

Al. Ioan Cuza University  
Faculty of Economics and Business Administration  
Doctoral School of Economics

# **Influence factors on the value of reliability estimators in marketing research**

- Summary -

Scientific Coordinator:

Prof. dr. Adriana Zaiț

Phd. Student:

Ursachi George Marian

Iași, 2012

## *Introduction*

This paper presents an analysis of the influence factors on the value of one of the most used estimators of the research reliability in marketing field, Cronbach's Alpha estimator. In the literature this estimator often use features in determining the level of reliability in marketing research is considered to be independent of the external factors, its value being influenced only by internal factors of the instrument, pertaining to its construction. The thesis presents a series of cases in which the same instrument obtain different values for Alpha estimator applied to different groups of respondents. These results indicate an influence of external factors on the value of the estimator.

The thesis includes a special program created in GAUSS language, based on Bootstrap technique, with which you can perform tests and comparisons between different values of the estimator, obtained for different samples. This program simulates a distribution of Alpha estimator, based on wich tests may be applied.

The conclusions of this study indicate an influence, sometimes very strong, of external factors on the value of reliability estimators and suggest the need for a rigorous reliability and validity of instruments approach, especially for investigations on a very diverse population.

Key words: Cronbach's Alpha, reliability estimators, internal consistency, reliability, validity, Bootstrap.

The thesis contents are as follows:

**Summary** Error! Bookmark not defined.

**Abstract** Error! Bookmark not defined.

**INTRODUCTION** ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

**1. Research premises. Necessity, curiosity, research** 0

**2. The purpose and the objectives of the research** Error! Bookmark not defined.

**3. Research Methodology** Error! Bookmark not defined.

**4. Operationalization of concepts** Error! Bookmark not defined.

**PART I. LITERATURE REVIEW** ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

**1. Purpose and objectives of the theoretical analysis** Error! Bookmark not defined.

**2. Theoretical section methodology** Error! Bookmark not defined.

**Chapter I. Validity and reliability in marketing research** Error! Bookmark not defined.

**I.1. Validity in marketing research** Error! Bookmark not defined.

I.1.1. Validity in qualitative research **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

I.1.2. Validity in quantitative research **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

I.1.3. Types of validity **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

I.1.3.1. Content validity **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

I.1.3.2. Criterion validity **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

I.1.3.3. Construct validity **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Method 1. Correlation between variables and construct **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Method 2. Different studies **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Method 3. Factor analysis **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Method 4. Convergent validity and divergent validity **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

**I.2. Reliability in marketing research** Error! Bookmark not defined.

Conceptual definitions **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Measurement related definitions **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Statistical definitions **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

I.2.1. Reliability in qualitative research **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

I.2.2. Reliability in quantitative research **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

I.2.3. Types of reliability **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

I.2.3.1. Inter-rater reliability **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

I.2.3.2. Test-retest reliability **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

I.2.3.3. Parallel test reliability **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

I.2.3.4. Internal consistency **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

I.2.4. Internal consistency **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

I.2.4.1. General aspects **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

I.2.4.1.1. Split-half test **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

I.2.4.1.2. Kuder-Richardson estimator	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
I.2.4.1.3. Cronbach's Alpha	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
I.2.4.1.4. Tarkkonen's Rho – a wider version of Cronbach's Alpha	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
<b>Chapter II. Cronbach's Alpha</b>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<b>II.1. General aspects</b>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<b>II.2. Estimation of reliability with Cronbach's Alpha. Theoretical considerations</b>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<b>II.3. Issues pro and against the estimator Cronbach's Alpha</b>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<b>II.4. Influence factors on the Cronbach's Alpha estimator</b>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<b>II.5. Limitations in using Cronbach's Alpha estimator</b>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<b>Chapter III. Simulation techniques. Bootstrap</b>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<b>III.1. Bootstrap. Theoretical considerations. Use</b>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<b>III.2. Overcoming some limits using Bootstrap</b>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<b>III.3. Using Bootstrap to achieve research objectives</b>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<b>Theoretical analysis conclusions</b>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<b>PART II. ANALYSIS AND PILOT STUDY</b>	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
<b>1. Why? (is Alpha changing for the same instrument)</b>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<b>2. Implications</b>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<b>3. Chapter objectives</b>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<b>4. Methodology - Strategy chosen</b>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<b>Chapter IV. Analysis of differences in the value of Alpha coefficients</b>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<b>Chapter V. Pilot study</b>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
V.1. The objectives of the pilot study	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
V.2. Possible variables	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
V.3. Hypothesis of pilot study	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
V.4. „ Testing ” pilot study hypothesis	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
V.5. What will be the bootstrap contribution at this point?	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
V.6. Pilot study conclusions	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
<b>PART III. QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH</b>	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
<b>Chapter VI. Quantitative research objectives</b>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Metodology for the quantitative research	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>

**Chapter VII. Data analysis. The research results**

- VII.1. Data analysis for Instrument A.
- VII.2. Results for Instrument A
- VII.3. Data analysis for Instrument B.
- VII.4. Results for Instrument B
- VII.5. Data analysis for Instrument C.
- VII.6. Results for Instrument C
- VII.7. Data analysis on factors
- VII.8. Quantitative research hypothesis
  - VII.8.1. Statistic hypothesis
  - VII.8.2. Results – testing the hypothesis
- VII.9. Quantitative research conclusions

Error! Bookmark not defined.  
**Error! Bookmark not defined.**  
**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

<b>Final conclusions</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Researcher's contributions</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Managerial implications and directions</b>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<b>Research limits</b>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<b>Future directions of the research</b>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<b>List of Figures</b>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<b>Annex</b>	Error! Bookmark not defined.

### *Research premises*

Research tools are those that provide ways for science to advance. The safer they are and better adapted to their purpose the more the data we will collect will help us in developing reliable conclusions, reflecting accurately the reality, phenomena, actions, intentions, perceptions, or any other aspect researchers pursue to clarify.

To provide useful data, research tools must simultaneously fulfill two conditions: to be valid and reliable. Reliability means that an instrument measure a phenomenon with consistency. Better said, reliability means that for more measurements of the same phenomenon the tool should provide the same result. This does not mean however that the result is also correct. Validity, on the other hand, involves a measurement accuracy, that an instrument really measure what it says it measures.

To be valid, however, a tool must be reliable first. To measure this reliability there have been developed over the years a number of methods, each with its peculiarities. In marketing research, the most widely used reliability estimator is Cronbach's Alpha, an indicator developed by Cronbach since 1951.

Alpha estimator has been and continues to be, maybe because of its excessive use, the subject of extensive analysis and debate.

The factor that pushed me towards this research was the curiosity. Assisting at one presentation of a colleague I noticed that there are differences between the values of Alpha for the same instrument. Or, Alpha is an estimator based on the calculation of correlation and whose value depends theoretical only on internal factors, related to the construction of the instrument.

The next step was to search for studies in this direction, of influence factors on the value of Alpha not related to instrument construction and noticed that this has been very little studied and not clear. I went ahead and asked the opinion of some people more informed than me in the field about the possibility of such influences and we concluded that these influences are due covariance, more precisely, there are many external factors influencing the relationship between the tool's elements. That is what this research seeks to identify, those external factors influencing the relationship between the tool's elements and therefore which affect the value of the reliability estimator.

### ***The purpose and the objectives of the research***

The thesis has a multidisciplinary character, as to achieve goals and objectives there are necessary knowledge from marketing, statistics and econometrics fields.

The work was done from the view of a marketing researcher who wants to know and master the external factors influencing the accuracy of the instruments used in research.

Research is divided into three parts: one theoretical analysis, analysis accompanied by a pilot study and empirical research.

**The overall goal** of doctoral research is: *Finding external factors that manifest influence on relations between the elements of the instrument and indirectly on the value of Cronbach's Alpha estimator and grouping them into categories according to the characteristics of the instruments.*

The **general objectives** of the research are derived from its purpose and are the following:

- Discovery of external factors that manifest indirectly influence the value of Cronbach Alpha;
- Determine, if possible the intensity and direction of the influences;
- Identify possible links between the characteristics of the instruments and the nature of the external factors influencing the value of Alpha;
- Testing the differences of Alpha values caused by the external factors analyzed.

### ***Final conclusions of the research***

The theoretical analysis of this thesis provides an overview of the domain of the validity and reliability of research instruments in science in general and marketing in particular. The field mentioned above is very important for any scientist but is, paradoxically, very confusing and controversial. In the theoretical section I made a classification and an ordering of roots and key concepts that make up the field.

Also in this section I presented a number of limitations in using Cronbach Alpha estimator. To overcome some of these at the end of the theoretical section I suggested a technique used in econometrics, namely the bootstrap.

I have created, along with PhD. Ruben Seiberlich at the University of Konstanz, Germany, a GAUSS program code that lets you create simulated distribution of the estimator Alpha, from the base sample which is considered representative. This distribution with the standard error allows us to apply tests and compare different values of the estimator.

Studying literature and relevant articles in the field led to a first outline of the research hypotheses. For formulating final hypotheses a pilot study followed, after which were added a number of variables.

The pilot study was conducted on a sample of 300 people and consisted of an analysis of the differences that have arisen between different categories of individuals on a number of external variables.

The quantitative research consisted of a questionnaire-based survey. 3 tools were used, applied to a total population of 900 individuals, as follows: 300 individuals instrument A, 300 individuals instrument B and 300 individuals instrument C.

Data analysis was done using SPSS and program designed in GAUSS by the Phd., based on Bootstrap technique.

The quantitative research began from the general objectives mentioned above.

Thus, the first objective has been achieved since there were discovered a number of 9 external factors that have significant influence on the value of Cronbach Alpha estimator. The differences were tested using the GAUSS program created one of the scales used in research and proved to be statistically significant.

The intensity of the influences differs from a scale to another and the direction of these influences differs also.

Regarding the links between instrument's characteristics and the nature of the factors influencing the value of the estimator, the study was inconclusive.

The differences between Alpha values caused by external factors were, as mentioned above, statistically tested for one particular scale - *ease of use*. The Gauss program was created only for 3 items scales and this is why I only tested that scale. Other scales studied were composed of 4, 10, 18 and 32-items. Writing a program adapted to a greater number of items is a future direction of the research.

The quantitative research tested a total of 9 hypotheses based on external factors obtained through documentary study and pilot study.

With eight confirmed and one partially confirmed hypotheses, the research draws a warning on the use of scales and hence on the use of research tools on varied populations. Furthermore, the chapter on factors analysis results we can see that the tools that are more

likely to present problems in some segments of the population caused by one of the analyzed factors are those that have a lower value estimator . In these cases variations within sample groups determined by factors of influence are larger and more often significant, sometimes there are classes for which the instrument is very poorly adapted or inappropriate

In conclusion, the thesis has experienced a difficult road, from a research curiosity and an idea that seemed at one point not to bring much in sight and reach the end where it succeed (the researcher hopes) to arouse the reader's curiosity, informed or uninformed, to take a database and test (at least at a starting level) if there are no categories of respondents, due to the factors identified in this research or other factors, which to question the scale used. The alarm is mainly drawn for the tools that get a value of the reliability estimators around the inferior limit, but are not excluded scales with very high values of reliability estimators.

### ***Researcher's contributions***

A first contribution that the researcher brings to marketing field, especially in the Romania, is the theoretical analysis that presents an overview of the concepts of validity and reliability of research instruments. The theme is briefly and incomplete treated in romanian marketing literature and the present study may be useful to many researchers both by its content and by bibliographic references it provides.

Another important contribution is the alarm that the study drags on research work with a reliability level at the limit of acceptability and on the need to adapt the instruments according to the specific of the population studied.

Another important contribution is the software designed by the Phd. student in GAUSS language, based on Bootstrap technique, creating a program that allows simulated distribution of estimator Alpha Cronbach and the application of tests for comparisons between different values of the estimators. To apply this program we should keep in mind that we assume that the sample we use is representative, without this assumption would not support the conclusions.

Last but not the least important contribution that the researcher brings to the field is the opening of a new research field, research of instruments reliability and of the need to adapt them according to the composition of the population studied, by a series of demographic and psychographic variables.

## ***Bibliography***

1. AERA. (1999). Standards for educational and psychological testing. *American Educational Research Association* .
2. Anastasi, A. (1988). Psychological Testing, ed. 6. *New York: MacMillan* .
3. Bernardi, R. A. (1994). Validating research when Cronbach's alpha is below .70: A metodological procedure. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, Vol. 54* , 766-775.
4. Brennan, L. (2007). Validity in Market Research Practice: 'New' is Not Always 'Improved'. *Der Markt* , 6-16.
5. Brown, W. (1910). Some experimental results in the correlation of mental abilities. *British Journal of Psychology, nr.3* , 296–322.
6. Bruner, G. (2009). *Marketing Scales Handbook, vol. 5*. Carbondale, Illinois: GCBII Productions.
7. Cameron A. C. și Trivedi P. K. (2005). *Microeconometrics. Methods and Applications*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
8. Charles, C. M. (1995). Introduction to educational research ed.2. *San Diego, Longman*
9. Christmann, A. și Van Aelst, S. (2006). Robust Estimation of Cronbach's Alpha. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis, Vol. 97* , 1661-1674.
10. Cortina, J. M. (1993). What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and applications. *Journal of Applied Psychology* , 98–104.
11. Creswell, J. W. și Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into Practice 39(3)* , 124-131.
12. Crocker, L., și Algina, J. (1986). Introduction to classical and modern test theory. *RineHart* .
13. Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, Vol.16* , 297-334.
14. Cronbach, L. J. (1988). Internal consistency of tests: Analyses old and new. *Psychometrika* , 53 - 63.
15. Davies, D. și Dodd, J. (2002). Qualitative research and the question of rigor. *Qualitative Health research, 12(2)* , 279-289.
16. DeVellis, R. F. (1991). Scale Development: Theory and Applications. *Newbury Park: Sage* .

17. Diamantopoulos, A. (2005). Procedure for scale development in marketing. A comment. *International Journal of Research in Marketing* , 1-9.
18. Eisner, E. W. (1991). The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice. *Macmillan Publishing Company*.
19. Golafshani, N. (2003). Understanding Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research. *The Qualitative Report* , 2.
20. Green, B. F. (1981). A primer of testing. *American Psychologist* nr.36 , 1001–1011.
21. Green, S. B., Lissitz, R.W., și Mulaik, S. A. (1977). Limitations of coefficient alpha as an index of test unidimensionality. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* nr.37 , 827–838.
22. Hogan, T.P., Benjamin, A. și Brezinski, K.L. (2000). Reliability Methods. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, Vol.60* , 523-531.
23. Hulin, C., Netemeyer,R., și Cudeck, R. (2001). Can a Reliability Coefficient Be Too High? *Journal of Consumer Psychology, Vol. 10, Nr. 1* , 55-58.
24. Iacobucci, D. și Duhachek, A. (2003). Advancing Alpha: Measuring Reliability with Confidence. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, Vol. 13* , 478-487.
25. Joppe, M. (2000). The Research Process.
26. Kaplan, R.M. și Saccuzzo, D. P. (1993). Psychological Testing: Principles, Applications, and Issues. *Pacific Groves* .
27. Kirk, J., & Miller, M. L. (1986). Reliability and validity in qualitative research. *Sage Publications*
28. Kopalle, P. K., și Lehmann, D. R. (1997). Alpha inflation? The impact of eliminating scale items on Cronbach's alpha. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, Vol.70* , 189-197.
29. Li, H., Rosenthal, R., și Rubin, D. B. (1996). Reliability of measurement in psychology: From Spearman-Brown to maximal reliability. *Psychologica lMethods* , 98-107.
30. Li, H., și Wainer, H. (1997). Toward a Coherent View of Reliability in Test Theory. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics, Vol. 22, Nr. 4* , 478-484.
31. Lincoln, Y. S., și Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. *Sage* .
32. Maydeu-Olivares, A., Coffman, D.L., Garcia-Ferero, C. și Gallardo-Pujol, D. (2010). Hypothesis testing for coefficient alpha:An SEM approach. *Behavior Research Methods, Vol.42* , 618-625.
33. McDonald, R. P. (1999). Test theory: A unified treatment. *Psychology Press* .

34. McGarland Rubio, D., și Kimberly, K.-L. (2005). Content Validity. *Encyclopedia of Social Measurement* , 495-498.
35. Mendoza, J. L., Stafford, K. L., și Stauffer, J. M. (2000). Large sample confidence intervals for validity and reliability coefficients. *Psychological Methods* , 356-369.
36. Montag, C. (2008). Does Speed in Completing an Online Questionnaire Have an Influence on Its Reliability? *Cyberpsychology & Behavior, Vol. 11* , 719-721.
37. Norman, C. (1984). An Improved Internal Consistency Reliability Estimate. *Journal of Educational Statistics, Vol. 9* , 151-161.
38. Nunnally, J. C. și Bernstein, I. H. (1994). Psychometric Theory ed.3. *New York: McGraw Hill* .
39. Osburn, H. G. (2000). Coefficient alpha and related internal consistency reliability coefficients. *Psychological Methods* , 343-355.
40. Patton, M. Q. (2002). Qualitative evaluation and research methods ed.3. *Thousand Oaks* .
41. Payne, R. W. (1989). Reliability theory and clinical psychology. *Journal of Clinical Psychology nr.45* , 351-353.
42. Peter, P. J. (1981). Construct Validity: A Review of Basic Issues and Marketing Practices. *Journal of Marketing Research, Vol. 18, Nr. 2* , 133-145.
43. Peterson, R. A. (1994). A Meta-analysis of Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha. *Journal of Consumer Research, Vol.21* , 381-391.
44. Revelle, W. (1979). Hierarchical cluster analysis and the internal structure of tests. *Multivariate Behavioral Research nr.14* , 57-74.
45. Saini, K. K., Sehgal, R.K., și Sethi, B.L. (2008). Evaluation of general classes of reliability estimators often used in statistical analyses of quasi-experimental designs. *American Institute of Physics* .
46. Schmitt, N. (1996). Uses and abuses of coefficient alpha. *Psychological Assessment nr.8* , 350-353.
47. Seale, C. (1999). Quality in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 5(4)* , 465-478.
48. Silverman, D. (2004). *Qualitative Research. Theory, Method and Practice* (ed. Second). Sage Publications.
49. Sitjma, K. (2009). On the use, misuse and the very limited usefulness of Cronbach's Alpha. *Psychometrika, Vol.74* , 107-120.
50. Spearman, C. (1910). Correlation calculated from faulty data. . *British Journal of Psychology, nr.3* , 271-295.

51. Spearman, C. (1904). The proof and measurement of association between two things. *The American Journal of Psychology*, nr.15 , 72–101.
52. Stenbacka, C. (2001). Qualitative research requires quality concepts of its own. *Management Decision* , 551-555.
53. Strauss, A., și Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques. *Sage Publications* .
54. Tzeng, O. C. S., și Welch, J. (1999). Inconsistencies Across Three Contextual Meanings of Reliability. *Quality & Quantity*, nr. 33 , 117–133.
55. Ursachi, G. M. (2011). Influence Factors on the Value of Reliability Estimators in Marketing Research. *Analele universității Ovidiu din Constanța. Seria Științe Economice, volumul XI, Issue 2/2011* .
56. Ursachi, G. M., Ursachi(Horodnic), I. A. (2011). Influence Factors on the Value of Reliability Estimators in Marketing Research. *Ovidius University Annals, vol. XI, issue 1* , 2223-2228.
57. Vehkalahti, K., Puntanen, S. și Tarkkonen, L. (2006). Estimation of Reliability: a better alternative for Cronbach's Alpha. *Elsevier Science* , 1-19.
58. Wainer, H., și Braun, H. I. (1988). Test validity. *Lawrence Earlbaum Associates* .
59. Winter, G. (2000). A comparative discussion of the notion of validity in qualitative and quantitative research. *The Qualitative Report* .
60. Zinbarg, R., Revelle, W., Yovel, I. și Li, W. (2005). Cronbach's , Revelle's , and McDonald's : Their relations with each other and two alternative conceptualizations of reliability. *Psychometrika* nr.70 , 123–133.
61. Zinbarg, R., Yovel, I., Revelle, W. și McDonald, R. (2006). Estimating generalizability to a universe of indicators that all have an attribute in common: A comparison of estimators. *Applied Psychological Measurement* nr. 30 , 121–144.