Barrett	University of Cambridge, UK	Cynthia Beath	University of Texas at Austin, USA
Michel Benaroch	University of Syracuse, USA	Francois Bodart	University of Namur, Belgium
Marie-Claude Boudreau	University of Georgia, USA	Susan A. Brown	University of Arizona, USA
Tung Bui	University of Hawaii, USA	Andrew Burton-Jones	University of British Columbia, Canada
Dave Chatterjee	University of Georgia, USA	Patrick Y.K. Chau	University of Hong Kong, China
Mike Chiasson	Lancaster University, UK	Mary J. Culnan	Bentley College, USA
Jan Damsgaard	Copenhagen Business School, Denmark	Samer Faraj	University of Maryland, College Park, USA
Chris Forman	Carnegie Mellon University, USA	Ola Henfridsson	Viktoria Institute & Halmstad University, Sweden
Hitora Higashikuni	Tokyo University of Science, Japan	Kai Lung Hui	National University of Singapore, Singapore
Hemant Jain	University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, USA	Bill Kettinger	University of South Carolina, USA
Rajiv Kohli	College of William and Mary, USA	Mary Lacity	University of Missouri-St. Louis, USA
Ho Geun Lee	Yonsei University, Korea	Jae-Nam Lee	Korea University
Kai H. Lim	City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong	Ji-Ye Mao	Remnin University, China
Anne Massey	Indiana University, USA	Emmanuel Monod	Dauphine University, France
Michael Myers	University of Auckland, New Zealand	Fiona Fui-Hoon Nah	University of Nebraska-Lincoln, USA
Mike Newman	University of Manchester, UK	Jonathan Palmer	College of William and Mary, USA
Paul Palou	University of California, Riverside, USA	Brian Pentland	Michigan State University, USA
Yves Pigneur	HEC, Lausanne, Switzerland	Jaana Porra	University of Houston, USA
Sandeep Purao	Penn State University, USA	T. S. Raghu	Arizona State University, USA
Dewan Rajiv	University of Rochester, USA	Balasubramaniam Ramesh	Georgia State University, USA
Timo Saarinen	Helsinki School of Economics, Finland	Susan Scott	The London School of Economics and Political Science, UK
Ben Shao	Arizona State University, USA	Olivia Sheng	University of Utah, USA
Carsten Sorensen	The London School of Economics and Political Science, UK	Katherine Stewart	University of Maryland, USA
Mani Subramani	University of Minnesota, USA	Burt Swanson	University of California at Los Angeles, USA
Dov Te'eni	Tel Aviv University, Israel	Jason Thatcher	Clemson University, USA
Ron Thompson	Wake Forest University, USA	Christian Wagner	City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong
Eric Walden	Texas Tech University, USA	Eric Wang	National Central University, Taiwan
Jonathan Wareham	ESADE, Spain	Stephanie Watts	Boston University, USA
Bruce Weber	London Business School, UK	Tim Weitzel	Bamberg University, Germany
Richard Welke	Georgia State University, USA	George Westerman	Massachusetts Institute of Technology, USA
Kevin Zhu	University of California at Irvine, USA	Ilze Zigurs	University of Nebraska at Omaha, USA
Administrator			
Eph McLean	AIS, Executive Director	Georgia State University, USA	
J. Peter Tinsley	Deputy Executive Director	Association for Information Systems, USA	
Reagan Ramsower	Publisher	Baylor University	