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“LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, MY MOTHER...OUR NEXT PRESIDENT”: EXPLORING THE DOUBLE BIND

Yvette Lynne Bonaparte, North Carolina Central University

ABSTRACT

At times, women of influence and power encourage audiences to focus on the notion that women leaders employ both traditionally, masculine and feminine characteristics (Jamieson, 1995). In 2016, the first women presidential nominee of a major party in the United States, Hillary Clinton, was challenged by gender-bias in the same way that numerous other women political candidates have been (Adams, 2011). A summative content analysis of the introduction speech made by Chelsea Clinton introducing her mother Hillary Clinton at the 2016 Democratic National Convention reveals the presence of gender-based stereotypes. This study also reports the results of comparative analysis in which Chelsea Clinton’s introduction speech of her mother is compared with Ivanka Trump’s introduction speech of her father as the Republican presidential nominee.

INTRODUCTION

The United States 2016 presidential election was unique in many ways. “The rise of Donald Trump as a political outsider has shattered a lot of preconceived notions of what it takes to be a successful political contender for the United States Presidency” (Dodo, 2016, p. 593). For example, “he is the first President in American history without prior government experience” (Fuchsman, 2017, p. 293). In contrast, the emergence of Hillary Clinton as the first woman presidential nominee of a major party is remarkable as well. Clinton’s 25 year presence in national politics resulted in “a profile unlike any woman before her in history” (Claassen and Ryan, 2016, p. 735).

Numerous studies have analyzed presidential campaign speeches and candidates of various elections. The 2016 United States presidential election presents an interesting opportunity to analyze the introduction speeches for each of the major party nominees. An important element shared by both major party nominees is the introduction of each of them by their daughter (Ivanka Trump and Chelsea Clinton) at the republican and democratic national conventions respectively. The analysis of the introduction speech for Hillary Clinton highlights themes reflective of gender stereotypes and illustrates the gender based competence and femininity double bind.

PRESIDENTIAL CONVENTIONS AND CAMPAIGNS

Presidential nominating conventions provide a formal mechanism for political parties to nominate candidates for both president and vice president. Additionally these party conventions provide an opportunity to mobilize support for the party platform through pageantry, presentations and speeches (Fine, 2003). Conventions take place over a number of days during which the convening party receives substantial attention from voters (Cera and Weinschenk, 2012). “During a convention, the convening party captures nearly all conventional media coverage and monopolizes it for several days” (Cera and Weinschenk, 2012, p. 162). According to Fortune
Magazine the 2016 Republican National Convention was viewed by 34.9 million people and the Democratic National Convention was viewed by 32.4 million people. This level of viewerhip illustrates the importance and impact of such events as a communications and marketing channel that can be categorized as both a personal appearance as well as a media event.

Presidential campaigns provide an opportunity for scholars from a number of disciplines (e.g. political scientists, communication scholars among others) the opportunity to analyze data related to public persuasion (Lowry and Naser, 2010). During presidential campaigns, candidates employ messaging strategies through multiple channels as voices of the candidate, media and public converge in campaign dialogue (Tedesco, 2001). In 2010, Lowry and Naser analyzed over 1,000 presidential television commercials to determine the presence of particular rhetorical variables in the advertising of presidential winners and losers. Specifically, their findings indicate that commercials associated with presidential winners were significantly higher on the following variables: collectives, inspiration, accomplishment, temporal terms, centrality, rapport, and exclusion. Table 1 summarizes this list of rhetorical variable and the words used to describe each of the variables.

| RHETORICAL VARIABLES ASSOCIATED WITH TELEVISION COMMERCIALS OF PRESIDENTIAL WINNERS |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Rhetorical Variable              | Words used to describe the variable              |
| Collectives                     | coalition, community, country, economy, family, group, housing, public, race and team |
| Inspiration                     | beauty, courage, dedication, faith, goodness, honor, hope, ideals, liberty, love, loyalty, pride, security, and trust |
| Accomplishment                  | achieve, campaign, change, deliver, develop, employee, establish, expand, finish, generate, improve, organize, produce, results, work and workers |
| Temporal Terms                  | decade, elderly, elders, history, immediate, lifetime, memory, memories, morning, present, senior, seniors, timeless, today, tomorrow and tradition |
| Centrality                      | conformity, core, custom, destiny, enduring foundation, humanity, mainstream, majority, primary, reliable, standard, steadfast, steady, unified and unify |
| Rapport                         | agree, comply, confirm, conform, consent, devote, embrace, empathy, endorse, pledge, pledges, tolerance, unison, and willing |
| Exclusion                       | alone, discard, displace, divisions, exclude, foreign, ignore, inequality, isolationism, opposed, prejudice, racism and reject |


It is plausible that these rhetorical variables have similar impact when communicated in alternate media channels such as personal appearances, and related speeches and presentations.

WOMEN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES

Substantial progress has taken place relative to gender equality in the United States since 1848 and the historic Seneca Falls Convention; the convention that fueled the women’s suffrage
movement (Adams, 2011). According to the Rutgers Eagleton Institute of Politics – Center for American Women and Politics, women have participated in presidential elections as candidates for the presidency since 1872. In that year, Victoria Claflin Woodhull became the first woman to run for president as a member of the Equal Rights Party. In 1964, Margaret Chase Smith, became the first women presidential candidate to seek a major party nomination. Eight years later, in 1972 Shirley Anita Chisholm became the first African American women to seek a major party nomination. In 2016, following attempts by other accomplished women (Patsy Takemoto Mink, Ellen McCormack, Patricia Schroeder, Elizabeth Hanford Dole, Carol Moseley Braun, Michele Bachmann and Carly Fiorina) Hillary Clinton, became the first women major party nominee for the office of president of the United States. The table 2 provides a list of women presidential candidates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party Affiliation</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Claflin Woodhull</td>
<td>Equal Rights</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>The first woman to run for president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belva Ann Bennett Lockwood</td>
<td>Equal Rights</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>The first woman to practice law before the US Supreme Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belva Ann Bennett Lockwood</td>
<td>Equal Rights</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>The first woman to practice law before the US Supreme Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Chase Smith</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>The first woman presidential candidate seeking a major party nomination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Anita Chisholm</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>The first African American women to run for president seeking a major party nomination, the first African American women to serve in the US Congress (US House of Representatives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patsy Takemoto Mink</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>The first women of color to serve in the US Congress (House of Representatives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen McCormack</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>The first women to qualify for secret service protection and federal campaign matching funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Schroeder</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Withdrew from the presidential race due to lack of funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Hanford Dole</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Worked in the Johnson and Reagan White House administrations, President Nixon appointee (Federal Trade Commission) and President Bush appointed (Secretary of Labor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Moseley Braun</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>The first African American woman to serve in the US Senate, President Clinton appointee (US Ambassador to New Zealand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary Rodham Clinton</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>US Senator, President Obama appointee (US Secretary of State), married to President Clinton/former first lady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele Bachmann</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Withdrew from the presidential race following the Iowa caucus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carly Fiorina</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>The first woman to lead a Fortune 50 business (Hewlett-Packard), the only woman republican presidential candidate for the Republican party in 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary Rodham Clinton</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>The first woman major party presidential nominee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While women have entered into national political campaigns, research related to female political candidates indicates there is reason to conclude that gender-based stereotypes still occur in political elections. (Ditonto, 2017). Women candidates in the United States
“are still held to a different standard than their male counterparts…..Female public figures and political candidates are still evaluated based on their appearances, parenting skills, and other gender specific qualities, rather than competency and leadership skills. Further, the use of gender frames that portray women public figures and political candidates purely in the stereotypical role as mothers, wives, and caretakers, undermine their political success.” (Adams, 2011, p. 20)

Women political candidates have attempted to balance gender stereotypes in numerous ways including “de-emphasizing their roles as mothers during campaigns” (Stalsburg and Kleinberg, 2015, p. 289). Interestingly voters do not exhibit the same level of scrutiny or concern regarding men and their ability to manage their role as fathers, as they do not face the same challenges with respect to their role as fathers and serving in political office (Stalsburg and Kleinberg, 2015).

**GENDER STEREOTYPES AND THE DOUBLE BIND**

A critical element in the candidate marketing process includes the development of a product concept that is saleable to voters. The concept should include the candidate’s stand on particular issues, the candidate’s style, and the candidate’s background and qualifications (Kotler, 1975).

*The disconnect in America between women and political office is fed by the cultural premise that politics is a domain for masculinized behaviors, messages and professional experiences – creating a masculine stereotype for politicians. (Meeks, 2012, p. 176).*

Lawless (2004) concludes that gender stereotyping in politics includes both general traits and issue expertise. “Such stereotypes based on gender may work to the detriment of women candidates for high-level political office” (Lawless, 2004, p. 487). Individuals consider a candidate’s gender as an indicator of policy expertise as well as an indicator of characteristics considered to be politically relevant. Masculine characteristics (such as self-confidence, assertiveness, toughness, and aggressiveness) are preferred in political leaders. For example, men in leadership are thought to be more competent than women in leadership in their ability to lead during war time and to address terrorism (Lawless, 2004). Additionally, because men are the norm in these leadership roles, a man’s competence is assumed and his capabilities are rarely questioned. A woman’s competence is not assumed, and when a woman passes the competence hurdle, she is likely to directly confront the competence and femininity double bind (Jamieson, 1995).

The double bind construct is derived from theology, biology and the law; and may be invariant in some cases and variant in other cases, based on an individual’s belief system. Regardless of the source of the derivation (theological, biological or legal) binds represent either/or constructs that include no-win scenarios and expectations that cannot be realized (Jamieson, 1995).

*A double bind is a rhetorical construct that posits two and only two alternatives, one or both penalizing the person being offered them. In the history of humans, such choices have been constructed to deny women access to power and, where individuals manage to slip past their constraints, to undermine their exercise of whatever power they achieve. The strategy defines something “fundamental” to woman as incompatible with something the woman seeks - be it education, the ballot, or access to the workplace. (Jamieson, 1995, p. 14)*
The competence and femininity double bind is of particular relevance when discussing women in or aspiring to obtain positions of power. Adam (2011) highlights this dilemma for women in politics. “As candidates, women are expected to appear tough, but yet feminine” (Adam, 2011, p. 8). Dolan, Deckman and Swers (as cited by Adam) conclude that in politics, women are called “bitchy” and criticized if they give an impression that is too serious, masculine or rigid. At the same time, women may be dismissed as not possessing the skills needed to compete if she creates an impression that is too feminine. Women may find that they are penalized for both appearing to be too masculine and for deviating from the masculine norm (Jamieson, 1995).

Implicitly, these women are also challenging one of the assumptions that lies at the crux of the bind: that a person must fall into one or the other of two invariant categories – masculine or feminine. The bind ignores the possibility that there is the possibility of a third category, labeled androgyny by some, that incorporates characteristics of both. (Jamieson, 1995, p. 130)

**Research Question**

During the 2016 United States presidential election, both the nominee of the Republican Party and the nominee of the Democratic Party selected to have their daughters introduce them at their respective conventions. The research questions addressed by this study is did Chelsea Clinton’s introduction of her mother serve to reinforce gender based stereotypes and as a result, support the presence of the competency and femininity double bind?

**Method**

This study provides an analysis of the introduction speech delivered by Chelsea Clinton, when she introduced her mother as the 2016 Democratic National Convention as the party’s presidential nominee. An analysis of Ivanka Trump’s introduction speech of her father at the Republican National Convention as the republican nominee was also performed as a comparison. NVivo 10 software was used to conduct a summative content analysis of the introduction speeches delivered by Chelsea Clinton and Ivanka Trump introducing their mother and father respectively, at the Democratic and Republican National Conventions. Summative content analysis begins with word counts and is expanded with the inclusion of themes (Hsieh and Shannon, 2005). Textual evidence is provided to demonstrate credibility and trustworthiness (Hsieh and Shannon, 2005). A minimum word length of 5 characters was set for words included in the analysis.

In addition to the summative content analysis, a directed content analysis was conducted using rhetorical variables associated with winning electoral candidates as determined by Lowry and Naser. In a directed content analysis, prior research will guide findings and can offer supportive or non-supportive evidence of a theory or framework (Hsieh and Shannon, 2005). In this study, words used to describe rhetorical variables provide insights into gender based differences.
FINDINGS

In both of the introduction speeches given by Chelsea Clinton and Ivanka Trump, their parental relationship with the respective nominee is dominant. In the case of Chelsea Clinton, the word “mother” is the most frequently mentioned word in her introduction speech. “Mother” is mentioned 13 times and represents a weighted percentage of 2.28% of the words in the speech. In the case of Ivanka Trump, the word “father” is mentioned most frequently, occurring 28 times in the speech. This translates to a weighted percentage of 3.33% of the words included in her introduction speech.

Differences can also be noted between the 2 speeches. For example, the lengths of the 2 speeches are notable different. The speech delivered by Ivanka Trump to introduce her father totals 1872 words, while the speech delivered by Chelsea Clinton to introduce her mother totals 1257 words. This represents 615 (or 33%) fewer words than the number used by Ivanka Trump.

Table 3 provides a summary of the 20 most frequently used words in each of the introduction speeches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Results for Chelsea Clinton (1257 words total)</th>
<th>Results for Ivanka Trump (1872 words total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weighted percentage (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loved</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worry</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chugga</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinosaurs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Together</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiden</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Around</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The word “president” appears among the top 20 words in Ivanka Trump’s introduction. In her introduction the word “president” is the 15th most frequently used word and it is used 5 times. In Chelsea Clinton’s introduction, the word “president” is used only twice and is listed as the 59th
most frequently mentioned word. A comparison of the frequency with which the nominee’s name is mentioned also highlights differences in the speeches. The words “Hillary” and “Clinton” are not among the top 20 most frequently used words in Chelsea Clinton’s introduction. The word “Clinton” is the 38th most frequently used word in the introduction and the word “Hillary” is the 48th most frequently used word. Each of these words are used only twice during the introduction. In comparison, the word “Trump” is used 13 times and “Donald” is used 8 times during Ivanka Trump’s introduction. Both of these words are among the top 20 words most frequently used during the speech.

References to words representing sentiment are evident in the top 20 most frequently used words in Chelsea Clinton’s introduction. Examples of these words include “proud”, “loved”, “heart” and “worry”. Together these words are used 25 times (for a weighted percentage of 4.39% of all the words used in the speech). In comparison, Ivanka Trump’s introduction included no sentiment words among the top 20 most frequently used words. However, words associated with patriotism, such as “country”, “America”, “American”, are among the top 20 most frequently used. Together these patriotic words are mentioned 21 times (for a weighted percentage of 2.43% of all the words used). No patriotic words are among the the 20 most frequently used words in the introduction of Hillary Clinton.

Summary statements provided in each of the introduction speeches highlight different branding themes as well. For Hillary Clinton, emphasis is placed on personal characteristics and motivators (sense of justice and heart full of love), her role as a mother and an advocate (for families and children), and as a progressive. An excerpt from Chelsea Clinton’s introduction speech is provided below.

She’s a listener and a doer. She's a woman driven by compassion, by faith, by a fierce sense of justice and a heart full of love. So, this November, I'm voting for a woman who is my role model, as a mother, and as an advocate. A woman who has spent her entire life fighting for families and children. I'm voting for the progressive, who will protect our planet from climate change and our communities from gun violence.


For Donald Trump, summary statements place emphasis on qualifications, his plan for existing and future problems and, his role as a loyal champion of America. An excerpt from Ivanka Trump’s introduction speech is provided below.

He is the single most qualified to serve as chief executive of an $18 trillion economy. My father will call upon the best and brightest people from all spheres of industry and both side of the aisle. A new set of thinkers, to face our countries existing and future problems with fresh perspective and brave new solutions. Come January 17, all things will be possible again. We can hope and dream and think big again. No one has more faith in the American people than my father. He will be your greatest, your truest and your most loyal champion.


Findings from the directed content analysis of the introduction speeches for both major party nominees include mentions for words that define the rhetorical variables associated with winning political candidates. These variables, identified by Lowry and Naser, include: collectives, inspiration, accomplishment, temporal terms, centrality, rapport and exclusion. The number of mentions of the descriptive words associated with each variable is summarized in Table 4.
Overall, taking into account both introduction speeches, the accomplishment variable received the most number of mentions. The accomplishment variable is described by words such as achieve, deliver, develop, establish, expand, finish, generate, improve, organize, produce, results, work, and workers. This variable received 36 mentions. The next most mentioned variable when both speeches are considered is collectives. This variable is described by words such as coalition, community, country, economy, family, public, and team. This variable received 21 mentions. The inspiration variable is the third most mentioned variable when both speeches are considered. Words used to describe this variable include beauty, courage, dedication, faith, goodness, honor, hope, ideals, liberty, love, loyalty, pride, security, and trust.

For 6 of the 7 rhetorical variables, Ivanka Trump’s mention of the words associated with presidential winners exceed the number of mentions of these words made by Chelsea Clinton. For Ivanka Trump, the majority of mentions (27) of associated words is for the accomplishment variable. Chelsea Clinton’s introduction includes 9 mentions of
associated words for this variable. Collectives is the rhetorical variable that received the second highest number of mention associated words. There are 18 mentions of associated words for this variable during Ivanka Trump’s introduction and 3 mentions during Chelsea Clinton’s introduction. Inspiration is the only variable for which the number of mentions of associated words in Chelsea Clinton’s introduction exceeds the number of mentions made by Ivanka Trump during her introduction. There are 12 mentions of associated words for the inspiration variable in Chelsea Clinton’s introduction versus 7 mentions during Ivanka Trump’s introduction. It should be noted that many of the words associated with the inspiration variable can be described as feminine. Examples of these words include beauty, goodness, faith, trust and love.

CONCLUSIONS

During the 2016 presidential election there was clear excitement associated with Hillary Clinton as the first woman presidential nominee of a major party. Additionally, a unique and compelling opportunity presented itself for her daughter Chelsea Clinton to introduce her at the Democratic National Convention. This content analysis highlights interesting findings associated with the introduction speech and the presence of gender based messages and stereotypes.

On a comparative basis, not only was there less emphasis placed themes meant to reinforce and further promote name recognition and patriotism in the introduction of Hillary Clinton, the introduction placed more emphasis on sentiment. Hillary Clinton’s qualifications and competence were clearly considered strong by many. Because of this, it is possible that the introduction of her as the first women presidential nominee of a major party at the party national convention was viewed as an opportunity to illustrate address the competence and femininity double bind by promoting her femininity. Highlighting her role as a mother and grandmother may have been viewed as an opportunity to illustrate femininity. However, reflecting on and emphasizing Hillary Clinton’s role a grandmother, a mother, and even as an advocate for justice, rather than her abilities as a diplomat, a decision maker and a problem-solver, reinforced gender based stereotypes. Additionally, focusing on messages aligned with the rhetorical variable of inspiration, according to Lowry and Naser, while Donald Trump emphasized messages related to the rhetorical variables of accomplishment also served to reinforce gender stereotypes. Consequently, the message points delivered during the introduction of Hillary Clinton, the first women presidential nominee of a major party, at that the democratic national convention, by her daughter, Chelsea Clinton may have highlighted elements of gender bias and stereotypes, and prominently placed her mother in the midst of the competence and femininity double bind construct.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study provides a number of insights as to the potential role and impact of messages delivered during introduction speeches within presidential conventions. Due to its qualitative design, the results of this study are limited to the introduction speeches for the presidential nominees of the republican and democratic parties in 2016. Specifically, the challenges associated with the gender based messaging during the introduction speech of Hillary Clinton by her daughter Chelsea Clinton are highlighted. While limitations exist, this study does make a contribution to the body of knowledge regarding gender based stereotypes and political marketing for women candidates in particular.
IMPLICATIONS

While advances have been made, women seeking positions of power continue to face gender bias and stereotypes. Interestingly, this study highlights the on-going challenges for women in and/or seeking positions of power and influence in the context of the competency and femininity double bind. The study illustrates a case in which attempts to combat gender based stereotypes have highlighted the presence of the double bind. The results illustrate the potential importance of the acceptance of androgyny (the supposition that an individual can possess both components of the double-bind construct, as opposed only possessing one or the other).

With respect to women seeking positions of power and influence in which they will lead and represent others (such as the case of a political candidate), rather than viewing leadership characteristics as either masculine or feminine that are possessed by either men or women respectively; and as characteristics that are often viewed as mutually exclusive, there is the opportunity to recognize that there may be individuals that are competent in both types of leadership characteristics. Individuals illustrating dual competence in that they possess both types of leadership characteristics may be viewed as exceptional. However, the challenge for women remains for them to be viewed as both exceptional and effective. This supposition reinforces the potential importance of achieving acceptance of androgyny as an alternative to the double bind construct and associated gender based stereotypes. Additionally, this supposition extends not only to political leaders (and those that aspire to obtain such positions), but to other sectors of society as well.

Future research to determine the presence and prevalence of gender bias and stereotypes in the content of introductory speeches of Hillary Clinton in settings other than the Democratic National Convention during the 2016 election represents an opportunity to further explore the challenges she faced in the context of the competency and femininity double bind. Numerous campaign events were held during the 2016 presidential campaign. During many of these events a speech was made to introduce Hillary Clinton. The degree to which the messages and themes in those introductions aligned with the double bind construct alternatives of competency and femininity, as well as supported examples of androgyny, would provide valuable insights for both scholars and practitioners with an interest in gender bias and stereotypes in politics.

An analysis guided by the rhetorical variables identified by Lowry and Naser and the presence of these variables in speeches given about (and by) men and women political candidates that have gone on to win elections, represents a research opportunity. Extending the work of Lowry and Naser by quantifying genders differences in the use of rhetorical variables in messages delivered via alternate medial channels (such as convention speeches and other campaign related events) would provide relevant insights for future political candidates. Additionally, those that work to develop winning campaign messages and themes in the face of present day gender bias and stereotypes would benefit as well. In a broader context, both of these future research studies could help inform women in leadership, women that aspire to leadership positions and, individuals and organizations tasked with presenting and promoting women leaders.
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ABSTRACT

This study presents an empirical examination of firm restructuring and interlocking directorates (i.e., board interlocks) in the post-asset restructuring period. Portfolio restructuring is an important area of study as it represents a shift in an organization’s domain and involves critical decisions that impact firm boundaries and the allocation of resources. Drawing upon agency and institutional theories, we suggest firms experiencing poor performance will restructure and redesign their governance structures, namely the number of board interlocks, in the post-restructuring period so as to enhance organizational legitimacy. Additionally, in response to institutional pressures for improved performance, organizations may choose to co-opt the source of these pressures as a means of averting threats to its stability or existence. The results reveal a positive relationship between divestiture size and the number of board interlocks in the post-restructuring period. The findings address a significant gap in the extant literature by addressing the need for further research examining firms’ propensity to implement corporate governance changes following a restructuring.

INTRODUCTION

Portfolio restructuring research is critical to better understanding the limits of firm growth, the implications of altering the firm’s business portfolio, and the effectiveness of changes in organizational and capital structures (Bowman & Singh, 1993; Johnson, 1996; Kolev, 2016; Schönhaar, Nippa & Pidun, 2014). The value of such activity has significantly increased over time (Brauer & Wiersema, 2012) and remains robust with 12,701 divestitures in 2015 (Deloitte Corporate Finance, 2016). Recent examples include Conagra Foods in 2015, GE in 2016, and Royal Dutch Shell in 2017.

Portfolio restructuring involves the process of divesting and/or acquiring businesses and entails a refocusing on the organization’s core business, resulting in a change in the diversity of a firm’s portfolio of businesses (Bowman, & Singh, 1993; Bowman, Singh, Useem & Bhadury, 1999). Empirical and theoretical investigations reveals the agency explanation has been the predominant perspective in the examination of antecedents of portfolio restructuring. The agency explanation suggests firms restructure in response to less-than-desirable performance and managerial inefficiencies arising from weak governance mechanisms are the primary drivers of poor performance (Abor, Graham & Yawson, 2011; Hoskisson & Hitt, 1994; Johnson, 1996; Johnson, Hoskisson & Hitt, 1993; Schönhaar, et al., 2014). Due to its overwhelming acceptance by researchers, the agency explanation has made portfolio restructuring synonymous with poor governance (Bethel & Liebeskind, 1993; Markides & Singh, 1997; Moschieri & Mair, 2012) even though research has not proven governance is truly deficient in the pre-restructuring period.

A critical facet of the restructuring literature that has received inadequate attention is post-restructuring governance. In calls for future research, Johnson (1996) asked if governance is
ineffective in the pre-restructuring period, then what changes should a firm make post-restructuring? Almost 20 years later, Schönhaar et al. noted the same gap in the literature and suggest “explicit explanations of post-restructuring governance systems are missing, which is somehow surprising, given the fact that weak governance is the leading explanation for conducting portfolio restructuring” (2014: 192). Governance is the most discussed antecedent of portfolio restructuring, yet it is largely ignored post-restructuring (with the exception of Cashen, 2009; 2011). This despite the agency explanation suggesting poorly performing firms are saddled with the same weak governance mechanisms post-restructuring if corrective actions are not implemented. As such, boards of directors and CEOs are pressured to not only address performance issues but also the governance issues frequently linked with poor performance.

Drawing on the tenets of institutional theory (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Meyer & Rowan, 1977), this paper posits firms initiate changes in governance structures (i.e., greater board interlocks) in the post-restructuring period so as to enhance organizational legitimacy (Oliver, 1991). By adopting governance structures that adhere to prescriptions of rationalizing myths in the institutional environment, an organization may demonstrate it is behaving on collectively valued purposes in a proper manner (Crilly, Zollo & Hansen, 2012; Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Westphal & Zajac, 2013). Additionally, conformity to normative pressures increases the flow of societal resources, allows for reduction/management of uncertainty, and enhances the chances of survival (Martin, Gözübüyük & Becerra, 2015; Meyer & Rowan, 1977). These arguments are especially relevant in regards to restructuring initiatives due to the uncertainty and organizational changes surrounding such events.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**The Institutionalization of the Agency Explanation of Restructuring**

The agency explanation of portfolio restructuring suggests firms engage in such actions in response to suboptimal performance resulting from managerial inefficiencies due to ineffective governance (Hoskisson & Hitt, 1994; Johnson et al., 1993). Research supports the link between poor performance and restructuring (Bowman et al., 1999; Hoskisson & Hitt, 1994; Johnson, 1996; Markides & Singh, 1997) and suggest firms divest assets to improve performance relative to competitors, the overall industry, and/or a predetermined aspiration level. Although never formally defined, weak governance is characterized by diffusion of shareholdings among outside owners, board passivity, minimal interlocking directorates, and managerial/board characteristics such as minimal equity ownership or an insider heavy board (Bethel & Liebeskind, 1993; Dalton & Dalton, 2011; Westphal & Fredrickson, 2001).

For decades the agency explanation has been the predominant perspective in the restructuring literature (Abor et al., 2011; Markides & Singh, 1997; Schönhaar, et al., 2014). This explanation suggests that performance needs to be improved as a result of past managerial inefficiencies, which arise as a result of agency costs. Due to its overwhelming acceptance and its intuitive appeal, the agency explanation has made portfolio restructuring synonymous with weak governance (Bethel & Liebeskind, 1993; Markides & Singh, 1997; Moschieri & Mair, 2012). Smart and Hitt support this sentiment in stating “many of the arguments and concepts embedded in the agency literature seem so compelling that agency and governance related arguments have become a virtual de facto explanation for many types of corporate restructuring” (1996: 1). As a result, the academic and practitioner restructuring literature has devoted much effort to pointing
out governance failures and highlighting ways of improving the modern corporate governance system (Jensen, 1993; Schönhaar, et al., 2014).

Agency arguments have become so ingrained in governance research that other paradigms are often ignored (Bratton, 2001; Dalton, Hitt, Certo & Dalton, 2007; Davis, 2005; Mizruchi, 2004; Shapiro, 2005). Daily, Dalton and Rajagopolan referred to this barrier as empirical dogmatism, which they argued has negatively impacted researchers’ willingness to “embrace research that contradicts dominant governance models and theories (e.g., a preference for independent governance structures) or research that is critical of past methodologies or findings” (2003: 379). In essence, agency arguments have become the norm for viewing governance, and, as such, impact the organization of firms (e.g., the structure of the board of directors). The agency arguments are embedded in how practitioners, institutional investors, and academicians define sound corporate governance. There is remarkable consensus as to the best practices that need to reside in firms if they are to maximize performance. Support is offered by Zajac and Westphal, who noted “large investors appear to have co-opted normative agency theory to help legitimate their political agenda, thus contributing to and benefiting from the growth of agency theory as a dominant perspective on corporate control” (1995: 287-288).

The governance reforms sought by powerful stakeholders are structures which supposedly minimize agency costs (Brown, 2003; Langley, 2003). Such pressures to reform the governance structure of a firm may not be driven by solid evidence of inappropriate governance since precise causes of poor performance are often difficult to identify (Cyert & March, 1963). However, it is widely suggested that poor performance does stimulate such changes within organizations (Davis, Diekmann & Tinsley, 1994) even when it cannot be attributed unambiguously to problems the proposed changes seek to rectify.

**The Value of the Board of Directors**

Corporate governance and control in a firm has predominantly focused on the board of directors. Theoretically, the board is the ultimate source of power in an organization (Bazerman & Schoorman, 1983; Perry & Shivadasani, 2005) and is responsible for effective functioning (Blair & Stout, 2001; Jensen, 1993). Additionally, the board has the power to confer authority on the firm (Stiles and Taylor, 2001). Gilson and Kraakman suggest, “in the corporate governance debate, all arguments ultimately converge on the role of the board of directors” (1991: 873). The board of directors is considered central to ensuring management acts in the best interest of shareholders (Finkelstein & Hambrick, 1996), reducing potential agency problems (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978; Williamson, 1975), and offering strategic and administrative advice (Baysinger & Butler, 1985; Chatterjee & Harrison, 2001; Mintzberg, 1983).

Board members can also serve as a connection to the external environment by providing valuable information that may lead to the acquisition of critical resources, including prestige and legitimacy (Mintzberg, 1983; Pfeffer, 1972; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978; Selznick, 1949). Proponents of resource dependence theory propose that external board members can act as boundary spanners between the organization and its environment (Dalton, Daily, Johnson & Ellstrand, 1999; Johnson, Daily & Ellstrand, 1996; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). For example, directors who are also executives of financial institutions may assist in securing a favorable line of credit, or outside directors who are attorneys may provide pro bono legal advice (Daily et al., 2003). The provision of, and access to, value creating resources can reduce uncertainty associated
with the firm’s environment and enhance organizational functioning, performance, and survival (Hillman & Dalziel, 2003; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978; Thompson, 1967).

Finally, board members have the ability to provide the firm with legitimacy and a positive reputation (Daily & Schwenk, 1996; Hambrick & D’Aveni, 1992; Lynall, Golden & Hillman, 2003). Prestigious directors can also enhance credibility and performance (Certo, 2003; Hillman & Dalziel, 2003). Pfeffer and Salancik note “prestigious or legitimate persons or organizations represented on the focal organization’s board provide confirmation to the rest of the world of the value and worth of the organization” (1978: 145). Similarly, Bazerman and Schoorman suggest, “An organization’s reputation can be affected by who serves on the board of directors and to whom the organization is seen to be linked” (1983: 211).

Legitimacy bestowed upon a firm through board members can decrease the probability of failure (Baum & Oliver, 1991; DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Meyer & Rowan, 1977). Legitimacy might result in additional benefits such as suppliers of capital accepting lower risk premiums (Cornell & Shapiro, 1987), less hesitation to invest in the organization (Mizruchi, 1996), and greater stock performance for firms undertaking initial public offerings (Certo, 2003). Given the need to satisfy shareholders, firms adopt specific board structures to signal legitimacy because “organizations that incorporate societally legitimated rationalized elements in their formal structures maximize their legitimacy and increase their resources and survival capabilities” (Meyer & Rowan, 1977: 352). As such, boards have a symbolic role and/or value that is independent of their tangible activities (Certo, 2003).

### Institutional Theory and Pressures for Governance Changes

Institutional theory suggests that organizational legitimacy is paramount for firm performance and survival (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Scott, 1995; Suchman, 1995). To gain legitimacy, organizations adopt similar organizational forms in response to pressures from, for example, suppliers of capital, consumers, owners, boards of directors, and regulatory agencies (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Townley, 2002). Such isomorphism transforms an organization into one resembling others confronted with similar environmental issues (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). This includes, but is not limited to, organizational characteristics such as structures and practices (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). Isomorphism increases legitimacy, which helps firms acquire resources and lessens the probability of failure (Baum & Oliver, 1991; DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Oliver, 1991; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978; Suchman, 1995).

Following significant restructuring events, firms will institute changes in their governance structures due to pressures from shareholders and activists (Mizruchi, 1983; Westphal & Fredrickson, 2001). In response to threats on performance, firms opt to restructure their portfolio of assets with the intent of positioning the firm for greater stability, or at least to signal that they are attempting to do so. Additionally, pressures are placed upon boards of directors and executives to address the causes of poor performance—namely, inadequate governance and inefficient governance structures.

Given the need to positively influence sources of power, firms may adopt structures to signal legitimacy. The anticipated result is an improved perception of the organization’s image and renewed confidence in its future (Daily & Dalton, 1995; Schwartz & Menon, 1985). Conceptual research indicates that such organizational structures include characteristics of boards of directors and top managers (Certo, 2003; Mizruchi, 1996; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978; Westphal & Zajac, 1994; 1998). Changes become part of the organization’s rationalized formal structure.
(e.g., board of directors), whose elements reflect rules that are socially constructed, deeply ingrained, and/or enforced by the views of important constituents (Berger & Luckmann, 1967; Meyer & Rowan, 1977). In other words, rather than incorporate elements in terms of efficient coordination and control of productive activities, firms incorporate elements that are legitimated externally and thus, demonstrate the organization is acting on collectively valued purposes in a proper and adequate manner (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Tolbert & Zucker, 1996).

As previously noted, significant pressures are exerted by stakeholders upon boards of directors to effectively respond in times of organizational crisis (e.g., period of declining performance). Additionally, top managers face similar pressures by boards of directors. It is critical that top managers and boards manage these multiple constituencies in order to preserve their positions. A failure to keep shareholders satisfied may result in removal from the board and a negative impact to the board members’ reputations. Additionally, corporate boards not active in pursuit of performance improvements might be regarded as negligent in their protection of stockholder interests (Westphal & Zajac, 1994). As such, in times of substandard performance, it is critical that firms conform to these pressures due to their dependence on these sources for stability, legitimacy, and the appearance of rationality (Oliver, 1991; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978; Suchman, 1995). Such arguments have direct implications for firms engaged in portfolio restructuring (Schönhaar et al., 2014) since these situations are often viewed as instances where shareholder (and other stakeholder) interests have been neglected (Westphal & Zajac, 1994). As a result, it can be implied pressures for, and adoptions of, governance reforms are driven by firm performance being used as a research proxy for a board’s governing effectiveness (Kosnik, 1987; Mallette & Fowler, 1992).

THEORY AND HYPOTHESES

An organization may choose to co-opt sources of institutional pressure (Oliver, 1991; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978; Thompson, 1967; Scott, 1995). Selznick defined co-opting as “the process of absorbing new elements into the leadership or policy-determining structure of an organization as a means of averting threats to its stability or existence” (1949:13). One way firms seek to do accomplish this is via board interlocks (i.e., interlocking directorates), which is when a person affiliated with one organization sits on the board of directors of another organization (Martin et al., 2015; Mizruchi, 1996). Research suggests poorly performing firms are more likely to interlock (Lamb & Roundy, 2016; Lang & Lockhart, 1990; Mizruchi & Stearns, 1988; Stearns & Mizruchi, 1993). For example, Richardson (1987) found bankers often join a board when the firm is underperforming. Such results imply interlocks may serve as means of monitoring the activities of the firm and thus a source of corporate control (Mizruchi, 1996). Whether interlocks are viewed as a means of corporate control or co-optation, they serve to provide additional resources to, or more favorable terms for, the organization (Hillman & Dalziel, 2003; Lamb & Roundy, 2016; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978; Zald, 1969). Pfeffer (1972) demonstrated organizations with directorate ties to external sectors that posed the most critical constraints outperformed industry counterparts lacking such ties.

In addition, board linkages can also provide the firm with legitimacy (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Selznick, 1949). Interlocks are a means of signaling to the environment that the board possesses knowledge, experience, and the ability to manage inter-organizational dependencies (Fama & Jensen, 1983). By appointing individuals with ties to other important organizations, the firm signals to potential investors that it is a legitimate enterprise worthy of support” (Mizruchi,
Bazerman and Schoorman stated, “An organization’s reputation can be affected by who serves on the board of directors and to whom the organization is seen to be linked” (1983: 211). While there still may exist some ambiguity regarding the outcomes of restructuring, as a whole, empirical research supports a relationship between restructuring and the number of board interlocks. As such, the following hypothesis is offered.

**Hypothesis 1**: Firm restructuring is positively associated with the number of board interlocks in the post-restructuring period.

Additionally, it is argued these linkage initiatives may become more pronounced as the size of the divestiture increases. Portfolio-restructuring events can be significant enough to surround the organization with ambiguity due to considerable changes to the firm’s routines and organizational domain. These changes represent critical decisions impacting not only the boundaries of the organization, but also the allocation of resources within (Goodstein & Boeker, 1991). It is reasonable to assume as the overall size of the divestiture increases the magnitude of the organizational and structural changes generate stress for those individuals involved/impacted by the restructuring (Moschieri & Mair, 2012). As such, larger divestitures may signal “greater” corrective action is needed to the firm’s portfolio of assets, and subsequently “greater” corrective action needed to the firm’s governance structure. It is also reasonable to suggest that larger divestitures are more public and discussed more often in the popular press than smaller divestitures. These larger divestitures then might open the firm up to more criticism and allegations of sub-optimal governance structures in the pre-restructuring period. As such, the following hypothesis is offered.

**Hypothesis 2**: Divestiture size is positively related to the number of board interlocks in the post-restructuring period.

**RESEARCH DESIGN**

**Sample Methodology**

The sample of firms was drawn from the *SDC Platinum Database* published by Thomson Financial derived from SEC filings. The search was restricted to U.S. firms that had $1 billion or more in annual revenues. A firm identified as restructured must have divested at least 10% of its assets, which represents significant strategic change by an organization. This criterion has been used in previous restructuring research and is accepted as a valid indicator of restructuring activity (e.g., Hoskisson & Johnson, 1992; Johnson et al., 1993; Markides, 1992).

A sample of 100 randomly selected restructuring firms were included in the analysis. Each restructuring event was compared against SEC filings for each firm to confirm the 10% criteria. Specifically, the asset data was located in the firm’s notes to the consolidated financial statements contained within the annual report to shareholders. The average firm in the sample divested 19.84% of its assets at an average value of $1.63 billion. The minimum and maximum percentages (and dollar amounts) divested were 10% ($508 million) and 46.7% ($4.57 billion), respectively.

The restructuring sample needed to be matched with a non-restructuring firm sample to allow for greater confidence in any proposed relationships as it increases the external validity of our conclusions and inferences (Cook and Campbell, 1979). A random sample of non-restructuring firms was selected also from the *SDC Platinum*. The same criteria were used – U.S. firms with $1
billion or more in annual revenues. A firm qualifies as non-restructuring if it had not engaged in any restructuring activity within a six-year period (i.e., three years before and three years after). A total of 110 non-restructuring firms were selected, however, one firm was acquired in the following year, thus reducing the non-restructuring sample to 109 firms. The non-restructuring sample was not statistically different from the restructuring sample based on assets, revenues, and capital structures. Adding the 100 restructuring firms to the 109 non-restructuring firms for a total sample size of 209 firms.

Operationalization of Variables

**Dependent variable.** The dependent variable is the *number of board interlocks*. This variable was measured as the sum of the number of board seats to external companies held by each director. Data was drawn from SEC filings (annual reports and proxy statements). The dependent variable was measured one year ($t_1$) and two years ($t_2$) following the restructuring. It is not appropriate to measure governance and restructuring cross-sectionally for two reasons. First, this paper is predicting that portfolio restructuring will lead to subsequent changes in governance. Second, the nature of governance mechanisms, (e.g., 3 year director assignments) limit the firm’s ability to immediately institute governance changes (Westphal & Zajac, 1998).

**Independent variables.** For hypothesis 1, *restructuring* was measured as a dichotomous variable. This was done since the assessment is to determine if differences exist between restructuring and non-restructuring firms in the post-restructuring period. As such, restructuring firms were coded as 1, and non-restructuring firms were coded as 0. For hypothesis 2, *divestiture size* is measured as the dollar value of the divested assets as reported in the firm’s Annual Report to Shareholders.

**Control variables.** The substitution effect of governance suggests that the desired level of one governance mechanism is contingent on the magnitude of other mechanisms. As a result, we control for the *proportion of outsiders on the board*. Other control variables include *CEO and board equity ownerships* (both measured as the number of shares held as a percentage of total shares outstanding) and *CEO duality* (measured as 1 if the CEO is the chairperson; 0 if not). A number of studies have hypothesized a link between CEO tenure and CEO influence over the board (Finkelstein & Hambrick, 1996). As tenure increases, CEOs may acquire personal power by populating boards with supporters (Finkelstein & Hambrick, 1996) while gaining expert power through an increased familiarity with the firm’s resources (Young, Stedham & Beekun, 2000; Zald, 1969). *CEO tenure* as a control variable was measured in months. Lastly, we control for *ownership concentration* because concentrated ownership increases the ability/incentive to monitor investments and institute changes in the organization (Bethel & Liebeskind, 1993; Ryan & Schneider, 2002). Ownership concentration was measured as the number of common shares outstanding divided by the total number of shareholders.

**Statistical Techniques**

Ordinary least squares (OLS) regression was used when testing the hypotheses. The control variables were entered in stage one and the main effect was entered in the second stage. In addition to being simple and straightforward in its interpretation of coefficients, OLS is able to accommodate both continuous and binary independent variables.
RESULTS

Table 1 presents the means, standard deviations, and correlations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Board ties t1</td>
<td>41.24</td>
<td>24.83</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Board ties t2</td>
<td>41.62</td>
<td>24.77</td>
<td>.96**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. CEO equity t1</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CEO equity t2</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.88**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Board equity t1</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>38.90</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Board equity t2</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>24.28</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. CEO duality t1</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. CEO duality t2</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Outside proportion t1</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Outside proportion t2</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. CEO tenure t1</td>
<td>84.91</td>
<td>81.07</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. CEO tenure t2</td>
<td>97.21</td>
<td>163.37</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Divestiture size</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership concentration t1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>23.91</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership concentration t2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>24.68</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.95**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 209. ** p < .01; * p < .05. Means and standard deviations for variables 3 – 6 are in millions.

Restructuring (Hypothesis 1)

Tables 2 and 3 provide regression results examining the number of board interlocks in the post-restructuring period when assessing the impact of restructuring (i.e., hypothesis 1). Specifically, Table 2 presents the number of board interlocks in the first year following a restructuring (t1) and Table 3 the number of board interlocks in the second year following a restructuring (t2). Testing the control variables in models 1 in Tables 2 and 3 reveal significant negative relationships between both ownership concentration and CEO tenure and the number of interlocks in the post-restructuring period. Additionally, both models 1 reveal a significant positive relationship between CEO duality and the number of interlocks in the post-restructuring period. Lastly, the proportion of outsiders on the board is positively related to board interlocks in the post-restructuring period, but only for year t1. When the independent variable was added in Model 2 for years t1 and t2, the aforementioned relationships between the control variables and board interlocks remain unchanged. In addition, models 2 of Tables 2 and 3 reveal the independent variable, restructuring (i.e., a restructuring event), is not significantly related to the number of board interlocks in years t1 and t2, thus not supporting hypothesis 1.
### Table 2
RESULTS OF REGRESSION ANALYSIS PREDICTING BOARD OF DIRECTOR TIES IN YEAR \( t_1 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variable: Board Ties ( t_1 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership Concentration</td>
<td>( t_1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( t )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Equity ( t_1 )</td>
<td>(-0.036)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO Equity ( t_1 )</td>
<td>(0.099)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO Duality ( t_1 )</td>
<td>(0.179)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO Tenure ( t_1 )</td>
<td>(-0.164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outsider Proportion ( t_1 )</td>
<td>(0.146)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restructuring Event</td>
<td>(-0.021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm Performance</td>
<td>(0.064)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( R^2 \) : 0.124  \quad \text{Adjusted } R^2 : 0.128

### Table 3
RESULTS OF REGRESSION ANALYSIS PREDICTING BOARD OF DIRECTOR TIES IN YEAR \( t_2 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variable: Board Ties ( t_2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership Concentration</td>
<td>( t_2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( t )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Equity ( t_2 )</td>
<td>(0.039)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO Equity ( t_2 )</td>
<td>(0.099)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO Duality ( t_2 )</td>
<td>(0.130)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO Tenure ( t_2 )</td>
<td>(-0.126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outsider Proportion ( t_2 )</td>
<td>(0.124)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restructuring Event</td>
<td>(-0.024)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm Performance</td>
<td>(0.047)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( R^2 \) : 0.093  \quad \text{Adjusted } R^2 : 0.095

### Divestiture Size (Hypothesis 2)

Tables 4 and 5 provide regression analyses results examining the number of board interlocks in the post-restructuring period when assessing the impact of divestiture size (i.e., hypothesis 2). Specifically, Table 4 assesses the number of board interlocks in the first year following restructuring \( (t_1) \) and Table 5 the number of board interlocks in the second year following restructuring \( (t_2) \).
following a restructuring (t2). Both Models 1 in Tables 4 and 5 reveal no significant relationships between the control variables and the number of board interlocks in the post restructuring period with the exception of the positive relationship with CEO equity ownership and board interlocks in year t2. When the independent variable was added in model 2 for years t1 and t2, the control variables of board equity ownership and CEO equity ownership were significant. Specifically, board equity ownership is negatively related and CEO equity ownership is positively related to the number of board interlocks in the post-restructuring periods, respectively. In addition, models 2 of Tables 4 and 5 reveal the independent variable, *divestiture size*, is positively related to the number of board interlocks in years t1 and t2 (p < .01 for both years), which suggests larger, more visible divestitures result in greater amounts of board interlocks in the post-restructuring period, thus supporting hypothesis 2. Models 2 for the number of board interlocks in years t1 and t2 were both significant (R2 = .198, p = .004, and R2 = .146, p = .038, respectively).

### Table 4

**RESULTS OF REGRESSION ANALYSIS PREDICTING BOARD OF DIRECTOR TIES IN YEAR t1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership Concentration t1</td>
<td>-0.174</td>
<td>-1.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Equity t1</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>-0.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO Equity t1</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>1.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO Duality t1</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>1.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO Tenure t1</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>-0.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outsider Proportion t1</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divestiture Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R2: .073, Adjusted R2: .198, Change in R2: .103, Significance of R2 Change: .004

Additional Analyses

In order to strengthen confidence in these findings additional analyses were performed. The theoretical development in this paper suggests substandard performance may lead to changes in governance structures and such changes may occur irrespective of a restructuring event. This assertion was empirically tested and the results are contained in Tables 2-5. Specifically, firm performance (using a commonly accepted measure: *change in ROA in the pre-restructuring period*) was assessed for both hypotheses. Model 2 in each of the tables demonstrates firm performance was not significant in its impact on the number of board interlocks in the post-restructuring period.

Additionally, it is not unreasonable to assume the changes in governance structures might be greater for those firms having restructured their portfolios of assets. This implies there might be an interaction effect between restructuring events/size and firm performance. These relationships were tested using moderated multiple regression. Although not reported, the analysis
revealed no significant effects regarding the interaction between firm performance and restructuring events (or restructuring size) and their impact on board interlocks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership Concentration $t_2$</td>
<td>-0.151</td>
<td>-1.187</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Equity $t_2$</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>-0.247</td>
<td>-0.507</td>
<td>-2.216**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO Equity $t_2$</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>1.745†</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>2.685**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO Duality $t_2$</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>1.109</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>1.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO Tenure $t_2$</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>-0.360</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>-0.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outsider Proportion $t_2$</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divestiture Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.508</td>
<td>2.476**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.751</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

Overall, the results generally support the hypothesis that restructuring firms institute governance changes in the post-restructuring period. As hypothesized, divestiture size did have a direct and positive relationship with the number of board interlocks in the post-restructuring period. This finding reinforces the belief that restructuring events are viewed as significant shocks to the organization and surround it with uncertainty and ambiguity and require corrective action. By attracting powerful board members (i.e., those with greater ties to external organizations), the firm has the potential to reduce and/or better manage uncertainty in its environment and is more likely to enhance its ability to attract scarce resources, convey legitimacy, and better align managers, directors, and shareholders. These findings support, at least implicitly, arguments set forth by Mizruchi who stated “by appointing individuals with ties to other important organizations, the firm signals to potential investors that it is a legitimate enterprise worthy of support” (1996: 276).

The present research makes several contributions to the extant literature. First, empirically testing the restructuring to interlock relationship addresses the need for additional research examining post-restructuring governance systems (Schönhäar et al., 2014). This is important to both practitioners and researchers because it demonstrates how organizational control and its relationship to managing the firm’s portfolio of assets are bounded by years of institutionalized beliefs. As for managerial implications, this research contributes to the discussion concerning how governance structures can signal stability to investors, help allay concerns over managerial loyalties, and potentially elicit a positive response from the markets. Second, this paper breaks free from the ingrained agency arguments by employing institutional arguments to suggest
Restructuring and governance literatures may benefit from alternative theoretical lenses when examining these relationships. Third, this research employs a finer grained operationalization of restructuring by not solely investigating restructuring as a dichotomous variable. Assessing divestiture size reveals greater insight into the post-restructuring board interlock discussion.

**Limitations and Future Research**

The current paper focuses solely on relatively large, publicly held, U.S.-based firms. As a result, caution should be used in generalizing the results. While there has been an increase in studies examining corporate governance in various contexts, additional research can provide improved insight as to the overall nature of corporate governance in firms. For example, foreign firms operate under different regulatory and governance standards. In addition, smaller firms, both public and private, may face, and react to, pressures to conform and establish interlocks different than larger, publicly held U.S. firms. Cornforth (2012), states that research supports the premise that board size, structure, and tasks faced vary with organizational size. Dalton, et. al.’s (2007) proposition that corporate governance research is overly focused on larger U.S. firms, remains, to a large extent, true today.

So as to better address the issue of *empirical dogmatism*, and further embrace research outside the parameters of dominant governance models, future studies should examine additional antecedents beyond those posited by the agency explanation. For example, the role of economic conditions as a driver of the decision to divest is an area where research can provide additional insight into the restructuring-performance relationship. According to Amiri, Kin, and DeMarie (2017), divestiture behaviors vary with changing economic conditions, but the direction and/or significance of such potential drivers is ambiguous. They note research examining the relationship between environmental uncertainty and the breadth of corporate operations reports positive (e.g., Jones & Hill, 1988), negative (e.g., Belderbos & Zou, 2009), and insignificant associations (Duhaime & Grant, 1984). Further research will allow for the refinement of theories and models examining antecedents to the restructuring decision. Doing so will assist in overcoming the *empirical dogmatism* (Daily, et. al., 2003) associated with the agency explanation of governance models.

Another limitation both in this study, and much of the extant research in the field, is the simplistic design. This considering the inevitable impact of external forces the association between divestitures and outcomes. Assuredly, this relationship is more complex than has, at this time, been adequately captured. While some advances in contingency frameworks can be found (e.g., Stone, et al., 2010), overall, insufficient attention has been directed towards developing and testing contingency models (Cornforth, 2012). Future research that takes into account the complexity of the restructuring-outcomes relationship and its moderators, both internal and external, should move the field closer to a general theory of corporate governance.

Portfolio restructuring was the only type of restructuring event investigated in this paper. However, they are other types of restructurings firms might implement. *Financial restructuring*, involves significant changes in the capital structure of a firm, and *organizational restructuring*, which involve significant changes in organizational structures, are other strategies that might be implemented. Future research could examine various types of restructurings and assess their individual impacts on governance in the post-restructuring period. It is not unreasonable to assume a weaker link between financial/organizational restructurings and governance related arguments.
since firms often undertake these types of restructurings as part of an M&A strategy in order to meet the rapidly growing demand during an economic expansion.

Restructuring studies tend to examine either programs of divestitures or single divestitures. Examining the latter allows for focusing on one event, thus allowing the examination of variables prior and post restructuring. Research has demonstrated that for such restructurings, the divested units and the parent firm tend to be poor performers versus matched control firms. Unlike firms in single divestiture studies, firms engaging in programs of divestiture may restructure not necessarily due to substandard business unit performance (Johnson, 1996). A company that undertakes a program of divestitures might instead do so as a result of lower than expected growth in the unit or as a result of a failed new market development strategy. Based on these issues, the link between substandard performance and restructuring activities might not be as strong for chronic restructuring firms as it would be for firms engaging in a single divestiture so as to rectify poor performance. As such, one might imply that linkages between governance deficiencies, firm performance, and restructuring would not be as strong for these firms as they are for single divestiture firms. This is an empirical question that could be addressed in future research in examining the boundaries of the governance-performance-restructuring paradigm.

Finally, even when governance structures are modified, uncertainty remains as to how these changes came about. Do organizations make changes due to pressure from powerful actors or as a proactive measure so as to appease actors in the external environment (Oliver, 1991)? These changes might constitute a compromise between the organization and multiple constituent demands (Oliver, 1991), since powerful actors might have the different agendas (Hoskisson et al., 2002). Future research might address these issues in order to attain a greater understanding of governance in the post-restructuring period.
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ABSTRACT

The study of the theory of authentic leadership is in its infancy, but the practical application of the theory is available today. Authentic leadership is seen as a positive form of leadership that has roots in transformational, ethical, charismatic, and servant leadership. In an increasingly volatile organizational climate, the call for developing leaders – particularly authentic leaders – is on the rise. In this paper, the authors review authentic leadership theory and provide a research-based application designed for practitioners to train authentic leaders for internal professional development or as a training program for adult learners.

INTRODUCTION

The world landscape is increasingly filled with polarized views of government, business, and even non-profits (Yaacoub, 2016). In all parts of the world, there is division and protest and a call for leaders to showcase transparency, responsibility, and value to stakeholders (Yaacoub, 2016). The concept of authenticity has roots in Ancient Greece with the idea of being ‘true to oneself’ (Novicevic, Harvey, Buckley, Brown, Evans, 2006). In management and organizational studies, Novicevic et al. (2006) point to Chester Barnard (1938)’s classic works of executive leaders displaying authenticity for the benefit of individuals and organizations. More modern theorists have begun to study the theory of authentic leadership as a contribution to the body of knowledge on leadership studies (Novicevic et al., 2006). As the research continues, the idea is to connect theory to reality and develop applications for leaders and organizations to implement into their training of tomorrow’s leaders. With authentic leaders, perhaps the organizations of the future will find synergy where there is polarization and find unity where there is division.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The search for meaning is a natural phenomenon that occurs both in humans and in organizations. Sagnak and Kuruoz (2017) describe it as a “universal human motive” and one of the “basic mechanisms that make work meaningful” (p. 447). Authenticity and its connection to leadership is a paradigm that has been reviewed in academic literature for about three decades. In the early 1990’s, Terry (1993) released one of the first “how-to” books regarding authentic leadership and the search for meaning within self. Terry (1993) developed a diagnostic tool called the Authentic Action Wheel to help leaders appropriately select a response that most accurately found the root of management problems and would result in more authentic leadership. The Authentic Action Wheel categorized organizational problems into six categories including meaning, mission, power, structure, resources, and existence (Terry, 1993). This instrument was designed to help leaders frame the questions “What is really, really going on?” and “What are we going to do about it?” (Terry, 1993). Under Terry’s (1993) theory, leaders could locate their
problem on the wheel and select a strategically appropriate response that benefitted the leader, the group, and the organization.

According to Terry (1993), authenticity is at the center of effective leadership. While Terry’s (1993) authentic leadership model offers a practical, action-oriented tool that could be useful for leaders in daily management practices, the Authentic Action Wheel is not an evidence-based measurement model. Furthermore, Terry (1993) lacks an operational definition that can be easily measured.

A decade later, Luthans and Avolio (2003), whose work on authentic leadership was spearheaded out of the University of Nebraska at Lincoln in the Gallup Leadership Institute, first wrote about authentic leadership development as a model of leadership that was more ethical and concerned with the human condition. Luthans and Avolio (2003) describe authentic leaders as “confident, hopeful, optimistic, resilient, transparent, moral/ethical, future-oriented, and gives priority to developing associates to be leaders” (p. 243). The authentic leader is concerned with his or her followers and the connection between leader and follower. Luthans and Avolio (2003) defined authentic leadership as “a process that draws both from positive psychological capacities and a highly developed organizational context, which results in both greater self-awareness and self-regulated positive behaviors on the part of leaders and associates, fostering self-development” (p. 243). The Luthans and Avolio (2003) authentic leadership concept includes interpersonal, intrapersonal, and developmental definitions by including the leader, followers, and the organizational context.

Significance of Gallup Leadership Institute

As mentioned, Luthans and Avolio (2003)’s work grew out of the Gallup Leadership Institute. At the time, the Gallup Leadership Institute was a part of the Department of Management in the College of Business Administration at the University of Nebraska at Lincoln. At its inaugural leadership conference in June 2004, organized by leadership experts Bruce Avolio and William Gardner, more than 250 scholars, business leaders, undergraduate and graduate students came together to discuss the emergence and development of authentic leadership and authentic followership to produce greater organizational outcomes (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). A small number of scholarly papers selected from the summit appeared in a special edition of The Leadership Quarterly on authentic leadership development. The first-ever opinion poll on attitudes toward authentic leadership in the U.S. were released at the summit (Hoskins, 2004). The purpose of the biannual poll, which was developed to highlight the need for further research in this area, was to track how leadership in American organizations changed over time (Hoskins, 2004).

The significance of the Gallup Leadership Institute to the advancement of authentic leadership development cannot be overstated. The theory of authentic leadership that would be eventually produced benefitted from conversations that took place at the inaugural Gallup Leadership Institute conference (May, Chan, Hodges, & Avolio, 2003). This institution helped propel the desire shared by scholars to bring a sense of discipline to work in accelerating authentic leadership theory to be grounded in science and becoming evidence-based to advance the science and practice of authentic leadership (Avolio, 2010).

Authentic Leadership Defined

Glowacki-Dudka and Griswold (2016) state that “authentic leadership seeks to bring what is genuine to the forefront” (p. 106). Sagnak and Kuruoz (2017) and others define it as being true
to yourself as an individual and as a leader. It is considered a positive form of leadership that is rooted in positive psychology (Sagnak & Kuruoz, 2017). Shamir and Eilam (2005) agree that authentic leadership relies heavily on the meaning that the leader attaches to his or her life experiences. Shamir and Eilam (2005) argue that leaders’ authenticity can be measured to the fidelity of their actions and thoughts to the meanings they create by their life stories. George, Sims, McLean, & Mayer (2007) go a step further by asserting that the journey to authentic leadership begins with understanding one’s life story and from it finding the inspiration they need to make an impact in the world.

Bill George, a corporate practitioner and leader, published his first book on authentic leadership as a “business how-to” guide to transparent leadership (George, 2007). In 2010, he added a second book to the literature that outlined five areas of authentic leadership: 1) understand your purpose, 2) practice values, 3) establish relationships, 4) demonstrate self-discipline, 5) lead with heart (George, 2010). George (2010) calls for authentic leadership as an approach to positivity in the workplace and a pathway to help leaders face the tough decisions in a corporate environment that is filled with temptations. By developing an authentic leadership style and commitment, executives establish a foundation from which to make decisions (George, 2010).

Another practitioner perspective comes from Donna Orem (2016), interim President of N.A.I.S., a large non-profit organization within K-12 schools. Orem (2016) summarizes authentic leadership as having four characteristics: “Being self-aware and genuine…Being mission driven, with a focus on results…leading with both the heart and the mind…focusing on the long term” (p. 9). At its core, authentic leadership is about understanding and the self and others (Orem, 2016).

While there are various theories of authentic leadership, the model that will be used herein is the Avolio & Gardner (2005) model. This model takes a developmental approach to authentic leadership by suggesting that interpersonal and intrapersonal behaviors are qualities that can be developed into authentic leadership and these behaviors may be developed over a lifetime or triggered by life events (Mazutis, 2010). The Avolio & Gardner (2005) model of authentic leadership is generally regarded as the most commonly referred to approach of the authentic leadership theory. It relies on four areas of balance:

1. Self-awareness
2. Self-regulation (or internalized moral perspective)
3. Balanced processing
4. Relational transparency

According to Avolio and Gardner (2005), authentic leadership develops over time between leaders and followers as the relationship between them becomes more authentic. These four elements of the Avolio and Gardner (2005) model are grounded in positive psychological capital and positive moral perspective, and provide a starting point to examine development of the theory. Shamir and Eilam (2005) go further to suggest that authenticity also includes the elements of followership:

1. Followers want to follow the leader because they share the leader’s values, beliefs, and convictions, and the leaders’ concerns. Followers follow the leader not out of coercion or expectation of personal rewards but because of their authenticity.
2. Followers do not hold illusions or delusions about the leader and do not follow the leader because of a false sense of safety. They have a realistic view of the leader’s strengths and weaknesses.
3. Followers judge the leader’s claim for leadership based on their personally held values and convictions and judge the leader’s behavior as consistent with their own beliefs, values, and convictions.
4. Authentic leaders inspire their followers to act authentically at work and thus experience greater meaning by performing consistently with their moral values (Avolio & Gardner, 2005).

**Criticism of Authentic Leadership**

Early criticism of the original authentic leadership model focused on the lack of a clear, measurable definition and whether or not it was something that could be taught (Cooper et al., 2005). The Avolio and Gardner (2005) model offers a theory of authentic leadership that can be measured by the evidence-based Authentic Leadership Questionnaire, which was designed to complement (and accompany) the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), which measures transformational leadership. The ALQ has multi-rater and self-rater versions that may be utilized to measure the degree of a leader’s authenticity (Wong, Laschinger, & Cummings, 2010). Therefore, the survey measures are susceptible to social desirability bias both on the part of the leader and their followers. Dunning, Heath, and Suls (2004) indicate that in general, self-assessments of skills, expertise, and knowledge are flawed in systematic and substantive ways with among other things, people being overly confident and overestimating their skills. Additionally, the theory has been thus far only validated by single source data and survey measures. Gardner, Cogliser, Davis, and Dickens (2011) suggest that more rigorous and diverse research methods including experimental designs and qualitative methods should be implemented to legitimize the theory.

The theory also fails to draw deeper connections to specific aspects of foundational leadership theory. For example, the study of ethics appears to be closely linked to that of authentic leadership (Wilson, 2014). The theory has fundamental grounding within the ethical aspects of leadership and the paradigm of virtue ethics but, according to Wilson (2014), little work has been done to build a framework for the connection. More needs to be done to differentiate the theory as its own track of study within the literature.

**Relationship to Other Leadership Theories**

While it is postulated that authentic leadership stands alone as a distinct theoretical element, authentic leadership certainly does incorporate various other forms of positive leadership (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). Both transformational and authentic leaders are likely to stimulate personal identification among their followers so that followers’ beliefs and values become more similar to those of the leader (Bass, 2010). Transformational and authentic leaders have the enhanced ability to show individualized concern among their followers (Pierce & Newstrom, 2011). Transformational leaders help followers find meaning in their tasks and emote a sense of trust in leadership (Sun, Chen, & Zhang, 2017). The primary difference between the two types of leadership is that the transformational leader intentionally transforms their followers’ values to be congruent with their own, whereas the authentic leader focuses on followers’ collective value (Yaacoub, 2016).
Similarly, authentic leaders have high levels of emotional intelligence, optimism, and compassion for others. Both charismatic and authentic leaders aspire and use role modeling as a leadership strategy. However, authentic leaders will influence followers based on their individual characteristics rather than using rhetoric like charismatic leaders (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). Authentic leadership is also closely linked with ethical forms of leadership, including servant leadership (Wilson, 2015). Leaders are often in positions of power and have a responsibility to use this power for the good of the organization and often the good of the individual (Wilson, 2015). The idea of service to others is related to an altruistic sense of giving of oneself as a positive form of leadership (Pierce & Newstrom, 2011). Service and authentic self as a form of ethical leadership contribute to followers and to organizations in positive capacity. Ethical leadership “makes good business sense” because positive forms of leadership typically have higher returns than corruption or deceit (Wilson, 2015). Yaacoub (2016) asserts that what differentiates authentic leadership from transformational and servant leadership is that authentic leadership is at the root of positive leadership in any form. Therefore, a leader may be more or less authentic and possess various characteristics of each of the aforementioned leadership models.

DISCUSSION

Wilson (2014) asserts that ethical leadership is increasingly important in numerous fields, including education and other industries. As public scandals and a loss of trust in the corporate sector rises, so does the need to promote ethical forms of leadership (Wilson, 2014). According to Cooper et al. (2005), the decline in ethical leadership accompanied by increased societal challenges necessitates the need for positive relationships now more than any other period in history. Proponents of authentic leadership believe that organizations should conduct business in a socially responsible and ethical environment (Cooper et al., 2005; Wilson, 2014).

According to the Avolio and Gardner (2005) model, authentic leaders foster trust in leadership, which is associated with positive employee attitudes, behaviors, and outcomes including job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and retention. Gardner and Avolio (2005) assert that through increased self-awareness, self-regulation, and positive modeling, authentic leaders facilitate the development of authenticity in their followers, which contributes to sustainable performance.

How do leaders accomplish these areas? The Avolio and Gardner (2005) model developed greater theoretical support for the theory of authentic leadership, and much has been written since then calling for additional empirical evidence of both the model and the Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (Wilson, 2014). In fact, Wilson (2014) states “such research is in its infancy with more to be done to establish firmer theoretical foundations of leadership ethics in general and authentic leadership in particular” (p. 492). The application suggested here was developed based on the research currently available, and it is suggested that these types of practical applications can be implemented and tested to build evidence of the theory in practice.

THE APPLICATION

George (2003) states “to become authentic, each of us has to develop our own leadership style, consistent with our personality and character.” Developing leaders is a common practice in business, and the literature seems to suggest, then, that training or personal development are activities that will produce leadership growth. Yaacoub (2016) specifically states that “authenticity in leaders can be developed rather than having it as an innate trait for a fortunate few” (p. 48).
Pierce and Newstrom (2011), among other authors of leadership development readings and self-assessments, provide numerous applications for self-reflection and self-study of leadership practice, action, and uses in practice. In fact, many scholars refer to leadership as a journey and often a process of discovery (Pierce & Newstrom, 2011).

At the start of the journey, the leader examines critical life events. The application begins with identification of roles that might signify or relate to one’s approach to life and the various aspects of one’s segmented areas of identity. By listing roles, the individual completing the application can begin to segment their various paths and life events. This helps begin the process of self-discovery.

Next, the application asks for reflection on triggers. George (2003) notes several negative events in his life that were triggers on his path towards authentic leadership. In college, he lost six consecutive elections in his fraternity, and he did not understand why. He was later told that his egotism and arrogance might be qualities that were holding him back, and he later won an election after modifying his behavior (George, 2003). The loss of his mother and his fiancé early in his professional career were even more powerful triggers for George. He describes these events as emotional moments that “caused me to look inside myself, acknowledge my shortcomings, and realize I was on the wrong path” (George, 2003). These triggers led to his growth as an authentic leader. Triggers are often seen in psychological literature and adult learning theory (Merriam, Caffarella & Baumgartner, 2007). Transformational learning asks us to examine the triggers and past events to identify historical patterns that may be influencing our current actions (Merriam et al., 2007). Just as George (2003) examined his triggers, so too can an individual on a quest for self-reflective knowledge.

Next, authentic leaders are defined by their humility, which in turn promotes trust. Morris, Brotheridge, and Urbanski (2005) states that humility “is expected to generate servant leader-type behaviors such as engaging in supportive relationships, presenting a socialized power motivation, and leading through participation” (p. 1343). Developing this humility comes from careful evaluation of one’s own mistakes and challenges as recognition of the imperfections of others. Ego tends to pass judgment on others while humility understands and evaluates logic. Therefore, the next stages of the application examine weaknesses, values, and personal definition. These areas help create transparency for the self and the uniqueness of one individual in the exercise. Each person’s analysis and humble reflection will be different, and this, in turn, leads to a unique picture of what authenticity means for the individual.

The application ends with action. In other words, after self-assessment of the various aspects of the application, the individual creates action steps to put into practice. This step is established to bring the application full circle from concept to reality.

Figure 1 outlines the application designed to develop an authentic leader in the following steps:

(1) An authentic leader is self-aware, and must recognize how their various life roles create their identity (Avolio & Gardner, 2005).
(2) An authentic leader is self-regulated and recognizes the various triggers or critical life events in his or her life (Avolio & Gardner, 2005).
(3) An authentic leader is balanced and understands his or her weaknesses (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). Recognition and overcoming weaknesses creates balance and also helps create self-control (Avolio & Gardner, 2005).
(4) Authentic leaders possess relational transparency (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). By creating value statements, he or she creates commitment to his or her core morals that will help create transparent relationships (Avolio & Gardner, 2005).

(5) Finally, the individual creates a personal definition for authentic leadership. In this way, the individual more fully understands his or her place in leadership and creates a transparent, trustworthy relationship with followers (Avolio & Gardner, 2005).

(6) The “Action” at the end of the application are the culminating items for the individual. How will they put their definition for authentic leadership into practice?

**Figure 1**

*Application: Developing an Authentic Leader*

The training program is flexible and can be delivered in a variety of ways. For example, individuals can use this tool as a self-directed program for individual growth. It is also useful in a group setting to promote team building and leadership development. Either way, participants work through the steps of the application by considering each aspect of their own authentic self. In a group setting, participants can then share experiences to hear examples of how others might define and describe aspects of the application. The sharing of the experiences creates group dialogue that help individuals process their own progress and will possibly help trigger new learnings.

The student reflection workbook is a training tool used in hard copy format to help the participants reflect on their learning. The primary components of the workbook are outlined in Table 1. This workbook creates a record of their activity and an opportunity for post training reflection. The participants write about their life roles and their life triggers, and they reflect on how these roles and triggers have helped shape them as a person and a leader. The participants are asked to consider their weaknesses. They create value statements. The program culminates with each participant writing their own definition of authentic leadership and then outlining up to five action items they plan to take after they leave the workshop. The learning objectives include: (1) The learner will be able to outline, in writing, a personal reflection on life roles, life triggers, personal weaknesses, value statements. (2) The learner will describe a personal definition of authentic leadership. (3) The learner will outline specific action steps they will apply to their work setting. The student reflection workbook can be modified to fit the needs of an organization. For example, if an organization has defined work roles, these roles could be the focus of an activity rather than simply personal roles.
Another area of applicability for the application and the workbook is in coaching and mentoring sessions. Leadership preparation programs in the form of coaching are an expanding area of individual development (Celoria & Roberson, 2015). New learnings from these sessions help promote self-growth and goal achievement (Celoria & Roberson, 2015), and this application could serve as a tool to enhance knowledge of the authentic self.

### Table 1
**Student Reflection Workbook**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List your roles</td>
<td>How does this role help me be a leader?</td>
<td>How does this role hinder me from being a leader?</td>
<td>Rank this role in your life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal: (e.g., child, parent, friend)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (e.g., employee, boss…)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer (e.g., board, committee…)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g., other roles…)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trigger Moments</td>
<td>What lesson did this moment provide me?</td>
<td>How did this moment help me grow as a person?</td>
<td>What “life roles” did this moment effect?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
<td>Why do I consider this a weakness?</td>
<td>How can I turn weakness into a strength?</td>
<td>Tools to help me conquer this weakness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 4</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>I believe in this value because…</td>
<td>This value matches these roles in my life…</td>
<td>Rank these values</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 5</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Items</td>
<td>In what role(s) will I incorporate this action?</td>
<td>When will I complete this action?</td>
<td>How will I hold myself accountable?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE IMPLICATIONS

As noted throughout this review, the theory of authentic leadership is relatively new in the literature. There has also been some criticism in the literature on the approach to empirical studies of the paradigm. Future studies should seek methodologies that provide clear evidence as to the validity of the foundational elements of being authentic or true to oneself. It is important to add studies that explore quantitative elements of both the theory and the practice of authenticity.

Novicevic et al. (2016) suggest future research in the area of measuring individual factors that might lead to the success or failure of an authentic leader. To further this idea, future studies should focus on the specific factors that might identify an authentic leader vs. an ethical leader or a servant leader. While early studies began some of this work, much of the comparison was based on aspects of the previous developmental theories rather than the work that has been completed and validated in the past decade. In addition, perhaps future studies might focus less on the distinctions between theories and more on the similarities and cross-over relational aspects of various forms of positive leadership. Novicevic et al. (2016) also point to organizational aspects that might influence authenticity as a concept. Therefore, future studies might compare individual factors vs. organizational factors and the link or disparaging effects on authenticity. There exists
some intersect here between studies in organizational development and leadership theory. The intersection of the two fields creates a fruitful opportunity for continued exploratory studies.

The application and suggestions for implementation presented in this paper are based on research aspects, but they have not been studied in practice. Methodologies that observe and measure the results of the exercises would provide evidence of the ability to provide professional development related to building authenticity. Qualitative students of individual’s emotional connection to the application might also add value to the positive psychological implications of working to become an authentic leader.

The theory of authentic leadership may be in its infancy, but the application to leadership development can begin now. The training program described herein is based on the research conducted thus far, but much more can be done to provide empirical evidence to the literature. In the meantime, self-reflection through the use of this application and workbook can begin to help leaders think introspectively about their own approach to leadership to begin to develop more transparent and authentic approaches. As organizations seek leaders to lead through crisis and tumultuous times, the practice of working toward authenticity can add value to workplace.
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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate how servant leadership influences a salesperson’s perceived organizational support (POS), outcome performance, turnover intentions, and turnover. This study, using a sample of 382 business-to-business salespeople, is the first one to investigate how servant leadership influences POS and actual turnover. The data were analyzed using structural equation modeling. The results showed that servant leadership had a direct influence on POS and performance, but was related only indirectly to both turnover intentions and turnover through POS and performance. The results clarify how servant leadership influences performance directly and indirectly through POS.

INTRODUCTION

Leadership has been an important area of research in professional sales because of its relationship to important job attitudes and behaviors (Ingram et al. 2005). While sales researchers have investigated various leadership theories such as ethical leadership (DeConinck 2015; Schwepker 2015), participative and instrumental leadership (Mulki, Caemmerer, and Heggde 2015), transformational/transactional leadership (Bass 1985; Mullins, and Syam 2014; Mackenzie, Podsakoff, and Rich 2001; Schwepker and Good 2010; Shannahhan, Bush, and Shannahhan 2015), supportive leadership (Jaramillo and Mulki 2008; Netemeyer et al. 1997), and leader-member exchange (Darrat, Atinc, and Babin 2016; Paparoidamis and Guenzi 2009), in recent years increased attention has been devoted to servant leadership involving employees in a variety of occupations (Liden 2008; Liden, Wayne, and Meuser 2015; Van Dierendonck 2011) including professional selling (Schwepker and Schultz 2015; Jaramillo, Bande, and Varela 2015; Jaramillo et al. 2009).

The concept of servant leadership was developed many years ago (Greenleaf 1970, 1977). But, since only the early 2000s it has drawn the interest of scholars. Servant leaders emphasize the followers’ development and growth (Barbuto and Wheeler 2006; Liden et al. 2008) directly through mentoring or indirectly by providing a supportive work environment (Liden et al. 2008). Servant leaders view their role as developing followers’ responsibility and autonomy (van Dierendonck 2011). They place followers’ needs and interests above their own needs and interests (Barbuto and Wheeler 2006). Servant leaders act the same in all aspects of their lives (Liden et al. 2008). The key aspect of servant leadership is to serve others (Greenleaf 1977).

Servant leadership is related to a variety of job attitudes and behaviors such as organizational commitment (Liden et al. 2008), organizational justice (Ehrhart 2004; Schwepker
2016; Walumbwa, Hartnell, and Oke 2010), organizational citizenship behavior (Liden, Wayne, and Meuser 2015; Neubert et al. 2008), and psychological contract fulfillment (Panaccio et al. 2015). While these studies have provided insights into understanding servant leadership’s influence on employees’ attitudes and behavior, several questions remain. First, what is the relationship between servant leadership and performance? The issue of performance is particularly relevant in professional selling because the firm’s revenue is partially dependent upon the performance of the sales force (Chakrabrty, Widing, and Brown 2014).

The results of prior research are inconclusive regarding the relationship between the two variables. For example, some research indicates a direct relationship between servant leadership and performance (Jaramillo et al. 2015; Liden et al. 2014b; Schwepker and Schultz 2015) while other research indicates that the relationship is mediated by other variables (Bande et al. 2016; Chiniara and Bentein 2016; Jaramillo et al. 2009b). Thus, does the sales manager who is viewed as a servant leader directly influence salespersons’ performance? This study will attempt to provide further clarification into the relationship between servant leadership and salespersons’ performance.

Second, what is the relationship between servant leadership and perceived organizational support (POS)? POS, “the extent to which employees perceive that their contributions are valued by their organization and that the firm cares about their well-being” (Eisenberger et al. 1986, p. 501), has been the focus of many studies during the last 30 years and has been linked to a variety of job attitudes and behaviors (Rhoades and Eisenberger 2002). A few studies have reported that POS is related positively to several leadership theories such as transformational leadership (Epitropaki and Martin 2013) and leader-member exchange (Sweet, Witt, and Shoss 2015; Wayne, Shore, and Liden 1997). However, a search of the literature found only one study that analyzed the relationship between servant leadership and POS (Zhou and Miao 2014). This study, which involved Chinese public-sector employees, reported a positive relationship between POS and servant leadership. Intuitively, salespeople who think their sales manager cares about their well-being and places their needs and interests above his/her own needs and interests should perceive a higher level of perceived organizational support. Given the important relationship of POS to other leadership theories and various job attitudes and behaviors, a need exists within a sales environment to understand its relationship to servant leadership.

A third important purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between turnover and servant leadership. Much research has been devoted to understanding variables related to turnover (see the meta-analyses by Griffeth, Hom, and Gaertner 2000 and Holtom et al. 2008). Turnover is especially important in professional selling where the turnover rate can be double the rate for other jobs (Richardson 1999). While the direct costs of salesforce of turnover is high, the indirect costs (customer retention and the time needed to train a new salesperson) also can be substantial (Boles et al. 2012).

Previous research investigating the influence of servant leadership among salespeople has used turnover intentions as a surrogate for turnover (e.g. Jaramillo et al. 2009a; Lewin and Sager 2010; Rutherford, Park, and Han 2011; Wang and Ma 2013). However, an employee stating a desire to leave is not the same as actually leaving. The meta-analysis by Griffeth, Hom, and Gaertner (2000) found that the correlation between turnover intentions and turnover is only .38. Thus, a need exists to examine if the presence of a servant leader in a sales environment is related to turnover rather than just the intent to leave.

The proposed relationships are presented in the model below. Support for the model is presented in the literature review.
Servant Leadership

Robert Greenleaf (1977) developed the concept of servant leadership as defined below:

*The Servant Leader is servant first...It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings me to aspire to lead...The best test, and difficult to administer is this: Do those served grow as persons? Do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, and more likely themselves to become servants? And, what is the effect on her least privileged in society? Will they benefit, or at least not further be harmed?* (1977, p. 7).

Servant leadership shares similarities to other leadership theories (see reviews by Stone, Russell, and Patterson 2004 and van Dierendonck 2011). For example, servant leadership overlaps with ethical leadership in three areas: people, humility and development, and empowering people (van Dierendonck 2011). In contrast to ethical leadership whose main focus is on creating role models who communicate ethical values and rewarding and punishing employees for ethical or unethical behavior, servant leadership emphasizes other dimensions of a leader’s behavior (Liden et al. 2014a). Both servant leadership and transformational leadership emphasize similar leadership attributes: articulating a vision, trust, honesty, integrity, role modeling, and empowerment (Stone, Russell, and Patterson 2004). However, the major difference between servant leadership and other leadership theories is the leader’s focus. The primary focus of servant leaders is on the needs of the follower while transformational leaders focus on organizational
effectiveness (Parolini, Patterson, and Winston 2009; van Dierendonck et al. 2014). While relationships are important to other leadership theories, it is a central component of servant leadership (Liden et al. 2014a). The servant leader attempts to help followers grow, prosper, and develop (Greenleaf 1977) and motivates followers by focusing on their needs and behaviors (Liden et al. 2014a). A servant leader’s primary motivation is to serve others (Liden et al. 2014a).

Grisaffe, VanMeter, and Chonko (2016) reported that while facets of servant leadership do overlap with other forms of leadership (i.e. transformational and transactional), it does provide incremental increases in salespersons’ attitudes and behaviors beyond that of transformational and transactional leadership styles at higher levels of the sales hierarchy. In addition, Liden et al. (2008), reported that servant leadership was related positively to organizational commitment and in-role performance, after controlling for the effects of transformational leadership and leader-member exchange. Recently, Hoch et al. (2018) compared the incremental variance of authentic leadership, ethical leadership, and servant leadership with transformational leadership regarding certain variables. A key finding of their study was that servant leadership (12%) explained more incremental variance over what is explained by transformational leadership than did either authentic leadership (5.2%) or ethical leadership (6.2%). In addition, these authors reported that, while the correlation between servant leadership and transformational is high (.52), it is considerably less than the correlation between transformational leadership and both authentic leadership (.75) and ethical leadership (.70). Thus, while servant leadership is similar to other leadership theories, it contains distinct characteristics from them.

During the last ten years, increased attention has been given to servant leadership in the professional selling area. For example, research has reported that servant leadership is related to a caring ethical work climate and performance (Jaramillo, Bande, and Varela 2015; Schwepker and Schultz 2015), organizational commitment (Jaramillo et al. 2009b), satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior (Grisaffe, VanMeter, and Chonko 2016), organizational justice (Schwepker 2016), and turnover intentions (Jaramillo 2009a). The next section of the paper presents a discussion of variables hypothesized to be outcomes of servant leadership.

**Perceived Organizational Support**

Both the norm of reciprocity and social exchange theory is the basis for POS (Blau 1964). Blau (1964) defined social exchange as “the voluntary actions of individuals that are motivated by the returns they are expected to bring and typically do in fact bring from others” (p. 91). Economic exchanges differ from social exchanges. Economic exchanges involve getting paid for performance at a specified time while social exchanges involve non-specified rewards in the future and involve high levels of trust (Gouldner 1960). Employees who perceive that the organization treats them fairly and cares about their well-being will feel obligated to reciprocate that behavior through increased loyalty, commitment, and performance (Eisenberger et al. 2001).

Surprisingly, only one found study could be located that has examined the relationship between servant leadership and POS (Zhou and Miao 2014). However, a few studies have reported that POS is highly correlated with both leader-member exchange (Dulac et al. 2008; Sweet, Witt, and Shoss 2015; Wayne, Shore, and Liden 1997) and transformational leadership (Bai, Li, and Xi 2012; Epitropaki and Martin 2013). In their meta-analysis of POS Rhoades and Eisenberger 2002 reported that perceived supervisor support is correlated highly with POS. However, their study did not report the correlation between any specific leadership theory and POS. Liden et al. (2008) theorized that by caring for employees’ interests and creating a relationship built on trust, servant
leaders display support for followers that extends outside the formal employment relationship. In addition, the interactions between servant leaders and subordinates may increase subordinates’ perceptions that the organization supports them.

Servant leadership contains similar attributes as those characteristics found in transformational leadership and leader-member exchange. Since both transformational leadership and leader-member exchange theory are correlated highly with POS, intuitively servant leadership also should be related to POS.

**H1: Servant leadership is related positively to POS.**

**Servant Leadership and Performance**

Researchers have been particularly interested in studying leadership and its relationship to performance. Salespeople have the direct responsibility to increase the firm’s revenue. Generally, research has shown that various leadership styles can influence performance indirectly through increased job satisfaction, effort, and motivation (Jaramillo et al. 2009a).

While servant leadership has been shown to be related to a variety of employees’ job attitudes and behaviors, its relationship to performance is somewhat unclear. For example, both Liden et al. (2014) and Chiniara and Bentein (2016) found that the relationship between servant leadership and employee task performance was mediated by other variables. Regarding salespeople some research indicates that the relationship between servant leadership and performance is both direct and indirect through other variables (Grisaffe, VanMeter, and Chonko 2016; Jaramillo, Bande, and Varela 2015; Schaweiker and Schultz 2015). However, Jaramillo et al. (2009) reported that servant leadership was related to outcome performance only indirectly through other variables (job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job stress).

One purpose of this study is to analyze if servant leadership influences salespersons’ performance directly or indirectly through other variables. The preponderance of research involving salespeople appears to indicate that servant leadership is related to performance directly. Thus, the following hypothesis will be tested.

**H2: Servant leadership is related positively to salespersons’ performance.**

**Antecedents of Turnover**

While turnover is important for all businesses, it especially is important for sales organizations because of the direct and indirect costs. Direct costs include hiring and training new salespeople and lost sales. Turnover rates can reach 50 percent in some industries (Brashear, Manolis, and Brooks 2005). Indirect costs include customer retention (Rutherford et al. 2011). A relationship of trust that has developed between the salesperson and the client may be lost when a new salesperson takes over the territory. Another indirect cost is the “ramp-up” time needed to get the new salesperson familiar with the territory (DeConinck and Johnson 2009). Given these high costs, the number of studies devoted to sales force turnover is not surprising (Darmon 2008).

In order to reduce the costs of turnover organizations need to understand factors related to increased turnover. Prior research has indicated many variables associated with sales force turnover including job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Russ and McNeilly 1995; Wang and Ma 2013), leadership style (Mulki, Caemmerer, and Heggde 2015), organizational justice (DeConinck and Johnson 2009), ethical climate (Jaramillo, Mulki, and Solomon 2006;
Schwepker 2001), supervisory trust (Mulki, Jaramillo, and Locander 2006), and performance (DeConinck and Johnson 2009; Mulki, Caemmerer, and Heggde 2015.

Intuitively, when organizations provide help to employees and values their contributions, the employees should reciprocate with positive work-related behavior such as increased effort and performance. Several studies (Cullen et al. 2014; Piercy et al. 2006; Riggle, Edmonson, and Hansen 2009) including the meta-analysis by Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) have shown a positive relationship between POS and job performance. In addition, research has shown that POS is related to turnover intentions (Dawley, Houghton, and Bucklew 2010) and performance is related negatively to turnover intentions/turnover (Griffeth, Hom and Griffeth 2000; Williams and Livingstone, 1994; Zimmerman and Darnold 2009) while turnover intentions are related to turnover (Griffeth, Hom, and Gaertner 2000; Hom et al. 1992).

H3: POS is related positively to performance.

H4: POS is related negatively to turnover intentions.

H5: Performance is related negatively to turnover intentions.

H6: Performance is related negatively to turnover.

H7: Turnover intentions are related negatively to turnover.

While prior research has indicted a significant correlation between the various leadership theories and turnover intentions (e.g. Bauer et al. 2006; Harris, Kacmar, and Witt 2005; Waldman, Carter, and Hom 2015), most research has reported that other variables mediate or moderate the relationship (Burch and Guarana 2014; Deconinck 2011; Darrat, Atinc, and Babin 2016; Harris, Wheeler and Kacmar 2009; Mulki, Caemmerer, and Heggde 2015).

However, few studies have examined the relationship between servant leadership and turnover intentions. Three studies reported that other variables mediate the relationship (Babakus, Yavas, and Ashill 2001; Jaramillo et al. 2009; Zhao, Liu, and Gao 2016) while one study reported that servant leadership was related directly to turnover intentions (Hunter et al. 2013). Since controlling turnover is very important in professional selling, understanding the relationship between servant leadership and turnover is important.

Although a few studies involving salespeople have used actual turnover (DeConinck and Johnston 2009; Johnston et al. 1988; Lucas et al. 1987; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, and Ahearne 1998; Sager, Varadarajan, and Futrell 1988), most sales force research has used turnover intentions as a surrogate for turnover (e.g. Fournier et al. 2010; Jaramillo, Mulki, and Solomon 2006 and 2009; Lewin and Sager 2010; Mulki, Jaramillo, and Marshall 2007; Pettijohn, Pettijohn, and Taylor 2007). However, only 14 percent of the variance in turnover is accounted for with quit intentions (Griffeth, Hom, and Gaertner 2000). Two recent studies have reported similar results (Peltokorpi, Allen, and Froese 2015; Podsakoff, LePine, and LePine 2007). Thus, just because a salesperson states an intention to quit, does not mean that he or she will actually leave. Therefore, two important purposes of this study are to (1) investigate if servant leadership is related directly to turnover intentions and (2) if servant leadership is related directly to turnover or if these relationships are mediated by other variables.

RI: What is the relationship between servant leadership and turnover intentions/turnover?
METHODOLOGY

This study employed a cross-sectional group of business-to-business salespeople. A list of 600 sales managers located in the United States was purchased from a commercial broker. Each sales manager was sent a letter explaining the purpose of the study and a copy of the survey. The sales managers who agreed to participate in the study were asked to encourage their salespeople to access a link so that they could complete the survey. The salespeople were assured that only the researchers would have access to their responses. The survey was coded in order to match the salespeople with their sales manager. This situation was necessary since the sales managers provided performance data for each of their salespeople, to track non-response bias and evaluate turnover. In order to ensure confidentiality demographic and performance data were obtained prior to the salespeople having access to the survey. Thus, the sales managers were not able to ascertain which of their salespeople chose to complete or not complete the survey.

A total of 38 letters were returned as undeliverable. Of the remaining sales managers, 153 supplied performance and demographic data for their sales force. Completed surveys were received from 382 salespeople (59.4 percent). One year later each sales manager was contacted to obtain turnover information. The names of the salespeople who completed the survey one year earlier were compared to the names who had left the company. After one year, 15 salespeople had been promoted and 86 had left the company. The salespeople who were promoted were not counted as turnover.

All of the salespeople were employed in a business to business sales position working in both manufacturing and services industries. The salespeople had worked in sales an average of 11.2 years; their average age was 37.7; 281 were male (73.6 percent); and a majority had at least an undergraduate degree (234 – 61.3 percent). Respondents were compensated via salary (32.7%), commission (19.1%), or a combination of salary, commission, and bonus (48.2%). According to information provided by the sales manager, no statistical difference in demographics was found between the salespeople who stayed and those salespeople who left or between the salespeople who completed a survey and those salespeople who did not.

Measures

The survey items appear in the appendix. Servant Leadership was measured using the 7 – item short form for the 28 – item scale developed by Liden et al. (2008). Liden et al. (2015), using six samples of employees in three independent studies, found the short form of the scale was highly correlated with the longer version. Perceived Organizational Support was measured using five items from the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support developed by Eisenberger et al. (1986). Performance was measured using three items from the scale used by Low, Cravens, and Moncrief (2001). Turnover Intentions were measured with five items used by Wayne, Shore, and Liden (1997). Turnover was measured as a dichotomous variable and coded as 1 for salespeople still employed after one year and 2 for those salespeople who left.

Measure Assessment

Common method bias can be a serious problem in survey research (Podsakoff et al. 2003). Several steps were taken to alleviate the problem of common method bias. First, the salespeople responded to questionnaire items related to servant leadership, POS, and turnover intentions while
the sales managers rated the salesperson’s performance. Second, the items were randomly dispersed in the questionnaire. Third, Harmon’s one factor test was used as a statistical measure for common method variance. The one factor explained 27 percent of the variance, which is less than the recommended 50 percent level. While some concern exists for the use of Harmon’s one factor test in its ability to detect common method bias (Podsakoff et al. 2003), a recent study concluded that it “can detect biasing levels of CMV under conditions commonly found in survey-based marketing research” (Fuller et al. 2016, p. 3197). These results indicate that common method bias is probably not a serious problem.

**Analysis and Results**

The results were analyzed using LISREL version 8. The means, standard deviations and correlation among the variables appear in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Matrix, Means, and Standard Deviations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Servant leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The measurement model indicated a good fit ($\chi^2 = 301.09$, $df = 180$, $p = .00$, GFI = .92, AGFI = .89, NFI = .97, RMSEA = .046). Based on the results of the confirmatory factor analysis, the hypothesized model was tested. The results for the hypothesized model also indicated a good fit ($\chi^2 = 305.95$, $df = 183$, $p = .00$, GFI = .92, AGFI = .89, NFI = .96, RMSEA = .046).

Support was found for each of the hypotheses. Servant leadership is related positively to POS (Hypothesis 1) ($\beta = .32$, $t = 5.18$); servant leadership is related positively to performance (Hypothesis 2) ($\beta = .32$, $t = 5.18$); POS was related positively to performance (Hypothesis 3) ($\beta = .20$, $t = 3.11$); POS is related negatively to turnover intentions (Hypothesis 4) ($\beta = -.28$, $t = 4.63$); performance was related negatively to turnover intentions (Hypothesis 5) ($\beta = -.22$, $t = 3.51$); performance is related negatively to turnover (Hypothesis 6) ($\beta = -.23$, $t = 3.84$); and turnover intentions were related negatively to turnover (Hypothesis 7) ($\beta = .31$, $t = 5.48$).

A second model tested the relationship between servant leadership and turnover intentions/turnover (R1). The results indicated that this model did not fit the data better than did the hypothesized model ($\Delta\chi^2 = 3.07$, NS). The paths from servant leadership to turnover intentions ($\beta = .08$, $t = 1.41$) and servant leadership to turnover ($\beta = .07$, $t = 1.26$) were insignificant.

**DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS**

Leadership has been an important focus of research for many years among a variety of employees. But, the study of leadership has been especially important in the area of professional selling because of the unique nature of a salesperson’s job and its link to various outcomes, especially performance (e.g., Bass 1997; Ingram et. al 2005; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, and Rich 2001; Mulki, Caemmerer, and Heggde 2015; Schwepker and Schultz 2015).

The major purpose of this study was to examine outcomes of servant leadership, which recently has become an important area of research in professional selling (Grisaffe, VanMeter, and
Chonko 2016). Specifically, this study examined the relationship between servant leadership and performance, perceived organizational support, turnover intentions, and turnover. The results of this study have important theoretical and practical implications for managing the sales force.

**Theoretical Implications**

An important implication of these results is the relationship between servant leadership and performance. Research has analyzed variables related to sales force performance for more than thirty years (Churchill et al. 1985). Four studies have examined the relationship between servant leadership and outcome performance with samples of salespeople. This study confirmed the results of prior research (Schwepker and Schultz 2015; Grisaffe, VanMeter, and Chonko 2016; Jaramillo et al. 2015) indicating that servant leadership influences performance both directly and indirectly. In this study POS partially mediated the relationship between servant leadership and performance. An important aspect of this study is that it used actual performance data from the sales manager rather than relying on self-reported data. Thus, the salesperson’s performance evaluation was separate from their opinion of their sales manager as a servant leader.

An important implication of these results is that servant leadership has a direct relationship with salespersons’ level of POS. Many studies have shown the influence POS has on a variety of employees’ behavior and organizational consequences. However, only a few studies have investigated POS within a sales context. This study expands on prior sales force research by showing that POS directly influences performance and turnover intentions. Sales managers who care about their salespeople’s career development and puts the salesperson’s best interests above their own development will instill a perception that the organization also cares about them. The type of behavior by the sales manager will lead to higher sales force performance and a lower intention to leave the organization.

An interesting theoretical implication of this study’s results is that the lack of a direct, significant relationship between servant leadership and either turnover intentions or turnover. Few studies have examined the relationship between servant leadership and turnover intentions and only one study involved salespeople (Jaramillo et al. 2009a). No study has looked at actual turnover data. The results indicated that sales managers perceived as servant leaders did not have a direct influence on either turnover intentions or turnover among this sample of salespeople.

**Managerial Implications**

Leadership has been the focus of much research in the sales area because of its relationship to various behaviors and outcomes (e.g., Jaramillo, Bande, and Varlea 2015; Ingram, Lafortune, and Schwepker 2007; Schwepker and Good 2010). But, as noted by Grisaffe, VanMeter, and Chonko (2016), servant leadership has the potential of creating gains in outcomes beyond what is achieved by either transformational leadership or transactional leadership. Thus, implementing a servant leadership approach can assist sales organizations to achieve desired goals.

The results presented here have several practical implications for sales organizations. Although not a construct in this study, research has indicated that servant leadership is related to ethical behavior of employees (Jaramillo, Bande, and Varela 2015; Schwepker and Schultz 2015). One of the items in the Liden et al. (2015) measure of servant leadership, which was used in this study and the Schwepker and Schultz (2015) study, asks about whether the sales manager would compromise his/her ethical principles to achieve success. The recent ethical scandal involving the
sales practices at Wells Fargo emphasizes the importance of ethical leadership. Since serving others is a central component of servant leadership, hiring and/or promoting sales managers and executives who possess the traits of servant leadership may be a way to reduce unethical behavior in sales organizations.

Another important practical implication is that sales managers who are viewed as servant leaders have a direct influence on the performance of their salespeople. Much research for many years has been devoted to understanding factors related to increasing salespersons’ performance (e.g., Churchill et al. 1985; Goad and Jaramillo 2014; Miao and Evans 2007; Verbeke, Dietz, and Verwaal 2011) including how leadership influences job performance (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, and Rich 2001; Mulki, Caemmerer, and Heggde 2015; Schwepker 2015; Shannahan, Bush, and Shannahan 2013). The sales manager who makes a salesperson’s career development a priority, gives the sales force freedom to make difficult decisions, and who has the ability to see when something is going wrong is viewed as being a servant leader. That type of sales manager can have a positive influence on a salesperson’s performance.

The inclusion of POS in this study also has important implications for sales managers. The sales manager, acting as a servant leader, creates a perception among the sales force that the organization cares about them, takes great pride in their accomplishments, and is willing to help them when they have a problem. This perception that the organization supports their efforts will lead to higher performance and indirectly to lower turnover. Clearly, creating an environment where higher performance is achieved while reducing turnover, especially among the best performers, are goals that every organization wants to achieve regarding their sales force. This study indicates that the sales manager plays a vital role in ascertaining and relaying the needs of the sales force to higher levels of management, which helps achieve these goals. However, failure to provide adequate support to the sales force can lead to lower performance and higher turnover.

Limitations and Future Research Opportunities

This study, like all research, has some limitations. First, the data are cross-sectional. The results may differ depending on the sample of salespeople selected. The model should be tested within a specific organization. Collecting data from a single organization may be particularly relevant regarding performance data. Second, this study was limited to examining the relationship between servant leadership and certain outcome variables. Future studies may include other outcome variables such as organizational identification, psychological contract fulfillment, and organizational justice.

Another limitation of this study is that it examined only outcomes and not antecedents of servant leadership. To date, no study has examined variables that influence a manager to become a servant leader. What role, if any, does religion or family play in a person becoming a servant leader? One might expect that a person’s parents or other family members are important in developing moral values associated with servant leadership. But, no research has tested this assumption. In addition, can an organization teach sales managers to become servant leaders? If so, what training can organizations undertake to influence sales managers or salespeople who will become sales managers to become servant leaders? Have these sales managers who are viewed as servant leaders received training that is different from other sales managers? What role does upper management play in the development of servant leaders? Also, how can lower level managers become servant leaders unless upper level managers adhere to the importance of servant leadership? Future research can perhaps provide answers to these questions.
This study was the first one involving salespeople that examined the influence of servant leadership on POS. Future research needs to be undertaken to confirm these results. In addition, this study examined only POS and not perceived supervisor support (PSS). The success of the salesforce is partially dependent on the leadership skills of the sales manager. Is servant leadership related to the level of perceived support salespeople receive from their sales manager? Future research can attempt to answer this question.

The recent Hoch et al. (2018) meta-analysis presents interesting opportunities for research. While these researchers reported that servant leadership is distinct from transformational leadership in its ability to predict job satisfaction, organizational commitment, trust, and engagement, it did not provide additional variance in the prediction of performance over the variance predicted by transformational leadership. The ability of any leadership theory to predict performance is important, but their ability to predict performance in a professional selling environment is especially important given the uniqueness of a sales job.

In conclusion, this study has shown the importance of servant leadership on salespersons’ POS and performance. Indirectly, through these two variables, servant leaders can influence the turnover process in the sales force. Hopefully, these results can show organizations the benefits of hiring and or promoting sales managers who can act as servant leaders to their salespeople.
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**Appendix**

**Turnover Intentions**
1. I am actively looking for a job outside of my company.
2. As soon as I can find a better job, I’ll leave my company.
3. I am seriously thinking about quitting my job.
4. I often think about quitting my job.
5. I think I will be working at another company five years from now (Reverse scored).

**Perceived Organizational Support**
1. My organization takes great pride in my accomplishments.
2. My organization really cares about my well-being.
3. My organization strongly considers my goals and values.
4. My organization is willing to help me if I need help.
5. Help is available from the organization when I have a problem.

**Servant Leadership**
1. My sales manager can tell if something work-related is going wrong.
2. My sales manager makes my career development a priority.
3. I would seek help from my sales manager if I had a personal problem.
4. My sales manager emphasized the importance of giving back to the community.
5. My sales manager puts my best interests ahead of his/her own.
6. My sales manager gives me the freedom to handle difficult situations in the way that I feel is best.
7. My sales manager would NOT compromise ethical principles in order to achieve success.

**Performance** (items measured on a scale ranging from 1 “needs improvement” to 5 “outstanding”)
1. Achieving annual sales targets and other objectives.
2. Understanding customer needs and work processes.
3. Keeping expenses at acceptable levels.
This research attempts to understand and empirically examine consumer acceptance of licensed fashion apparel extension under a mass-market auto brand name. A conceptual model and research hypotheses were proposed based on a review of the literature on fashion apparel consumption and brand extension. An online survey was designed and conducted to collect data from a convenience sample with 391 valid responses. Structural equation modeling was applied to test the proposed conceptual model and hypotheses. Results show that consumer acceptance of the mass-market auto brand’s fashion apparel extension is affected by attitudes toward the fashion apparel extension, perceived fit, attitudes toward the parent brand, parent brand image, and parent brand quality. Implications were provided.

INTRODUCTION

Brand extension has been one of the most commonly used strategies to launch new products for decades (Aaker, 1996). Strong brands are trusted and valued by consumers, and consequently, can be leveraged through brand extensions to create a compelling value proposition in a new market or segment (Taylor, 2004, Martínez et al., 2009). In fact, established durable goods brands have already been extended into other product categories including fashion apparel, home bedding, and accessories, through licensing.

While brand extensions and licensing used to be considered two distinct branding strategies, extant literature suggests that licensing should be treated as an “external” brand extension (Walsh et al., 2014). Brand licensing refers to a process of creating and managing contracts for a brand owner (a licensor) to give another firm (a licensee) the right to produce and sell products using the brand (Buratto and Grosset, 2012). A firm may have difficulty in stretching its brand far from the extant product categories internally, which requires additional resources or acquisition of competences. However, this difficulty can be overcome through licensing (Colucci et al., 2008). Advantages of brand licensing include generating revenues by extending the brand without incurring the costly expense of direct entry, in addition to helping enhance the brand’s equity in new markets (Jayachandran et al., 2013).

Lifestyle positioning is another popular approach among brand managers to increase brand equity, especially in commodity categories in which functional differentiations are difficult to maintain. Many well-established brands have transitioned from being performance-focused to lifestyle-oriented. To brand managers, lifestyle brands seem to offer a way to avoid face-to-face
competition within a category by bonding with consumers’ personal lives (Chernev et al., 2011). Fashion apparel, home décor, fitness, sports, and culinary arts are among the industries catering to markets with specific lifestyles (Danskin et al., 2005). These lifestyle-related categories seem already to have evoked certain “personality” (Batra et al., 2010), and therefore, successfully launching licensed fashion apparel extensions may be a good combination of brand extension and lifestyle branding. For instance, in the automobile industry, many luxury brands including Bentley, Ferrari, Land Rover, Porsche, Mercedes-Benz, and Cadillac have been growing their licensed merchandise programs or launching lifestyle products. Those licensed products include but are not limited to outdoor specialties, sporting goods, fashion apparel, eyewear, electronics, luggage, bikes and kids riding toys (Gelsi, 1996).

Previous research highlights that the success of a brand’s extension significantly depends on the strong image of its parent brand, as well as perceived fit between the parent brand and the brand extension (Völckner and Sattler, 2006) in terms of product features (e.g., Aaker and Keller, 1990), and brand concept (Park et al., 1991) or relevance (Broniarczyk and Alba, 1994). Luxury brands having prestigious images, and featuring desirable lifestyles are more likely to succeed in extending into a variety of product categories including fashion apparel and accessories (Park et al., 1991). Functional mass-market brands are normally considered less likely to be able to extend into distant product categories because of the difficulty in transferring the functional feature of the brand across different product categories. Fashion apparel has been considered a means of nonverbal communication to deliver messages about the wearer’s identity, social status, and lifestyle. Extending a functionally oriented durable product brand into a more experientially oriented fashion apparel market is a challenging long-distance stretch. Moreover, the billion-dollar fashion industry has been full of self-expressive brands and is very competitive in all segments. Do functional brands, such as mass-market auto brands, have a chance to extend into more experientially oriented product categories such as fashion apparel?

In fact, the chances for a functionally orientated brand to extend into lifestyle categories successfully ultimately depend on consumers’ acceptance. To this end, it is our goal to examine consumers’ acceptance of fashion apparel extensions licensed by functional mass-market auto brands. This empirical study intends to provide knowledge concerning consumer acceptance of fashion apparel extensions, which may facilitate functional mass-market brands to identify the direction for cross-category brand extensions and to compete for a share of consumer identity. We intend to examine how those identified extension success factors, including parent brand image, quality, and perceived fit, affect consumers’ attitudes toward and acceptance of a mass-market auto brand licensed fashion apparel extension. We also want to explore whether consumers’ favorable attitudes toward a functional mass-market auto brand can be transferred into favorable attitudes toward its fashion apparel extension.

**THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT**

**Attitudes toward brand extension and acceptance**

Previous research suggests that a brand extension succeeds if consumers hold positive attitudes toward the extension (Aaker and Keller, 1990, Völckner and Sattler, 2006). However, some other researchers do not agree that a consumer holding positive attitudes toward a product will necessarily purchase the product; therefore, they propose that extensions success should be assessed based on consumers’ intent to purchase (O’Cass and Grace, 2004, Lafferty, 2007). This
study conceptualizes consumers’ acceptance of a brand extension as their behavioral intentions to
the brand extensions, which include purchase intention and willingness to engage in positive word
of mouth because the social and financial benefits of the cross-category extensions have important
behavioral consequences beyond attitudinal evaluations (Xie, Batra & Peng, 2015).

According to the theory of reasoned action (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980), a person’s
behavioral intention is a function of his or her attitudes. Attitudes consist of beliefs about a
particular behavior and the individual's positive or negative evaluation of the outcome (Han and
Chung, 2014). Thus, an individual is more likely to perform a behavior when he or she has a
positive attitude toward performing the behavior. Soloman and Rabolt’s (2009) fashion decision-
making model describes the last few stages as evaluation of alternatives (consumer compares
several styles and brands of the products in terms of construction, country of origin, or added
features), product choice (consumer chooses one product and tries it on), and outcome (consumer
buys the product and enjoys the purchase). According to these two models, a consumer may show
positive or negative attitudes toward a licensed fashion apparel extension product after evaluating
it and make a purchase decision based on the formed attitudes. Thus, the first hypothesis is posited:

H1: Consumers’ favorable attitudes toward licensed fashion extensions increase the likelihood of their
acceptance of the fashion apparel extensions

Parent brand quality

Aaker and Keller (1990) found that the perception of high quality for a parent brand led to
evaluations that are more favorable on extension products. Consumers often think high-quality
brands are more credible, expert, and trustworthy. If a brand is associated with high quality, its
extension may benefit (Aaker and Keller, 1990), and consumers are willing to pay more for the
brand extension and recommend it to others (Fedorikhin et al., 2008). As a result, even if
consumers do not clearly perceive the fit between a relatively distant extension and its parent brand
in terms of product features, they may still be willing to give a high-quality brand extension more
chances than to one considered average quality (Keller and Aaker, 1992). According to Forney et
al. (2005), the salient dimensions of evaluative criteria for purchasing fashion products consisted
of quality, image, color, style, design, and beauty. When a consumer evaluates a brand’s fashion
apparel extension, perceived quality of the parent brand may be transferred to the fashion apparel
extension and affect individuals’ attitudes toward and intention to purchase the brand extension
products. For those mass-market functional brands, even if there is a lack of prestigious image,
good quality including reliability, durability, workmanship, and dependability may function as
extrinsic cues on consumers’ perceptions of quality and value upon their extension products (Teas
and Agarwal, 2000). This is especially true for product categories in which quality matters
significantly to consumers such as jeans and active wears. Thus, we posit the following set of
hypotheses:

H2: Higher perceived quality of a mass-market functional brand leads to (a) more favorable attitudes
toward, and (b) higher likelihood of acceptance of its licensed fashion apparel extensions.

Fit

A review of the literature found that perceived fit has been considered as the most salient
success factor in brand extension development (Keller, 1993, Boush, 1987, Barone et al., 2000,
Bhat and Reddy, 2001). Even for brands that are perceived as reasonable, or “make sense” to enter a specific new product category, it is still very challenging to succeed if perceived fit is not good enough (Af Sandeberg and Östlund, 2003). The “categorization” perspective from the viewpoint of psychology (e.g., John et al., 2006, Boush, 1987) can help better understand the concept of perceived fit. According to the view of categorization, consumers’ evaluations of brand extensions follow a two-step process. First, consumers determine whether there is a match between what they know about a parent brand and what they believe to be true about its extension. If consumers perceive the match, then in the second step, they might transfer extant brand attitudes towards the parent brand to its extensions (Keller et al., 2011, Keller et al., 2008).

According to Keller (2011), any of the parent brand associations serve as a potential source for fit. Most researchers agree that consumers’ judgment of relevancy or consistency is a function of salient shared associations between a parent brand and its extension product category (Choueke, 2009). The more shared associations there are between the parent brand and its new extension category, the greater the perceived fit. Greater perceived fit between the extant and new extension products leads to a better transfer of positive beliefs and attitudes to its new extensions (Aaker and Keller, 1990).

Park et al. (1991) suggested that product feature similarity and brand concept consistency are the two factors affecting the success of brand extensions. Consumers not only take into account information about the similarity of product features between the parent brand products and its extensions but also consider the concept consistency between the parent brand and its brand extensions. Fit at the level of the brand concept affects brand extension success more saliently than the similarity of product features between parent brand products and its new extensions (Broniarczyk and Gershoff, 2003). Extending a mass-market functional brand into fashion categories is a distant extension. Even if there is no product similarity between a parent brand and its fashion apparel extension, it is reasonable to assume that perceived fit, which mainly comes from conceptual consistency still plays a role for consumers to form attitudes toward brand extensions. Therefore, we posit the following hypothesis:

**H3:** The perceived fit between a parent brand and its licensed fashion apparel extensions leads to favorable attitudes toward the fashion apparel extensions.

**Parent brand attitude**

Attitudes toward an extension are favorable when a consumer trusts a parent brand (Reast, 2005). Consequently, the consumer buys the brand's products regularly or shows a commitment to repurchase them (Vöckner and Sattler, 2006). This relationship might create a virtuous cycle in which loyal consumers are more likely to have positive experiences with a brand, and those experienced consumers are more likely to try the brand extension (Swaminathan, 2003). In short, positive attitudes toward a parent brand may be transferred to the attitudes toward its extension products. (Hem et al., 2003).

Previous research (Bhat and Reddy, 2001) found that attitudes toward a parent brand, which is associated with the brand’s attributes, play a prominent role in the process of forming attitudes toward the brand’s extensions. For auto brands, significant brand attributes affecting attitude formation include dependability, economy, masculinity, social status, aggressiveness, ruggedness, style, leadership, comfort, safety, and etc. (Hughes and Guerrero, 1971). These attributes can be classified into three categories: functional, social, and economic. When consumers select fashion apparel products, they form attitudes based on the brand and product attributes from functional,
social, and economic perspectives too. According to the brand concept consistency theory (Park et al., 1991), it is reasonable to assume that attitudes toward a durable mass-market brand associated with its functional, social, and economy attributes can be consistently transferred into attitudes toward its fashion apparel extensions. Therefore, we post the following hypothesis:

\[ H4: \text{Favorable attitudes toward a mass-market functional parent brand lead to favorable attitudes toward its fashion apparel extension.} \]

**Parent brand image**

Brand image refers to all the perceptions that consumers hold in their mind about a brand (Keller, 1993) which results from communicating the brand identity to markets and creating brand associations (Martínez et al., 2009). It is argued that consumers use their knowledge of brands and products to “simplify, structure, and interpret a specific marketing environment” to make a decision (Keller et al., 2011). Previous research suggests that individuals usually evaluate each new stimulus they are exposed to in terms of whether they can classify it as a member of an already defined category (Meyers-Levy and Tybout, 1997). If consumers see a brand extension as closely related to the parent brand’s category, they could easily transfer their extant attitudes toward the parent brand to its extension. They may be able to directly apply those favorable brand associations into extension product evaluations, and form positive evaluations of the brand extensions (Martínez et al., 2009). Yeung and Wyer (2005) found that if a brand evokes a strong positive emotional attraction, consumers are less likely to be influenced by the low perceived fit between a parent brand and its extension.

The image of fashion products is an important purchase criterion when brands are extended into fashion-related categories (Forney et al., 2005). Empirical studies (e.g., Lin, 2010, Fennis and Pruyn, 2007) found a connection between individual consumer personality and brand personality, indicating that consumers’ evaluation and selection of brands reflect their needs for self-expression. For consumers who choose mass-market functional brands may perceive and favor the brand’s personality and image of being down-to-earth, and sincere. Meanwhile, when consumers select fashion apparel, showing personality or image is one of the major motives or evaluation criteria for product selection. When a mass-market functional brand extends into fashion apparel categories, if consumers hold favorable image perceptions toward the parent brand from self-expression perspective, they may transfer such positive image perceptions toward its extension products, which also serve the function of self-expression. Thus, the fifth set of hypotheses is proposed as follow:

\[ H5: \text{Favorable perceptions of a mass-market functional parent brand image lead to (a) favorable attitudes toward, and (b) acceptance of the brand’s fashion apparel extension.} \]

Based on the review of the literature, a research model was proposed with all the hypotheses specified (see Figure 1).
**RESEARCH METHOD**

*Research design*

An online survey was developed using Qualtrics.com to collect empirical data. A screening question, “have you bought/tried on/heard of Ford jeans?” was asked at the very beginning of the survey to filter out the participants who were exposed to Ford jeans to reduce pre-experience bias.

*Auto brand Ford.* First, we sought a brand that would be familiar to consumers, because familiarity was required to allow participants to draw upon their knowledge and be able to resolve a moderate incongruity between the brand and its fashion apparel extension. Second, we wanted a brand that would evoke similar, moderate-positive associations across participants. The findings from a pilot study suggested that Ford fit these criteria. Ford is the second-largest U.S. based automaker and the only one of the “Big Three” of U.S. auto brands whose reputation was not extremely damaged during the auto industry crisis that occurred between 2008 and 2010 (Shen et al., 2011). Moreover, Ford Motor Company manages more than 300 licensees across all its vehicle brands (Wilensky, 2007). Recently, Ford Motor adjusted its brand strategy and shifted its focus to increase brand equity of the corporate brand, Blue Oval. Ford Motor also is trying to leverage brand equity through licensing to get into fashion clothing markets to compete for a share of consumer identity. Therefore, this research collaborates with one of the Ford automobile brand licensees to explore consumers’ acceptance of Ford fashion clothing extensions.

*Fashion apparel extension category.* When a brand extension is associated with fashion, merchandisers need to offer a wide assortment of fashion apparel products to meet the preferred image, quality, design/beauty, color, and/or style dimensions (Forney et al., 2005). A sample of 37 undergraduate college students enrolled in the Textiles, Apparel Design, and Merchandising program were recruited to participate in a pilot study to identify fashion apparel categories, which have a high level of conceptual fit with the auto brand Ford. Three categories including menswear, active/sportswear, and footwear/leather goods were identified with menswear having the highest scores on perceived conceptual fit. Thus, menswear was selected and used in the research instrument development.
Measure

Scales to measure research constructs were adopted or adapted from the extant research to fit the focus of the current research. All measures were rated on a 7-point Liker-type scale (1=strongly disagree/very bad/very unlikely/not at all, 7= strongly agree/excellent/very likely). Six items assessing Parent Brand (PB) image were adopted from the research conducted by Truong, Simmons, McColl, & Kitchen (2008), Perceived Fit (FIT) was measured by a three-item scale considering both the similarity between the parent brand and the extension developed by (Keller and Aaker (1992). PB quality was measured using the six-item-scale adapted from the research done by Yoo, Donthu, and Lee (2000). PB attitude and Brand Extension (BE) attitude were measured using the three-item scale adapted from Musante (2007). BE acceptance was measured by three items adapted from previous research (Dall'Olmo Riley et al., 2013, O'Cass, 2004, Lafferty, 2007).

Sampling and sample

A pretesting was conducted on 56 undergraduate students at a major university in the U.S. South. Analyses of the responses revealed that each construct measure was unidimensional with Cronbach alpha levels of .7 or greater. The survey was refined for clarity based on the pretest findings, and the revised survey was then deemed ready for use in collecting data.

The participants for the main study were recruited from students registered in a major university in the southern region of U.S.A. A random sample of 2,700 students was drawn by the university administration office, and individuals’ email addresses were provided. A follow-up reminder was sent three days later. A total of 449 responses were received with a response rate of 16.63%. The relatively low response rate in comparison with that for other studies may result from the fact that some email systems automatically marked the invitation emails as spam. After data cleaning, 391 valid responses were included in the empirical analyses.

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Measurement assessment

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was first conducted to examine the basic structure of the measures of variables proposed in the research model. Using a principal component extraction method, all scale items measuring six constructs were subject to EFA using Varimax rotation. Items exhibiting low factor loadings (<0.70), high cross-loadings (>0.40), or low communities (<0.30) were eliminated (Hair, 2006). The final factor analysis solution, with 23 items measuring six factors, showed a clear structure and high factor loadings, as presented in Table 1. The total variance explained was 75.89%.
Table 1
Construct assessment results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>EFA Loading</th>
<th>CFA Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent Brand Quality</td>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>.853</td>
<td>.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall quality</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td>.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Durability of Ford</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Fit</td>
<td>Ford clothing shown above fits the Ford brand</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ford clothing conveyed the same impression as the parent brand</td>
<td>.929</td>
<td>.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is logical that Ford launch clothing products</td>
<td>.891</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Extension Attitude</td>
<td>Do you like above-shown Ford clothing?</td>
<td>.779</td>
<td>.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you think above-shown Ford Clothing is appealing?</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td>.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In your opinion, is Ford Clothing favorable?</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Extension Acceptance</td>
<td>Buy Ford clothing for myself or family</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td>.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend to my friends to buy Ford clothing</td>
<td>.875</td>
<td>.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Try Ford clothing</td>
<td>.874</td>
<td>.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buy Ford clothing as gifts</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Brand Attitude</td>
<td>Do you like Ford?</td>
<td>.810</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you think Ford is appealing?</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is Ford favorable?</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Brand Image</td>
<td>To what extent is Ford a symbol of prestige?</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent is this brand a symbol of wealth?</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent is Ford a symbol of achievement?</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent does Ford attract attention?</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td>.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can a person use the brand Ford to impress other people?</td>
<td>.887</td>
<td>.721</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using maximum likelihood approach was conducted on the 23 items. The initial results showed acceptable fit ($\chi^2 = 609.983$, df = 215; $\chi^2$/df = 2.837; GFI = .875; CFI = .947; RMSEA = .069) (Hair et al., 2009). However, checking modification indices revealed that three pair of error items (within constructs) were highly correlated. We then added correlation links between the three pairs of error items to increase model fit. The final CFA showed a good fit measurement model ($\chi^2= 408.359$, df = 212; $\chi^2$/df = 1.926; GFI= .915; CFI = .973, RMSEA=0.049). Table 2 shows correlations between research constructs and extracted variance for each construct.
Table 2
Construct correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PB Quality</th>
<th>PB Image</th>
<th>PB Attitude</th>
<th>Perceived Fit</th>
<th>BE Attitude</th>
<th>BE Acceptance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PB Quality</td>
<td>.558a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB Image</td>
<td>.368b</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB Attitude</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Fit</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE Attitude</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE Acceptance</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>.824</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Numbers in diagonal cells (in bold) are variances extracted.
b All correlations are significant at level of .001.

Hypotheses testing

Structural equation modeling (SEM) was conducted using AMOS 23 to test the proposed research model and hypotheses. Results showed great model fit, with major fit indices higher than cutting points ($\chi^2= 408.359$, df = 212; $\chi^2$/df = 1.926; GFI = .915; CFI = .973; RMSEA = 0.049) (Hair et al., 2009), indicating that the research model was accepted. Significant path coefficients supported H1, H2b, H3, H4, and H5b, but not H2a nor H5a (see Table 3).

Therefore, acceptance of the auto brand’s fashion apparel extension is directly affected by the attitudes toward the brand extension, parent brand image, and parent brand quality. The BE attitudes are affected by the PB attitudes and FIT. However, empirical results did not show support for the hypothesized effects from PB quality, PB image on the BE attitudes. The highest path coefficient is from the BE attitudes to the BE acceptance, followed by the path from the PB attitudes to the BE attitudes, and from FIT to the BE attitudes. The overall structural model path coefficients are shown in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Research Model Testing Results
Table 3
Summary of direct effects testing results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The relationship within proposed research model</th>
<th>Path coefficient</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Testing results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BE Acceptance ← BE Attitude</td>
<td>0.751**</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE Attitudes ← PB Quality</td>
<td>-0.337</td>
<td>H2a</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE Acceptance ← PB Quality</td>
<td>0.145*</td>
<td>H2b</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE Attitudes ← Perceived Fit</td>
<td>0.364**</td>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE Attitudes ← PB Attitudes</td>
<td>0.468**</td>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE Attitudes ← PB Image</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>H5a</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE Acceptance ← PB Image</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>H5b</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model fit indices
- GFI = .910; CFI = .969; \( \chi^2/df = 2.65 \), RMSEA = .055

** p < .001; * p < .05

**DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS**

To our knowledge, this research is an initial attempt to understand the consumer acceptance of a mass-market functional brand’s fashion apparel extension. This research contributes to brand extension and brand licensing literature by adding the self-expression notion. From a self-expression standpoint, both brands and fashion products are used for consumers to display their knowledge of culture, taste, and/or style to communicate membership in particular social or professional groups; and to convey hidden aspects of their self-images (Chernev et al., 2011). Therefore, it might be different from conventional brand extensions when a non-fashion brand extends into fashion and other lifestyle-related categories, which are full of self-expression products competing for consumers’ identities.

The proposed research model was developed based on review of extant research. This research added theoretical contributions through empirically testing the established theories and identified brand extension success factors in a more specific brand extension context, with a focus on durable and functional brands. Most of the hypotheses were supported and the overall research model was tested and accepted. The findings reveal that favorable attitudes toward brand extension, better perceived PB quality, and favorable PB image directly leads to consumers' acceptance of the mass-market functional brand’s (i.e., Ford) fashion apparel extension. Among the three factors directly affecting brand extension acceptance, consumers’ attitudes toward the brand extension have the strongest effects, consistent with Soloman and Rabolt (2009)’s fashion decision-making model.

Meanwhile, an individual is more likely to form favorable attitudes toward a fashion apparel extension when he or she perceives high fit in terms of brand concept consistency and holds favorable attitudes toward the parent brand. This finding is consistent with Keller et al.’s (2011) argument that “successful brand extensions occur when the parent brand is seen as having favorable associations and there is a perception of fit between the parent brand and the extension product” (p. 431).
Keller et al. (2011) posited that consumers’ evaluations of brand extensions follow a two-step process from the categorization perspective. First, consumers determine whether there is a fit between what they know about a parent brand and what they believe to be true about its extension. If the perceived fit is good, then consumers might transfer their existing attitudes toward the parent brand to the extension products (Keller et al., 2008). Thus, to form positive attitudes toward a brand extension, there should be a perceived fit between the parent brand and its brand extension, and positive attitudes toward the PB that can be transferred to the brand extension. When any one of them is lacking, the positive attitudes toward a brand extension might not occur. Moreover, previous research found that, despite the product feature similarity, brand concept fit is more likely to happen and be used by individuals to make extension acceptance decisions for prestigious brands than for functional brands (Keller and Aaker, 1992). Bhat and Reddy (2001) reported that only attitudes toward a symbolic parent brand influence the acceptance of its cross-category extensions. However, our research findings showed that both consumers’ attitudes toward a parent brand and brand concept consistency between the parent brand and its fashion extension affect consumers’ acceptance of the brand’s fashion apparel extension. Our findings indicate that conceptual fit is important not only for prestigious brands’ extensions but also for relatively functional brands’ extensions when extending into different product categories. Our findings are consistent with Choi, Liu, Liu, Mak, & To (2010)’s conclusion that brand concept consistency is the most important factor affecting attitudes toward cross-category extensions.

Our empirical results showed that perceived parent brand quality and image did not affect individuals’ attitudes toward the auto brand’s fashion apparel extension. However, higher perceived parent brand quality and image contribute to a higher likelihood of acceptance of the brand’s fashion apparel extension directly, instead of being mediated through attitudes toward the extension. These findings indicate that both tangible parent brand equity (i.e., perceived parent brand quality) and intangible equity (i.e., perceived parent brand image) can be leveraged to promote brand extension acceptance in the context of a cross-category long-distance brand stretching with low product-feature similarity between parent product category (i.e., automobile products) and the extension product category (i.e., fashion apparel). According to Soloman and Rabolt (2009) and Forney et al. (2005), consumers evaluate fashion extension products mostly based on fashion styles and designs, without considering parent brand associations very much. Once an overall evaluation of the fashion extension product is formed, a consumer may consider parent brand quality and image to facilitate his or her further decisions. Generally, consumers often perceive high-quality brands as having more credible, expert, and trustworthy even in the context of brand stretching to a long-distance category (Aaker and Keller, 1990). Our findings further indicate that there are opportunities for functional durable good brands with high perceived quality to stretch into soft consumer good categories, which are more lifestyle oriented.

All brands have boundaries on extending to different categories. In the case of extending a mass market functional brand to fashion apparel categories, if the perceived fit is too low, or does not “make sense” to consumers, consumers may question the ability of the parent brand to make attractive fashion apparel products. For instance, people might think it does not make sense to launch women’s wedding gowns under an auto brand name. In this circumstance, the incongruence of a parent brand and its brand extension may lead to unfavorable attitudes toward the brand extensions. Since the favorable attitudes crucially affect the acceptance of the fashion apparel extension, the positive influence from the perceived high quality of the parent brand or positive parent brand image might be dwarfed.
This study also has some practical implications. To increase consumers’ acceptance of the fashion apparel extension from a mass-market functional brand, marketers should focus on maximizing the conceptual fit (if not physical feature fit) between a parent brand and its extension. Choosing appropriate categories to extend or stretch a parent brand to expand markets is the most critical first step. In addition, the study findings indicate that marketers need to provide sufficient product information of a mass-market functional brand’s fashion extensions to increase the perceived fit that facilitates the formation of positive attitudes. It is also critical for marketing communication to provide parent brand information strategically to form a conceptually fit perception and facilitate the evaluations of brand extension.

This study has some limitations. The convenience sample may be biased to some degree in comparison with the general young consumer population. This research did not take into account those individual characteristics related to fashion apparel purchasing and consumption. Individual characteristics, for instance, brand engagement, which measures the importance of brand in consumers’ daily lives and the strength of their self-brand associations may affect their decisions on buying a brand’s fashion apparel extension products (Sprott et al., 2009). In addition, this study only examined one American auto brand, Ford in the empirical study. Even though Ford has been considered a successful and representative auto brand, every other auto brand has its own brand personality and brand associations. In fact, consumers tend to evaluate Ford as a “functional,” “budget” brand with a personality of “tough,” “masculine,” and “outdoorsy.” Thus, those successful brands that are viewed as “prestigious” and “luxurious” (such as Porsche), or with a less distinguishable personality (such as Toyota), may be perceived and evaluated differently if they extend into fashion apparel markets.

For future research, we recommend examining other types of auto brands, comparing the differences between functional and luxury brands, or budget and prestige brands, and among brands with different personalities. Literature shows that consumers may perceive a fit between the parent brand and brand extension based on the evaluation of different types of a brand in terms of luxury brands or mass-market functionally oriented brands (Park et al., 1991, Keller et al., 2011, Aaker, 1997, Batra et al., 2010). Another recommendation is to consider cultural differences. Automobile brands usually target the global market. However, successful and popular products in one area may not have the same performance in another area because of cultural differences. Monga and John (2007) found that consumers from Eastern cultures (such as China) have a more holistic style of thinking and perceive higher levels of extension fit than do consumers from Western cultures (such as the United States), who have a more analytical style of thinking (Kim and John, 2008). Thus, examining the impact of cultural differences on brand extension success may help mass-market functional brands such as auto brands to extend further.
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ABSTRACT

The Brevard Music Center, a summer institute and music festival in Brevard, NC, has been a cultural destination in the region since the 1930s, bringing in both residents and visitors alike to participate in the Institute. Besides being an important cultural institution, the Music center has had an increasingly important economic impact on Brevard and Transylvania County, the county in which the municipality is located. With that in mind, this paper investigates the economic impact on output and employment attributable to the Music Center on Brevard and Transylvania County. Data were first collected in the summer of 2015 on selected performances and then extrapolated to estimate total spending throughout the entertainment season of the audiences, as well as students enrolled at the Center and their parents. The IMPLAN software system and database, (IMPLAN Group, LLC), was then used to estimate the overall economic impact of spending at the Center on Brevard and Transylvania County. In addition, this research deviates from existing impact studies by uniquely separating municipal from county taxes by generating city-to-county ratios for each category of taxes. Then in a seminal fashion these ratios were used to estimate the exclusive fiscal impact on the municipality of Brevard, NC from the economic activity of the Center. The novel method employed in this study could be generalized on a state-by-state basis to assess the economic effects of spending in terms of output and employment on individual municipalities in future studies employing IMPLAN.

INTRODUCTION

Transylvania County (Population: 33,200) is nestled in the Southern Appalachian Mountains of North Carolina and is well-known for its majestic mountains and beautiful waterfalls (Hansen & Pledger, 2000). This land of numerous mountain vistas and a cool summer climate has attracted tourists from the region and beyond since the early 20th century (Lefler, 2004, 2011). Moreover, Brevard (Population: 8,300) “has benefitted from [its] traditional [Southern Appalachian] heritage, craft, music, and dance, as well as from classical traditions celebrated at its internationally known Music Center …” (Lefler, 2004).

The Brevard Music Center is a summer music institute and festival located in Brevard, North Carolina. The Center was founded in 1936 as the Davidson School for Boys at Davidson College, and moved to Brevard in 1944 as the Transylvania Music Camp. The first summer festival accompanying the camp was held in 1946. The summer institute and festival became known as the Brevard Music Center in 1955 and has been in operation ever since. It is now recognized as one of the country’s premier training programs for classical music and teaches students from the high school through post-baccalaureate. The Brevard Music Center puts on over 80 public concerts...
from June through August each summer, and those performances are attended by more than 30,000
people annually.

While the Brevard Music Center has long been recognized as playing an important cultural
role in the region, the economic and fiscal impact of its summer institute and festival on the local
economy has never been estimated. Economic impact studies have been undertaken of other music
festivals; specifically, The Kaustinen Folk Music Festival in Kaustinen, Finland and the Umbria
Jazz Music Festival in Umbria, Italy (Tohmo 2005; Bracalente et al., 2011). With that in mind, the
genesis of this research was a request made by the President and CEO of the Brevard Music Center
to estimate its economic significance to the local economy. More specifically, this study was
designed to examine the economic impact of the Brevard Music Center on Brevard and
Transylvania County.

DATA AND METHODS

Three surveys were developed and used to collect primary data on the audiences, students
and/or their parents, and local businesses—data from the business survey was not included in the
impact analyses. The audience questionnaire was comprised of 16 questions that included
demographic, economic, marketing, and tourism-related questions. Data were collected at six
selected performances between June 20, 2015 and August 15, 2015, as well as through an internet
link to an on-line Qualtrics survey. (Refer to Table 1 for the performance schedule). These
performances were chosen because they were a representative sample in terms of audience size
and make-up of the approximately 80 performances that are typically put on by the Brevard Music
Center throughout the summer. Questionnaires and pencils were handed out and collected prior to
each performance. Reminder cards were handed out after the performances to encourage visitors
to take the survey on-line at home, if they were not able to complete a questionnaire at the
performance. Subsequently, an appeal letter was also e-mailed to all current year patrons with a
request to complete the survey on-line if they had not already provided their response. Audience
members completed a total of 849 questionnaires—346 hard copy and 503 on-line surveys. The
primary spending data that were generated by the interview instrument for these six performances
were then extrapolated to estimate total spending by audiences throughout the entertainment
season.

Audience members came to the Brevard Music Center from a very extensive geographic
area, as can be seen from the map. (Refer to Figure 1). Most audience members had residential zip
codes on the East Coast of the United States, although some attendees came from as far away as
Southern California. Some of them were seasonal residents whose primary residence had distant
zip codes. Still others were simply tourists to western North Carolina—the Great Smokey
Mountain National Park is the most visited national park in the United States. The mean income
of survey respondents was $112,392.24. The median income of audience members was
significantly higher than the United States average. Almost all respondents (91.2%) reported an
annual household income of more than $50,000, while over half (52.8%) reported a household
income over $100,000. (Refer to Table 2).
Audience members were asked to report their spending on lodging, food and beverage, shopping, arts and crafts, entertainment, recreation, health and personal care, as well as sundry other spending during their trip. Expenditures by attendees to the Brevard Music Center contributed significantly to the local economy of Brevard and Transylvania County. Of the 728

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saturday, June 20th</td>
<td>6:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Opening Night! w/ André Watts</td>
<td>Whittington-Pfohl</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Auditorium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, June 25th</td>
<td>7:30 P.M.</td>
<td>Rigoletto</td>
<td>Porter Center</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, June 30th</td>
<td>7:30 P.M.</td>
<td>Steep Canyon Rangers</td>
<td>Whittington-Pfohl</td>
<td>2,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, July 8th</td>
<td>7:30 P.M.</td>
<td>Chamber Music</td>
<td>Porter Center</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday, August 2nd</td>
<td>3:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Season Finale</td>
<td>Whittington-Pfohl</td>
<td>1,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Auditorium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday, August 15th</td>
<td>7:30 P.M.</td>
<td>Garrison Keillor’s A Prairie Home Companion</td>
<td>Whittington-Pfohl</td>
<td>2,099</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Household Income for Audience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $50,000</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $74,999</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 - $149,999</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 or more</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: There are 269 missing responses.
attendees who responded to the questionnaire, the analysis revealed that average total spending per person was $2,166 while median spending was $323 per respondent. (Refer to Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Audience Spending</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$1,064</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining/Food &amp; Beverage</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$287</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$591</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Crafts</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>$1,049</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment/Special events/Festivals</td>
<td>$224</td>
<td>$1,024</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$365</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Personal care</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$696</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,057</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Spending</td>
<td>$323</td>
<td>$2,166</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: There are 121 missing responses.

The participants and parents survey was comprised of 18 questions and incorporated demographic and economic questions, advertising information, as well as travel and local spending expectations. Surveys were administered by e-mail to all 436 participants. In the case of high school students, the parents received the survey request. For college students, the students themselves received the request. A total of 93 questionnaires were completed on-line for a response rate of 21.3%.

Participants or the parents of participants received on-line surveys throughout the summer session. Of the 93 surveys completed, about half were from students and the other half from their parents. More women (51.7%) answered the survey than men (42.5%), while 5.7% preferred not to share their gender. The mean age of respondents was 30.8 years old. The map below shows the geographic distribution of participants at the Brevard Music Center and its Summer Institute. Attendees came from 45 different states, indicative of the high regard in which the Center is held. (Refer to Figure 2).

Approximately two-thirds of the respondents were first time participants at the Summer Institute, while roughly one-third had participated two or more times. The household income of respondents varies, with 48.2% having an income of $100,000 or more and 22.4% having an income of less than $50,000. The average income of respondents was $105,382 with a median income of $125,000. (Refer to Table 4).

Survey results showed that respondents spent less than one night in the area on average before checking into Brevard Music Center and one night after checking out of the Center. Parents and friends visited students at the Brevard Music Center an average of 1.9 times during their stay at the Center. Respondents were asked to report student spending, excluding tuition, during their time at Brevard Music Center’s and Summer Institute. Respondents were asked how much they spent or expected to spend on a student’s lodging, food and beverage, shopping, arts and crafts, entertainment, recreation, health and personal care, as well as spending on other sundry goods and
services. Of the 84 respondents to the question, analysis showed that average total spending was $519 while the median spending total was $325. (Refer to Table 5)

Figure 2. Participants’ residential zip codes

![Participants’ residential zip codes map]

Table 4: Annual Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $50,000</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $74,999</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 - $149,999</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 or more</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: There are 8 missing responses.

Table 5: Student Spending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$155</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining/Food &amp; Beverage</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$289</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$82</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Crafts</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment/Special events/Festivals</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$46</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$58</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Personal care</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$27</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$21</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$325</strong></td>
<td><strong>$519</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: There are 9 missing responses.
ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

This section of the paper discusses the economic impact of the Brevard Music Center as measured by output and full-time equivalent jobs (FTEs) created in Transylvania County as a result of the Center. This research used financial data provided by the Brevard Music Center, as well as primary data generated from the audience and participant/parent surveys. The study employed the IMPLAN software modeling system and database (IMPLAN Group, LLC). IMPLAN is an economic development tool that applies multipliers and performs an input-output analysis in a general equilibrium framework to estimate the economic impact of spending in a local community or region. The model is based on input-output tables from the US Department of Commerce. Many economic impact studies use IMPLAN as a major analysis tool. The Regional Economic Models (REMI) is another input-output tool commonly used. While both IMPLAN and REMI have both been found to be reliable (Rickman & Schwer, 1993), the multiplier effects generated by IMPLAN have been found to be more reliable than those generated by REMI (Crihfield & Campbell, 1991).

Transylvania County was chosen as the appropriate study area because approximately 65.1% of the Brevard Music Center’s audience and fully 86.7% of full-time employees were residents of the county. Moreover, of those visitors who reported spending the night, 80% of these overnighters indicated that they stayed in Transylvania County. The preponderance of residents being from Transylvania County, as well as the fact that most overnight visitors stayed in the County, were the reasons for choosing Transylvania County as the study area.

The dollar amounts of the goods and services purchased within Transylvania County were entered into the IMPLAN software modeling system. IMPLAN then employed these statistics to calculate both the direct and secondary impacts of the Brevard Music Center’s economic activity on Transylvania County. Direct effects are those dollars spent on goods and services that are available within the study area and can be directly traced to the economic activities of the Brevard Music Center. Salaries paid and goods purchased by the Brevard Music Center are examples of such direct effects.

Direct spending is then employed by the IMPLAN input-output model to generate secondary economic impacts. Secondary impacts accumulate as a result of both indirect and induced effects. Indirect effects are secondary impacts that result from businesses that make expenditures in order to replenish goods and improve services that have been purchased by direct (initial) impact expenditures. An example of indirect effects would be the pens and photocopier paper purchased by a local stationary store. Induced effects are secondary impacts resulting from an increase in household spending by employees who are hired, or current employees paid to work longer hours to provide the goods and services being purchased. An example of an induced effect is the extra money earned by the manager of the stationary store due to the extra hours the store remains open to meet the needs of the Brevard Music Center.

Estimates of secondary impacts are based on a multiplier effect, a widely used economic principle designed to calculate spending that takes place as a result of the “ripple effect.” The multiplier concept essentially means that every dollar received by business owners and employees that is then re-spent within the region multiplies the initial sales and generates revenues in other sectors of the local economy. IMPLAN estimates the magnitude of both primary and secondary impacts for each industry, which form the so-called “multipliers.” It should be noted that a portion of direct and secondary dollar spending goes for goods and services that are not purchased in the local community and some goes to pay state and federal taxes. Money used to purchase items that are not available in the local community, as well as money used to pay state and federal taxes leave
the local economy, and therefore, do not continue to circulate within the local economy. IMPLAN does not include these leakages of spending in its multiplier effects.

In order to estimate the total economic impact of the Brevard Music Center on Transylvania County and Brevard, spending data were categorized into wages and salaries, operating expenses, visitor spending, and student/parent spending. The statistics on payroll and other operating expenditures are based on the 2015 fiscal year and were obtained from the financial records of the Brevard Music Center. Visitors are sub-divided into two groups—day-trippers and overnighters—because overnighters have the additional costs of lodging that are not incurred by day-trippers. Visitor spending is then determined by multiplying spending per-visitor times the number of attendees for both day-trippers and overnighters. Student/parent spending is estimated by taking the average spending per-student and multiplying it times the number of students. The employment effect is calculated by IMPLAN and is the estimated number of FTEs with the output effect. The total economic impact of the Brevard Music Center on Transylvania County in FY 2015 was estimated to be $14.9 million dollars in output, along with an added 245 FTEs. (Refer to Table 6).

Table 6: Economic Impact of BMC on the Local Economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Type</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Labor Income</th>
<th>Value Added</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Effect</td>
<td>193.5</td>
<td>$4,143,068</td>
<td>$6,339,479</td>
<td>$9,913,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Effect</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>$474,990</td>
<td>$1,338,620</td>
<td>$2,132,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induced Effect</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>$807,664</td>
<td>$1,751,587</td>
<td>$2,851,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Effect</td>
<td>245.0</td>
<td>5,425,722.0</td>
<td>9,429,686.0</td>
<td>14,896,384.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s estimation using IMPLAN

FISCAL IMPACT ON TRANSYLVANIA COUNTY AND BREVARD

The IMPLAN analysis also generated an estimate of the fiscal impact of the Brevard Music Center in terms of federal, state, and county taxes generated by the economic activity created by the Center—the fiscal impact on the county level is only available in the online version of IMPLAN. The model divides taxes into two categories: federal non-defense related taxes, and state and local non-education related taxes. In federal taxes, the Brevard Music Center produced a total of $1,415,310 in tax revenue in FY 2015 in the form of social security insurance taxes, taxes on production and imports, corporate profits taxes, and personal income taxes. At the state and local level, the Brevard Music Center generated a total of $1,108,336 in tax revenue in FY 2015 in the categories of social security insurance, taxes on production and imports, corporate profit taxes, and personal taxes. Taxes generated at the county level totaled $424,610 in FY 2015. (Refer to Table 7).

As mentioned above, IMPLAN does not separate municipal taxes from county taxes received as a result of economic activity in its program. City managers and mayors, as well as county executives are often interested in obtaining such information. Therefore, in this study, a unique method was developed and implemented to make that kind of bifurcation between the separate fiscal impacts on Brevard and Transylvania County from the Brevard Music Center.

This unique process involved the following steps. First, tax revenue data were obtained for the city of Brevard and Transylvania County from the financial reports of tax revenue received in FY 2015. That tax revenue was then broken down by type—property tax, sales tax, and other taxes. Next, from those distributions of taxes, in a seminal fashion, a city-to-county ratio was generated
for each source of tax revenue for FY 2015. (Refer to Table 8). Finally, the city-to-county
distribution ratios were applied to the three categories of taxes received by Transylvania County
to estimate the fiscal impact exclusively on Brevard attributable to the economic activity of the
Brevard Music Center. The tax revenue received exclusively by the city of Brevard as a result of
the economic activity of the Center was estimated to be $87,347 for FY 2015. (Refer to Table 9).

Table 7: Fiscal Impact of Brevard Music Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Tax</th>
<th>Federal Government</th>
<th>State/Local Government</th>
<th>County Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Defense</td>
<td>Non-Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Ins Tax- Employee Contribution</td>
<td>$408,958</td>
<td>4,140.39</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Ins Tax- Employer Contribution</td>
<td>$364,656</td>
<td>8,365.55</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax on Production and Imports: Excise Taxes</td>
<td>$74,817</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax on Production and Imports: Custom Duty</td>
<td>$29,352</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax on Production and Imports: Fed NonTaxes</td>
<td>$49,980</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax on Production and Imports: Sales Tax</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>442,701.25</td>
<td>$82,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax on Production and Imports: Property Tax</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>379,100.80</td>
<td>$321,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax on Production and Imports: Motor Vehicle License</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,028.69</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax on Production and Imports: Severance Tax</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70.05</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax on Production and Imports: Other Taxes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55,754.96</td>
<td>$13,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax on Production and Imports: S/L NonTaxes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Profits Tax</td>
<td>$189,541</td>
<td>11,471.26</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Tax: Income Tax</td>
<td>$298,006</td>
<td>159,276.93</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Tax: NonTaxes (Fines- Fees)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,159.35</td>
<td>4614.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Tax: Motor Vehicle License</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,711.69</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Tax: Property Taxes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,720.93</td>
<td>2306.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Tax: Other Tax (Fish/Hunt)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,318.72</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividends</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>515.10</td>
<td>$56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,415,310</td>
<td>$1,108,336</td>
<td>$424,610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IMPLAN analysis

Table 8: Estimating the City-to-County Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tax Revenue from the County Report</th>
<th>Tax Revenue from the City Report</th>
<th>City-to-County Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax</td>
<td>$30,292,321</td>
<td>$4,825,006</td>
<td>0.1593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>$7,011,688</td>
<td>$1,347,461</td>
<td>0.1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Taxes</td>
<td>$610,459</td>
<td>$593,841</td>
<td>0.9728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$37,914,468</td>
<td>$6,766,308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City and County Financial Reports FY 2015
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of this study demonstrate the economic and fiscal importance of the Brevard Music Center to the economy of Transylvania County and the Municipality of Brevard NC. Approximately $14.9 million of additional spending in Transylvania County was attributable to the primary and secondary impacts of the Brevard Music center in FY 2015. This additional economic activity resulted in the creation of approximately 245 FTEs. Also, $2.4 million were raised in local, state and federal taxes as a result of the economic activity engendered by the Brevard Music Center. Of the approximately $425,000 of tax revenue generated by the Center in FY 2015, the municipality of Brevard received $87,347.

In this study, a seminal approach was employed to estimate the fiscal impact of the economic activity of the Brevard Music Center on an individual municipality—Brevard NC. A city-to-county distribution ratio was generated and employed to ascertain the tax revenue received solely by the municipality as a result of the economic activity generated by the Center. In future impact studies, the method developed and employed in this research can provide city mayors, managers, and council members with important revenue information regarding the impact of specific economic activity on their municipal budgets. Further research into how this seminal approach to estimating the budgetary impact of economic entities on particular municipalities could be refined. A method of generalizing this approach, perhaps in the form of an algorithm developed on a state-by-state basis, would further enhance this contribution to economic impact analyses.
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GROUP COHESION: THE EFFECT OF DIVERSITY

Lavoy R. Love, Regent University

ABSTRACT

This paper entails the empirical research investigation of a proposed correlation between group diversity and workgroup cohesion contingent on group size. The primary hypothesis examines the statistical relationship between group cohesion, as measured by entitativity, and group diversity, as measured by Blau’s Index (1977). The study details a proposed positive relationship between measures of cohesion and diversity in relation to group size. The data collection procedure focuses on the collection of respondent data from four business units ranging in group size from 7 to 12 members. The descriptive statistics demonstrate the more homogenous the workgroup, the greater unit cohesiveness along with revealing an inverse relationship between group cohesion and diversity. This paper includes an examination of the data using a bivariate correlation and analysis of variances which produced findings failing to support the hypothetical correlation.

INTRODUCTION

Businesses initiatives such as management development, leadership engagement, executive developmental programs, and corporate social responsibility (CSR) programs, present more compelling options for favorably impacting organizational performance outcomes. To a greater degree than workgroup cohesion, business entities champion the concept of diversity, not only as a competitive advantage but as “the right thing to do”. Currently, there exists a paucity of business research informing the optimum amount of diversity within a business unit. The implications of diversity on group cohesion remains an understudied phenomenon. Robinson and Dechant (1997) endeavored to create a business case for workplace diversity and recommended the use of cross-cultural teams, creative heterogenous workgroups, and the development of non-traditional talent. The researchers acknowledged a fundamental challenge of linking these diversity initiatives to tangible business results.

This research intends to examine the implications of task diversity on the cohesion of a business unit. The contents of this study encompass a review of the literature focused on group behavior concepts and diversity. This empirical research details the formation of a quantitative research design and methodology used for furthering the study of group cohesion behavior by investigating a hypothesized correlation between group cohesion and diversity. The study also includes an investigation of propositions informing the causal relationship between cohesiveness and the magnitude of diversity based on business unit size.

This study extends group behavior theory in three directions. Primarily, this paper furthers the study of group behavior by investigating the hypothesized relationship between group cohesion and group diversity. Secondly, the contents of the study extend the theory of group cohesiveness by considering group size as a factor. Finally, this research addresses the significance of diversity within a business unit based on group size. The quantitative design of the study seeks to produce statistically findings quantifying the theorized organizational benefits derived from business diversity initiatives.
LITERATURE REVIEW

Weick and Roberts (1993) characterized group behavior phenomenon as a condition and product of the actions of individuals driven by social forces contributing to the group dynamic. The acknowledgment of a group’s identity allowed for the distinguishing of members from non-members couple with a recognition of a work unit’s social identity by non-members. Weick and Roberts stated, “Group action achieves the kind of result that would be understandable if all participants were acting under the direction of a single organizing center” (p. 2). The researchers concluded the interrelated group behaviors or characterized the properties of group performance prescribed the social reality of the group. They considered the group dynamic the foundation of group cohesion.

Forsyth (2009) later identified cohesiveness as one of five characteristics affecting a group dynamic. The other factors included group interaction, goals, interdependence, and structure. A group’s cohesiveness united group members together in a network of interpersonal relations founded on the member’s interactions, goals, interdependence, and structure. Forsyth defined the elements of group cohesion as “the integrity, unity, and groupiness, of a group” (p. 10).

Group cohesion promoted the increase of solidarity amongst group members. Campbell (1958) sought to quantify the extent to which individual members appeared to function as a single unified entity by developing a scale to measure cohesion. Calling the measurement entitativity, the researcher developed a construct for assessing the magnitude of group cohesiveness present within a workgroup. McGarty, Haslam, Hutchinson, and Grace (1995) sought to further Campbell’s (1958) research on the measure of entitativity by analyzing the factors affecting the measurement of group cohesion. Based on their empirical study, they determined factors of intra-group variability, group size, and diversity, acted as moderating variables affecting entitativity.

Esty, Griffin, and Schorr-Hirsh (1995) determined workgroup diversity advantageous to organizational group behavior as members embraced individual differences of age, class, race, ethnicity, gender, and disabilities. These individual differences constituted the basis for the definition of demographic diversity. Joshi and Roh (2009) espoused a theory advocating a group member’s attitudinal perspectives on diversity resulted in either cohesion or conflict. Conversely, Van Knippenberg, Haslam, and Platow (2007) posited the sameness of shared value-based beliefs by group members served as a contributing factor for increasing group cohesion. Using Tajfel and Turner’s (1979) social identity theory (SIT), they theorized the positive effects of the value of sameness between the individual and group.

Van Knippenberg et al (2007) hypothesized individuals preferred to work with members like themselves. The lack of homogeneity manifested itself negatively in workgroup cohesion through behaviors such as groupthink, employee turnover, and lack of group performance effectiveness. Their research supported the negative correlation between workgroup diversity and workgroup identification based on group member belief. Van Knippenberg et al. ascertained a group unsupportive of diversity dictated the group’s identity. The resulting group shared beliefs compelled the group’s endorsement of workgroup cohesion through a facilitation of homogeneity.

Contrary to previous studies, Horwitz and Horwitz (2007) proposed the positive effects of diversity on group performance and cohesion. In their meta-analytic study, they defined diversity by the presence of demographical differences such as ethnicity, age, and gender. Horwitz and Horwitz predicted group-level demographic diversity resulted in increased performance and creativity. Their results were inconclusive as they produced no empirical evidence supporting their hypothesis of the favorable effects of diversity on group performance when comparing
heterogeneous and homogeneous groups. The researchers realized results supporting a favorable correlation between homogeneity and group cohesion. Horwitz and Horwitz recommended a need for further study as diversity, if not managed by organizations, negatively affected group cohesion.

Kozlowski and Ilgen (2006) asserted the antecedents of group cohesion inclusive of the individual desire for group inclusion, the intention to maintain group membership, and group size. Casey-Campbell and Martens (2009) added diversity as an antecedent but determined only anecdotal evidence supporting any correlation to group cohesion. Casey-Campbell and Martens resolved to depend on the type of diversity the group size potentially mitigated the impact on a workgroup. They reported two types of diversity affecting group cohesiveness – demographic and task diversity. Demographic diversity included differences in individual attributions such as age, class, race, ethnicity, gender, and disabilities. Casey-Campbell and Martens defined task diversity as reflective of the degree an activity varies from another.

The study of demographic diversity extended to encompass factors emerging from cultural differences. Zhang, Lowry, Zhou, and Fu’s (2007) research in the arena of cultural diversity leveraged Hofstede’s (1980) cultural dimensions of power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity-femininity, and individualism-collectivism. Zhang et al. attributed the dimensions of individualism-collectivism as indicators of group cohesion. The researchers stated, “Individualism describes cultures in which the ties among individuals are loose, while collectivism describes cultures in which people are integrated into strong, cohesive groups that protect individuals in exchange for unquestioning loyalty” (p. 58). Zhang et al. discerned culturally heterogeneous groups experienced events differently challenging the group’s ability to maintain group cohesion. They predicted collectivism and cohesion could be produced over time if members developed relationships through shared experiences.

In furtherance of the study of cultural diversity, Stahl, Maznevski, Voigt, and Jonsen’s (2010) research expanded the framework of workgroups to include multicultural workgroups. Their meta-analytic review evaluated the positive and negative effects of cultural diversity associated with increased divergence and decreased convergence. They posited cultural diversity improved divergent processes requiring differing group member ideas, creativity, and values. Alternatively, convergent processes decreased as cultural diversity increased. Stahl et al. advised convergent processes aligned groups around common objectives. The researchers resolved cultural diversity was moderated by team tenure, dispersion, and size. They proposed further research to address research questions as to the appropriate mix of diverse cultures and values.

Task diversity defined the differences in job functionality, expertise, and skill level (Casey-Campbell & Martens, 2009). Van Knippenberg and Schippers (2007) considered the effects of workgroup work-related tasks and overall group performance. They acknowledged the existing literature presented a framework guided by social categorization and decision-making. The social categorization perspective identified comparisons resulting in the favoring of ingroup versus outgroup members. This perspective led to the assertion the more homogeneous a workgroup, the more cohesive, satisfied, collaborative, and task-productive the group members. Conversely, Van Knippenberg and Schippers determined a decision-making perspective supported diversity. The group task activity of decision-making fostered cohesion as members contributed to a range of ideas, experience, abilities, and perspectives. The diverse group behavior prevented groupthink practices while stimulating innovativeness during problem-solving exercises. Van Knippenberg and Schippers posited the integration of ideas increased task performance effectiveness through an interactive process.
The task-oriented diversity research study conducted by Hülsheger, Anderson, and Salgado (2009) encompassed an empirical evaluation of more than 30-years of group dynamic research. They examined a group’s affinity for cohesion associated with an individual’s background and job-relevant task diversity. Their definition of background diversity aligned with the traditional definition of demographic diversity. However, Hülsheger et al. considered job-relevant diversity inclusive of task-related functions, knowledge, and expertise. They contended the more heterogeneous the job-relevant tasking the more innovative, integrated and cohesive the workgroup. They concluded a workgroup’s ability to leverage divergent approaches to processes and procedures using a variety of task orientations provided a broad range of expertise resulting in innovation and group cohesion.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

McGarty, Haslam, Hutchinson, and Grace (1995) concluded diversity served as a significant factor influencing group cohesiveness. The researchers noted entitativity decreased as diversity increased. Conversely, they realized results showing entitativity increased as group size and diversity increased concurrently. McGarty et al. concluded organizational groups realized the benefits of innovation and creativity from the management of diversity.

This quantitative research sought to explore group cohesion by investigating the relationship between diversity and group cohesion within groups of varying size. Based on the review of the literature, this research entails a research methodology for assessing a workgroup’s entitativity in relation to a workgroup’s diversity as proposed by Hülsheger, Anderson, and Salgado (2009). This research seeks to further the existing research by examining workgroup size as a factor affecting the impact of workgroup diversity on group cohesion by examining the following hypothesis:

H1: There is a positive correlation between group cohesion and workgroup task diversity based on workgroup size.

Furthermore, this empirical study seeks to test the hypothesized differences in perceived cohesion and diversity present within each business unit based on group size.

H2: The average measure of group cohesion increases as workgroup size increases.

H3: The average measure of group diversity increases as workgroup size increases.

METHOD

This research methodology aimed to affirm a positive relationship between group cohesiveness and group diversity. Utilizing quantitative data collected from a sample population of four small workgroups ranging in size from 7 to 12 members, the method consisted of a comparative statistical analysis examining the presence and magnitude of any correlation. For quantifying the level of group cohesion, the procedure consisted of a 4-item entitativity scale instrument for measuring the cohesiveness of a unit. For the evaluation of a group’s diversity, the calculation of Blau’s (1977) Index proved useful for empirically assessing the amount of task diversity within each small group.
The procedure tested the relationship between group cohesion and diversity within groups of varying size. The methodology included a correlation-based research design inclusive of a purposive sampling strategy, instrumentation assessment, data collection procedure, and analysis of results. The resulting methodology presented an approach addressing the research hypotheses.

**Sample Strategy**

Zenger and Lawrence (1989) in an empirical study on organizations and the effects of age and tenure defined a small group as “a subgroup of ten employees, a number that we arbitrarily selected as being neither too small nor too large, was used to calculate the within-the-organization similarity measures” (p. 363). For the purposes of this study, data collection occurred leveraging four task-diverse groups representing four distinct business units working towards shared business objectives. Thus, the workgroup size of ten members represented the recommended membership for an appropriate small group.

The business units consisted of a mix of repair technicians, customer service agents, administrative support, and sales staff from an automotive group. Identified were two 10-member groups. One group identified for its task-heterogeneous characteristics in comparison to the other, and the other a homogeneous group comprised completely of account representatives performing identical tasks. The other two groups, considered heterogenous included a 7-member workgroup and a 12-member workgroup.

To meet the heterogeneous criteria the purposive selection of eligible small groups included requirements of group size and task-oriented diversity. Harrison and Klein (2007) determined task-relevant diversity inclusive of differences in individual knowledge, skills, information, and experience. The variable size of each group provided statistical information for the analysis of entitativity and diversity with size as a variable. The magnitude of task heterogeneity between the two 10-member workgroups allowed for a comparative analysis of homogeneity and heterogeneity.

**Instrumentation**

For the determination of group diversity, the research design included the employment of Blau’s (1977) index. Biemann and Kearney (2010) considered Blau’s (1977) index the most appropriate categorical scale for measuring diversity. Blau's Index calculated the amount of in-group diversity by adding the squared percentage of individuals in an identified category, summing the proportions, and then subtracting the addend from one. Based on the assumption of all groups possessing an equal variable distribution, Harrison and Klein (2007) deemed the calculation appropriate for groups with sizes smaller than 20 with less than two categorical differences.

Postmes, Brooke, and Jetten (2008) sought to quantify the extent to which individual members appeared to function as a single unified entity. The researchers developed entitativity items based on Campbell’s (1958) research on measuring group cohesiveness. Postmes et al. developed a 4-item entitativity questionnaire which consisted of the following statements:

- I feel the people in this group are a unit;
- I think the people in this group can act in unison;
- I experience a feeling of togetherness between the individuals in this group;
- I feel the people in this group are as one (Postmes et al, 2008).
The individual group participant responded to each statement using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from “0” – Not at all, to “4” – Frequently, if not always. Lakens and Stel (2011) deemed the questionnaire reliable after conducting a factorial analysis with a varimax rotation. The statistical procedure produced a Cronbach $\alpha$ of 0.84. The construct reliably measured the in-group entitativity in relation to similar group behaviors such as rapport, agreeableness, and conformity.

**The Procedure**

The procedure encompassed the administration of a 2-part electronic survey instrument to collect participant data. The initial section of the survey obtained participant task-relevant categorical data used for calculating task diversity. The respondent information included task experience, task difficulty, and task type. The final section entailed the 4-item entitativity scale statements informing respondent perception of group cohesion.

Each team member belonging to a business unit meeting the study criteria received the study questionnaire for completion. The individual workgroups received the instrument through electronic mail on the same day along with an overview reiterating the purpose of the study. To ensure the integrity of the responses from the four respondent clusters, participants received the survey through a cloud-based customizable survey tool.

The selected survey platform allowed for the real-time collection, segmentation, and aggregation of workgroup statistical means as shown in Table 1. The findings captured from the data collection procedure using the entitativity scale and diversity index produced the group level responses. To analyze the data, the procedure included the importation of survey data into the statistic software allowing for a correlational analysis and an analysis of variances (ANOVA) between Blau’s Index and each entitativity sub-item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.</th>
<th>Cohesion v. Diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Feel Unity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*10</td>
<td>3.200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Control Group

**RESULTS**

An assessment of mean-level data superficially suggested support for a plausible correlation between constructs. However, the analysis of the findings revealed a lack of statistical significance with respect to the hypothesized positive correlation between group cohesion and diversity. The lack of statistical significance disconfirmed the hypothetical correlation between group cohesion and group diversity. A review of the group level findings revealed statistical differences between data obtained from the 10-member homogeneous group and the 10-member heterogeneous group. The homogeneous workgroup produced a high mean cohesion score aligning the research results with Tajfel and Turner’s (1979) SIT proposition valuing sameness. The task demographical data served to manifest the calculation of the Blau Index for the homogeneous and heterogeneous workgroups. The heterogeneous group possessed 0.71 index score compared to a 0.31 index rating of the homogeneous workgroup.
Based on the group entitativity mean from the descriptive statistic coupled with the group task diversity measures, the results suggested a statistical relationship between each of the four entitativity items and the associated Blau Index value consistent with the research of McGarty, Haslam, Hutchinson, and Grace’s (1995). The researchers concluded the magnitude of diversity present in a group influenced the group’s cohesiveness. McGarty et al. observed an inverse relationship between group entitativity and group diversity. The methodology produced findings across three of the four entitativity scales showing a corresponding increase in group cohesion as the group size increased. The “As One” scale represented the exception as the heterogeneous 10-member group scored 0.02 higher than the 12-member heterogeneous group. Group cohesiveness increased as group diversity decreased across the three heterogeneous groups.

To test the significance of the hypotheses, the study warranted a bivariate analysis to confirm a correlation and an analysis of variation to assess any group differences. The resulting correlation analysis output, as shown in Table 2, depicted the inverse linear relationship between variables.

Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Blau's Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Cohesion Mean</td>
<td>-0.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel Unity</td>
<td>-0.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act United</td>
<td>-0.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel Unity</td>
<td>-0.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togetherness</td>
<td>-0.754</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (p < 0.05)*

**ANALYSIS**

The output revealed a negative Pearson correlation value between Blau’s Index and each of the four entitativity scales. Dixon and Massey-Frank (1950) declared a positive Pearson r value indicated variable agreement, whereas a negative Pearson r coefficient indicated a dissimilar relationship. The correlation coefficient values advised an inverse relationship between constructs measuring cohesiveness and diversity as evidenced by the following items: As One, $r = -0.75$; Act United, $r = -0.71$; Feel Unity, $r = -0.70$; and Togetherness, $r = -0.67$.

The interpretation of the correlation coefficients reflecting the relationship between Blau’s Index and each entitativity item indicated a Pearson r greater than -0.70, which is deemed a strong negative linear relationship (Taylor, 1990). Thus, based on the statistical analysis the r-value expressed a correlation, albeit negative, between the amount of group cohesion and the magnitude of group task diversity. The negative correlation supported McGarty et al. (1995) contention as task diversity decreased cohesion increased. Despite the presence of the hypothesized correlation, the associated p-values for each correlation revealed values greater 0.05 for each relationship informing a lack of statistical significance. The empirical data failed to support the research hypothesis. The p values realized were as follows: As One, $p = 0.25$; Act United, $p = 0.29$; Feel Unity, $p = 0.29$; and Togetherness, $p = 0.33$. 
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The mean entitativity values increased whereas the mean Blau Index value decreased in relation to workgroup size. An analysis of variances performed on respondent data produced findings failing to support the $H_2$ and $H_3$ hypotheses as shown in Table 3. The statistical procedure failed to inform the statistical significance of group cohesion or diversity based on group size as a variable. The findings showed as group size increased group cohesion increased in proportion. Subsequently, the results showed as group size increased task-diversity became less significant.

Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Size</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>*10</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Cohesion</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Value is significant at the 0.05 level ($p < 0.05$)

The proposed correlation was not supported by the results. The results associated with the procedure paralleled the findings produced by similar efforts to establish a correlation between cohesion and diversity. While entitativity and Blau Index statistical means possessed a similar inverse linear relationship to the results of McGarty, Haslam, Hutchinson, and Grace’s (1995) research, the procedure produced inconclusive findings consistent with the results of Horwitz and Horwitz (2007).

CONCLUSION

Organizations considered the presence of both diversity and workgroup cohesion essential to achieving effective performance and financial outcomes. As this study demonstrated in its review of existing research on the effects of diversity on group cohesion, further investigation is required. The findings varied in the same manner as the approaches taken, and few empirical conclusions have been drawn in terms of a correlation between cohesion and diversity. The research question asked not whether organizations should embrace diversity, but a need for an understanding of the correlation between the amount of diversity while still affecting maximum group cohesiveness.

This study sought to empirically address the question by analyzing the relationship between group cohesion, as measured by entitativity, and task diversity, as calculated by Blau’s Index. The findings did not support the research hypotheses. A comparative assessment of the 10-member groups produced descriptive statistics supporting a proposition theorizing greater group cohesiveness of homogeneous task groups than heterogeneous task groups. However, as the statistical analysis produced a correlation coefficient indicating an inverse linear relationship, the results lacked statistical significance.

This empirical study endeavored to further group dynamic research. The limitations of this study provided an opportunity for future research. As the findings exhibited an inability to support the suggested correlation between diversity and group cohesiveness, there exists an opportunity for a revised and improved sampling strategy. Based on McGarty, Haslam, Hutchinson, and Grace’s (1995) empirical study, factors of intra-group variability and unit performance required consideration as mediating variables affecting entitativity in conjunction with diversity and group size.
For future study, the procedure should include an increased sample of task-diverse groups. The four business units reflected in this studies sample potentially contributed to the lack of statistical significance due to relative sample size. A statistical power analysis prior to data collection would facilitate a more representative sample as part of the research design. The limited number of groups in this study potentially mitigated the evaluation of group size and diversity as factors when determining a correlation or variances.

The 4-item entitativity scale provided a necessary vehicle for measuring the concept of cohesion. However, the instruments assumption of an equal distribution of task-related variables may misrepresent the magnitude of diversity. In furtherance of this empirical study, a more in-depth instrument, such as the Group Environment Questionnaire (GEQ) (Carron, Widmeyer, and Brawley, 1985), recently developed to measure dimensions of the task and social cohesion should be considered. Any future research should engage in a qualitative exercise to gain a more in-depth understanding of the antecedents enabling group cohesiveness. Lastly, further research should support the development of a diversity scale addressing any confounding variable concerns by mitigating the confusion between demographic and task diversity attributes.
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The primary purpose of this study was to assess the extent to which attitudes among a current sample of college students regarding persons with body art may differ from those reported approximately ten years previous. Using the same instrument and general sampling procedure as in an earlier study, a survey was conducted resulting in a geographically dispersed sample of 434 respondents ranging in age from 18 to 49 years. Although it may have been expected that variations in the obtained sample from the earlier one as well as the passage of time would result in differences in attitudes, such was not the case. Exploratory Factor Analysis revealed that the factor structure inherent in the present data was virtually identical to that reported in the earlier study. Although there are relatively minor differences, overall the pattern of attitudes and stereotypes toward persons with body art are quite similar to that reported in the earlier study. Specific similarities and differences between the two data sets and their implications for marketing management are discussed.

INTRODUCTION

A person’s physical appearance, as an expression of a person’s identity, is often modified in ways that are regarded as both routine and normative in the U.S.A. (Foster and Hummel, 2000). Adorning the body has a centuries old history in Western society. Ackroyd (2011) notes that in England both men and women of the ninth and tenth centuries wore tattoos on their arms. In modern Western societies, the provision of services such as cosmetics, body waxing, hair styling, tanning, teeth whitening, coolsculpting, and other forms of elective cosmetic surgery, make up a large and growing industry in the U.S.A., reportedly over $1.5 billion in 2018 (“America’s Booming …,” 2018). Indeed, the body art industry constitutes a robust growth industry in the U.S. and around the world (Stirn, 2003). According to STAPAW.com (2012), 38% of Canadian adults and 36% of Irish adults had tattoos in 2012. In the United States, 42% of adults have tattoos (STAPAW.com, 2012). There is even a New Orleans Tattoo Museum & Studio that opened there in 2015 (McLeod, 2015).

A Statistic Brain Research Institute direct response study in 2016 found that 14% of adults have at least one tattoo (Statistic Brain, 2016). According to STAPAW.com (2012), 61% of adults have had piercings (including ear cartilage). The number of tattoo parlors in the U.S. has grown from 4,000 in 2001 (Sebastian, 2001) to 21,000 (Statistic Brain, 2016). There are reportedly over 38,000 tattoo businesses in the U.S. that employ over 45,000 people (“America’s Booming …,” 2018). A researcher at IBISWorld has forecasted that the tattoo industry will reach $1.1 billion by the year 2020 (“Toxic Tats,” 2016, p. 29) but this has already been exceeded as of 2018. A 2015
Harris Poll found that Millennials (47%) and Gen Xers (36%) had at least one tattoo, while only
13% of Baby Boomers had one (Quirk’s, 2016, p. 14). Body art is a term which is used for both
tattoos and body piercings, where jewelry is attached to the body.

Not surprisingly, the following studies indicate that the prevalence of both forms of body
art – tattoos and piercings, is highest among young adults. According to the American Academy
of Pediatrics, a recent Pew Research Center estimated that “about 38% of young people ages 18 to
29 have at least one tattoo” (Newman, 2017). The prevalence appears to increase during the college
age years, though data is conflicting. A study of Eastern Michigan University students found that
21% of students had tattoos, and almost 30% had body piercing (Anderson, 2003). A survey of
481 college students in New York showed that 42% of the men and 60% of the women had body
piercing (Mayers, Judelson, Moriarty, & Rundell, 2002). According to the Harris poll mentioned
above, body art and education attainment are inversely related, as 22 percent of those having a
high school education or less are tattooed or pierced, as compared to only 4 percent with post-
graduate degrees. According to a study of 400 undergraduates in a southeastern university, “Over
a quarter (27.5%) of the respondents reported that they had a tattoo–25.8% of men and 28.3% of
women” and “Almost seventy percent (69.7%) of the undergraduate women compared to 28.2%
of undergraduate men reported having any piercings” (Horn, Knox, Zusman, & Zusman, 2007).

Workplace Concerns

A concern for many organizations is the image projected by their employees to customers
or other interest groups. Many organizations have dress codes designed to project a specific image
which limit certain behaviors (Wich, 2007). An issue which appears to be of increasing concern
in the specification of dress codes in the U.S. is the growth of tattoos and body piercing among
employees. The concern results from the fact that body art, which is increasing in prevalence
in the U.S., is associated with negative behavior and connotations, such as being overly aggressive,
rebellious, and tending toward violence (Swami et al., 2015). Though it is a particularly significant
challenge to retailers in the U.S., the issue is widespread: law firms, hospitals, dental hygiene
programs, advertising agencies, non-profit organizations, and even government agencies such as
state parks “wrestle” with the issue of how employees should dress (e.g., see Baumann, Timming,
& Gollan, 2016; Bible, 2010; Elzweig & Peeples, 2011; Felton-O’Brien, 2007; Lau, 2016;
McGregor, 2015; Mlodzik, 2007; Rowe, 2015; Search, Tolle, McCombs, & Arndt, 2018; and
Timming, Nickson, Daniel, & Perrett, 2015).

The concern for managers is that in the past at least, both tattoos and body art have been
associated with risky and deviant behavior in Western culture. Questions exist from a management
perspective as to how tolerant retail customers may be and what stereotypes might exist (see
T rotten, Lipscomb, & Jones, 2009; Ellis, 2015 and Antonellis, Jr., Berry, & Silsbee, 2017). These
questions include: What size of tattoo is acceptable? How many are acceptable and on what parts
of one’s body? Are they more acceptable on women, or by women? The concern is not only
about the existence, number, size and location of the tattoos, but what the tattoo might express.
Ellis (2015, p. 111) encourages future research in these areas among others.

The issue is complicated by the fact that dress codes can quickly become legal “minefields”
(Williamson, 2006; Barron, 2007). Legal issues associated with the restriction of body art include
sex discrimination, freedom of religion and freedom of speech, and numerous lawsuits have
resulted from body art dress codes (see Miller, Nicols, & Eure, 2009; Mueller, 2017). Facebook™
has a discussion board for its “Tattoo Acceptance in the Workplace” group and postings suggest
that many feel that having body art “disqualifies them from consideration” (Ellis, 2015, p. 102).
“Modified’ applicants and employees have no legal recourse to discrimination under federal law in the United States” (Ellis 2015, p. 101). “However, strict dress code guidelines can diminish the talent pool” as more Millennials have body art and Baby Boomers are retiring (Carr, 2008). Mueller (2017, p. 30) found that “older generations may be more likely to discriminate against those with tattoos.” McElroy, Summers, and Moore (2014, p. 36) concluded that, “at least for more mainstream, business-oriented jobs, candidates with facial piercings face an uphill climb with regard to earning a job.” According to Foltz (2014) “Of the respondents, 27% believed that company policy should not dictate whether tattoos can be displayed whereas 73% felt that it was acceptable for policy to dictate the visibility of tattoos.”

**BACKGROUND LITERATURE**

Sociology, psychology and nursing fields have contributed most of the research reported in the literature concerning body art. Less attention on body art has come from the marketing and consumption perspectives. Much of the medical literature on tattooing and body piercing has focused on the risks and complications of these procedures (Carroll, Riffenburgh, Roberts, & Myhre, 2002; Armstrong, Koch, Saunders, Roberts, Alden, & Owen, 2007; Johnson, 2014; Carlsen & Serup, 2015). Sociological studies have primarily focused on body art as a byproduct of deviant and aggressive behavior, as well as descriptions of marginal and sub-cultural groups associated with tattooing and body art (Forbes, 2001; also see Adams, 2009; Silver, Silver, Siennick, and Farkas, 2011; Swami et al., 2015). Psychology studies concerned with body art, on the other hand, have tended to focus on psychopathology and intrapersonal motivational factors such as the expression of freedom or hedonism (Vail, 1999). One trend noted of late is body art that honors one’s children (Gleiter, 2008). Though historically considered to be somewhat deviant behavior in Western society, social scientists argue that the use of body art is becoming increasingly diffused and embraced by the middle class (DeMello, 2000; Carroll, Riffenburgh, Roberts, & Myhre, 2002; Rock, 2008). Koch, Roberts, Armstrong, and Owen (2015, p. 4) noted “Our findings here show further evidence of a shift in the meaning of tattoos about the time respondents acquire their fourth tattoo. At that point, it’s as though one’s tattoos become a more constitutive sign of a lifestyle rather than a nominal addition to the presentation of self.”

In a 2006 national survey, 24% of respondents were found to have tattoos and 14% had body piercings (Laumann and Derick, 2006). As noted earlier, STAPAW.com (2012) states that 42% of U.S. adults have tattoos. In the early 2000s two popular cable television shows that featured tattoos were *Miami Ink* and *Inked* (“Tattoos Put Their Stamp,” 2006). Current television shows about tattoos include *Black Ink Crew*, *Ink Masters*, and *Just Tattoo of Us*. There are also shows in Australia (*Bond Ink Tattoo Crew*) and Great Britain (*London Ink*) (List of tattoo TV shows, 2018).

Not surprisingly, studies indicate that the prevalence of both forms of body art is increasing most rapidly among young adults. Laumann and Derick, (2006) found that, among those born between 1975 and 1986, there was a higher incidence of tattoos and other forms of body art than was the case for those individuals born in the period 1953-1974. In one small-scale study, Forbes (2001) reported that among members of a university anthropology class, 5% had a tattoo and 36% had a body piercing. According to The Chronicle of Higher Education (2003), a 2002 Pace University study of their student body indicated that of the undergraduates, more than half had some type of body piercing, and 23% had at least one tattoo. A study of Eastern Michigan University students found that 21% of students had tattoos, and almost 30% had body piercing...
(Anderson 2003). Ten years ago, Lipscomb, Jones, and Totten (2008, pp. 48-49) found that 40.5% of 496 college business students had some form of body art, and 26.3% of male students had body art versus 56.8% of female students. A survey of 481 college students in New York showed that 42% of the men and 60% of the women had body piercing (Mayers, Judelson, Moriarty, & Rundell, 2002). According to the Harris poll mentioned above, body art and education attainment are inversely related, as 22% of those having a high school education or less were tattooed or pierced, as compared to four percent with post-graduate degrees. But this is changing; a 2006 Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology study found that 48% of “20-somethings and 30 percent of all adults have a tattoo or body piercing” and “23 percent of those with body art hold at least a bachelor’s degree” (Fiorentino, 2006, D1). Dundes and Francis (2016, p. 219) studied honor students and their use of body art. They found that “(f)ewer Honors students had tattoos (13% versus 29%) and a greater proportion of those who did thought about this decision for at least a year (75% versus 19%).” Dale, Bevill, Roach, Glasgow, & Bracy (2009) surveyed 1,412 students and 581 business people at universities and communities in Arkansas, California, and Ohio. They found that just about 48% of students “did not think that visible tattoos and body piercings would hinder a person’s chance of getting a job . . . .”

Among the most prolific investigators of body art use is Armstrong and her associates, who conducted a number of studies during the 1990’s. Their studies of high school students, college students and career women suggested that body art consumption among adults tends to be carefully thought out in advance, and not associated with alcohol and drug usage, rebellion or post-purchase regret (Armstrong, 1991; Armstrong and McConnell, 1994; Armstrong and Pace Murphy, 1997; Greif, Hewitt, & Armstrong, 1999). Armstrong and Koch have since formed a “body art” team that continues to conduct research into this second decade of the 21st century.¹

Kjeldgaard and Bengtsson (2003) studied tattoo consumption in Denmark and concluded that it is “better understood as either neotribal or reflexive individualistic forms of expression” (p. 26). Lim, Ting, Leo and Jayanthy (2013) concluded that in Malaysia, “the society may perceive tattooing and body piercing practices as a form of art, spirituality, immortalizing significant moment memories, self-expression and representation of the dark.” In other consumption related research, Solomon (2004, p. 180) noted that consumers “use this body art [tattoos] to make statements about the self, and these skin designs serve some of the same functions that other kinds of body painting do in primitive cultures.” Body piercing, using metallic inserts, has also “evolved from a practice associated with some fringe groups to become a popular fashion statement” (Solomon, 2004, p. 181) and has even been applied in medical disability research (“Tongue piercing,” 2013). Hoyer and MacInnis (2001), in focusing on symbolism, mentioned that marketers help consumers with symbol development, communication, reinforcement, and removal. “Consumers often want tattoos removed because they are emblematic of an earlier time of life or an abandoned reference group and impede the development of new identifications” (p. 455). Shelton and Peters (2008) found supporting evidence in their exploratory study, concluding that “tattoo acquisition and removal are undertaken as a means of identity negotiation” and “when identity conflict arose, consumers sought tattoo removal services” (p. 10). Approximately 45,000 tattoos were removed by laser surgery in 2013 (Bowerman, 2013).

Hawkins, Mothersbaugh, and Best (2007) noted that there are meanings on at least three levels: having tattoos, the location of those tattoos, and the nature of the tattoos, in terms of symbolism and private meaning. Hill, Ogletree and McCrary (2016, p. 251) found that 44% of the students who participated in their Central Texas study had tattoos, and that “wanting to be unique

¹ See their current research at: http://drjkoch.org/Research/Tattoo%20Team.htm.
is a common reason for obtaining tattoos.” Walzer and Sanjurjo (2016, p. 79) concluded that “according to tattoo artists and individuals with tattoos, the media has had a remarkable and multifaceted impact on the practice of tattooing in our contemporary societies.”

A key concept in the field of consumer behavior is that of consumer involvement, the perceived relevance of the object to the consumer based on his/her inherent needs, values and interests (Zaichkowsky, 1985). Regarding body art, involvement would appear to be in part a function of the situation in which the purchase decision takes place. Rational factors that may impact the decision to purchase body art services may include the price of the service, amount of pre-purchase information available or sought, as well as the time frame in which the decision is made among other factors (adapted from Figure 4.3 in Solomon, 2004, p. 124). However, emotions are also at work in the decision-making process, as people may pursue liberation or uniqueness or rejecting symbolism or conformity (Pentina & Spears, 2011). Firmin, Tse, Foster, and Angelini, (2012) also found that friends exert some influence on people’s tattoo adoption decisions. Health-related concerns may also enter in the purchase decision as “there are no universal procedural health standards for tattooing” (Koch, Roberts, Harms Cannon, Armstrong, and Owen, 2005, p. 81; also see Boodman, 2006; Johnson, 2014; “Piercing pain,” 2006; “Tattoos Are No Longer Taboo,” 2006). “As of September 2003, 34 states have regulations for both tattooing and body piercing, 39 states for tattooing only, and 35 states specifically for body piercing” (Armstrong, 2005, p. 40). As of 2018, “almost every state have laws addressing some aspect of body art. (Nevada has no laws addressing body art; Maryland has very limited laws). At least 45 states have laws prohibiting minors from getting tattoos. Thirty-eight states have laws that prohibit both body piercing and tattooing on minors without parental permission” (NCSL.org, 2018). Armstrong, et al. (2002, p. 320) reported that their college students “seemed to be knowledgeable consumers agreeing that there should be a clean studio, an artist who explains the procedure, that the studio/artist should be recommended, that they should shop around before selecting the best studio/artists, know what the health problems are, and that tattoo decisions should be avoided during times of stress.” Resenhoeft, Villa and Wiseman (2008, p. 595) suggested that: “Healthcare providers could inform a college student considering getting a tattoo that despite the apparent popularity of tattooing, a tattoo may harm perceptions of them by their peers.”

In a large-scale survey of college students’ attitudes toward persons with body art, Totten et al. (2009) found that overall the respondents expressed favorable attitude towards persons with both form of body art and that they found both forms to be attractive. They reported that younger persons in the sample, however, tended to indicate more favorable relevant attitudes than did older persons. There were also differences as a function of the sex about whom such attributions were made as both men and women in that study indicated positive attitudes toward women with body art more frequently than to their male counterparts.

The present study represents an update to these findings by assessing the extent to which these results are consistent with prevailing attitudes among a similar sample of college students. As such, the same instrument and a similar sampling procedure were utilized. It is recognized that because of sampling variability it cannot be inferred that attitudes have either changed or remained stable by comparing the two sets of results. Rather, the intent is to provide a current day basis for insights with respect to strategic marketing implications for this important demographic of consumers.
METHODOLOGY

A non-probability sampling procedure similar to that utilized by Lipscomb et al. (2009) was conducted in an attempt to obtain a geographically diverse sample of college students in the United States. The assistance of seven members of the marketing faculty at seven different accredited universities in the following states was obtained: Alabama, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and South Dakota (2). The faculty members were emailed copies of the same questionnaire used by Lipscomb et al. (2008) with appropriate permission and relevant Institutional Review Board approvals. These were then printed out and distributed attached to an informed consent letter in the faculty members’ Principles of Marketing courses. Those students in attendance in these courses who wished to participate completed and returned the questionnaires to the faculty members who then kept them secure and mailed to the researchers via U.S. Postal Service. A total of 434 completed questionnaires were received in this manner. Data were extracted from these questionnaires and analyzed using SPSS v. 22 in the manner described below.

RESULTS

Sample Characteristics

A total of 434 respondents returned completed questionnaires. The obtained sample had an age range of 18 to 49 years with a mean age of 21.05 years. With respect to gender, 44.5% identified as female and 51.6% as male; 3.9% did not identify as male or female. Six states, geographically dispersed, were represented in the sample. These were: Alabama (5.8%), Kentucky (20.5%), Louisiana (11.1%), Michigan (18.4%), Pennsylvania (6.5%), and South Dakota (37.8%). The following demographic variables were used in the analyses: age, gender, region of residence, and whether or not the respondent reported having body art.

Prevalence of Body Art

For this study, respondents were asked to exclude pierced earlobes on women from consideration in their responses relating to body piercing. Among the respondents, 35.2% indicated having some form of body art. Of these, 82.1% reported having tattoos while 87.4% indicated having piercings. Among those having tattoos, 33.9%, indicated having one tattoo while 23.4% reported having two. Six or more tattoos were reported by seven respondents (5.6%). This pattern was quite similar for the prevalence of piercings. The largest percentage (32.6%) reporting having one piercing while 15.9% reporting having two piercings. Eighteen individuals (13.5%) reported having six or more piercings. Table 1 reports more specific detail regarding prevalence (see next page).
Pearson chi-square for independence tests were performed resulting in statistically significant gender-based patterns for prevalence of body art of both types - tattoos, and piercings. For body art in general, significantly more women (49%) than men (21.4%) reported having some form of body art, $\chi^2(1, N = 416) = 35.85, p < .001$. Among these, significantly more men (91.3%) than women (70.8%) reported having tattoos, $\chi^2(1, N = 118) = 7.04, p = .008$. There was a statistically significant relationship in the opposite direction for piercings with 92.3% of the women as compared to 52.8% of the men reported having piercings, $\chi^2(1, N = 127) = 26.3, p < .0001$. There was a statistically significant relationship for the prevalence of body art and state of residence $\chi^2(5, N = 433) = 11.51, p = .042$. Residents of Kentucky reported the highest prevalence (44.9%) and residents of Pennsylvania the lowest (17.9%). Pearson Product-moment correlation revealed no statistically significant relationships of prevalence of body art to age of respondent.

**Rasch Analyses**

The items assessing attitudes toward persons with body art were subjected to Rasch Rating Scale Model (RSM) (Andrich, 1978a, 1978b) analysis as implemented in the WINSTEPS v. 3.68.2 (Linacre, 2009) as a means of assessing the psychometric properties of the items. The mean endorsement level for the 37 items was “centered” or set to zero logit units. The observed as well as True SD was 1.74 logit units for both model and actual data; the relatively small RMSE of 0.14 for model and 0.15 for actual data indicated a high level of precision in calibrating items measures. The reliability was .99 for both model and real data corresponded to high 12.49 and 11.33 reliability-separation indices or 16.99 and 15.44 identifiable item strata for model and real data, respectively. Thus, the functioning of the response format and the items used are considered to be psychometrically sound for their intended purpose.
Data Reduction

These thirty-seven items comprising the scale assessing attitudes toward persons with body art were subjected to Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) utilizing Principal Axis Factor extraction with direct oblique rotation and Kaiser normalization in order to explore inherent latent factor structure within the data. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test of sampling adequacy resulted in a value of .863 indicative of the appropriateness of the analysis with this data set (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1984). With no number of fixed factors specified, the scree plot resulting from this initial analysis revealed evidence for three discrete factors. Accordingly, a three-factor solution was specified for which the rotation converged in nine iterations accounting for 45.68% of the variance. Following Sheskin’s (2011) recommendation that with sample sizes comparable to that in the present study, factor loadings of .3 or greater should be used. Inspection of the factor loadings indicates that the first factor consists of items indicating positive attitudes toward body art. Twenty-four items loaded positively at .3 or greater on Factor 1 and may be viewed as indicative of positive characteristics associated with persons having body art (see Table 2). Four of these items double-loaded on factors 1 and 2, possibly indicative of ambivalence among the sample. It is of note that this factor is quite similar to the results reported by Totten et al. (2009) using the same scale but a completely different sample of college students. Again, similar to the aforementioned study, fifteen items loaded positively (including the four with double loadings .3 or greater) on a second factor seemingly indicative of negative characteristics associated with persons having body art (see Table 2). These items assess attributions with traditionally negative social connotation. An exception has to do with the four double loaded items, all of which deal specifically with sexual promiscuity which may be indicative of ambiguity among the sample as to whether this represents a positive or negative trait. Three items loaded of Factor 3. These items have in common that they assess a perspective-taking dimension in that all have to do with attributions of how persons with body art are viewed by others.

Two separate composite factor scores were computed by summing the data for those items that showed loadings of .3 or greater for Factor 1 – Positive Characteristics Associated with Persons Having Body Art (range = 17 – 79, M = 46.07, SD = 12.15) and for Factor 2 – Negative Characteristics Associated with Persons Having Body Art (range = 13 – 48, M = 28.97, SD = 7.84). After performing a median split procedure for the age variable, each factor score was subjected to a 2 (gender) x 2 (age) ANOVA. The ANOVA for Factor 1 (positive characteristics) resulted in a significant main effect for gender, F (1,402) = 5.52, p = .019, $n^2 = .019$, indicating that women generally expressed significantly more positive attitudes toward persons with body art (M = 46.75) than did men (M = 45.33). Neither the main effect for age nor the age x gender interaction were significant. The ANOVA for Factor 2 (negative characteristics) also resulted in a significant main effect for gender, F (1,403) = 8.64, p = .003, $n^2 = .021$, indicating that men expressed significantly more negative attitudes toward persons with body art (M= 30.18) than did women (M = 27.65). Again, neither the main effect for age nor the age x gender interaction were significant. The results for the individual items within composite factors are depicted in Table 3 and discussed subsequently supported by Pearson chi-square for Independence tests to assess potentially meaningful relationships among items and demographic variables considered. This approach was selected because the data were in terms of frequencies and there was evidence of significant skewness among the majority of the scaled items (-1.47 to .926).
Table 2
Factor Loadings from Principal Axis Factor Analysis: Communalities, Eigenvalues, and Percentages of Variance for Items on the Body Art Appreciation Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tattoos can be attractive</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tattoos on women are attractive</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A small, discrete tattoo is “sexy” on a woman</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Piercing(s) with body jewelry on women is attractive</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Extensive tattoos are attractive on a man</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Piercings with body jewelry can be attractive</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. A small, discrete piercing with body jewelry is “sexy” on a woman</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tattoos on men are attractive</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Piercing(s) with body jewelry on men is attractive</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Extensive tattoos are attractive on a woman</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Tattoos are appropriate for a parent</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Piercing(s) with body jewelry is appropriate for a parent</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Extensive piercings with body jewelry are attractive on a man</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. A small, discrete piercing with body jewelry is “sexy” on a man</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. A small, discrete tattoo is “sexy” on a man</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Extensive piercings with body jewelry are attractive on a woman</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A man with a tattoo(s) is sexually promiscuous</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A woman with a tattoo(s) is sexually promiscuous</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Tattoos indicate “free spiritedness”</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Tattoos are appropriate for a person of any age</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. A man with piercing(s) and body jewelry is sexually promiscuous</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. A woman with piercing(s) and body jewelry is sexually promiscuous</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Piercing(s) with body jewelry is appropriate for persons of any age</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Piercing(s) with body jewelry indicate “free spiritedness”</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. People tend to stereotype persons with a tattoo(s)</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. A person with piercing(s) with body jewelry is “tough”</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. The number of piercings with body jewelry that a person has makes a difference in how he/is perceived by others</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. The number of tattoos that a person has makes a difference in how he/is perceived by others</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. A person with a tattoo(s) is “tough”.</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Piercing(s) with body jewelry indicate a “partying lifestyle”</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Piercing(s) with body jewelry indicate that the person abuses alcohol or drugs</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. A person with a tattoo(s) is aggressive</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. A person with a piercing(s) with body jewelry is aggressive</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Tattoos indicate a “partying lifestyle”</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Tattoos indicate that the person abuses alcohol or drugs</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I consider a person with a piercing(s) with body jewelry to have a “bad” image</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I consider a person with a tattoo(s) to have a “bad” image</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of variance</td>
<td>24.88</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Items in parentheses are frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tattoos can be attractive</td>
<td>7.4 (32)</td>
<td>10.2 (44)</td>
<td>14.3 (62)</td>
<td>47.3 (205)</td>
<td>20.8 (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tattoos on men are attractive</td>
<td>13.6 (58)</td>
<td>10.5 (45)</td>
<td>37.6 (161)</td>
<td>27.3 (117)</td>
<td>11 (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tattoos on women are attractive</td>
<td>12.5 (54)</td>
<td>17.1 (74)</td>
<td>27 (117)</td>
<td>31.6 (137)</td>
<td>11.8 (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A small, discrete tattoo is “sexy” on a woman</td>
<td>8.1 (35)</td>
<td>12.7 (55)</td>
<td>26.7 (116)</td>
<td>37.1 (161)</td>
<td>15.4 (67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive tattoos are attractive on a man</td>
<td>29.1 (125)</td>
<td>22.1 (95)</td>
<td>34.4 (148)</td>
<td>11.4 (49)</td>
<td>3 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A man with a tattoo(s) is sexually promiscuous</td>
<td>24.9 (107)</td>
<td>26.7 (115)</td>
<td>39.5 (170)</td>
<td>8.1 (35)</td>
<td>0.7 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive tattoos are attractive on a woman</td>
<td>40.8 (177)</td>
<td>29 (126)</td>
<td>15.7 (68)</td>
<td>11.5 (50)</td>
<td>3 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A small, discrete tattoo is “sexy” on a man</td>
<td>23.5 (101)</td>
<td>16.8 (72)</td>
<td>42 (180)</td>
<td>13.5 (58)</td>
<td>4.2 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A woman with a tattoo(s) is sexually promiscuous</td>
<td>21.9 (95)</td>
<td>24 (104)</td>
<td>33.4 (145)</td>
<td>19.1 (83)</td>
<td>1.6 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piercings with body jewelry can be attractive</td>
<td>11.5 (50)</td>
<td>13.6 (59)</td>
<td>16.4 (71)</td>
<td>49 (212)</td>
<td>9.5 (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piercings(s) with body jewelry on women is attractive</td>
<td>9.9 (43)</td>
<td>12 (52)</td>
<td>23.3 (110)</td>
<td>43.9 (190)</td>
<td>10.9 (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A small, discrete piercing with body jewelry is “sexy” on a man</td>
<td>42.2 (181)</td>
<td>23.5 (101)</td>
<td>26.3 (113)</td>
<td>6.3 (27)</td>
<td>1.6 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive piercings with body jewelry are attractive on a woman</td>
<td>39.7 (172)</td>
<td>33.7 (146)</td>
<td>18 (78)</td>
<td>6.7 (29)</td>
<td>1.8 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A man with piercing(s) and body jewelry is sexually promiscuous</td>
<td>37.4 (160)</td>
<td>24.2 (108)</td>
<td>31.3 (134)</td>
<td>5.1 (22)</td>
<td>0.9 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A woman with piercing(s) and body jewelry is sexually promiscuous</td>
<td>23.2 (100)</td>
<td>23.9 (103)</td>
<td>33.6 (145)</td>
<td>16.5 (71)</td>
<td>2.8 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piercing(s) with body jewelry on men is attractive</td>
<td>43.3 (184)</td>
<td>22.6 (96)</td>
<td>28.2 (120)</td>
<td>4.2 (18)</td>
<td>1.6 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A small, discrete piercing with body jewelry is “sexy” on a woman</td>
<td>13.7 (59)</td>
<td>9.5 (41)</td>
<td>21 (116)</td>
<td>40.2 (173)</td>
<td>9.5 (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive piercings with body jewelry are attractive on a man</td>
<td>56.6 (241)</td>
<td>19 (81)</td>
<td>23 (98)</td>
<td>0.7 (3)</td>
<td>0.7 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person with a tattoo(s) is aggressive</td>
<td>21.1 (91)</td>
<td>34.1 (147)</td>
<td>30.4 (131)</td>
<td>13.7 (59)</td>
<td>0.7 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider a person with a tattoo(s) to have a “bad” image</td>
<td>28 (120)</td>
<td>35.4 (152)</td>
<td>22.6 (97)</td>
<td>11.9 (51)</td>
<td>2.1 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tattoos are appropriate for a person of any age</td>
<td>26 (112)</td>
<td>36.4 (157)</td>
<td>13.5 (58)</td>
<td>20 (86)</td>
<td>4.2 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People tend to stereotype persons with a tattoo(s)</td>
<td>1.2 (5)</td>
<td>1.4 (6)</td>
<td>6.8 (29)</td>
<td>55.8 (239)</td>
<td>34.8 (149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of tattoos that a person has makes a difference in how he/she is perceived by others</td>
<td>3 (13)</td>
<td>2.8 (12)</td>
<td>8.8 (38)</td>
<td>57.4 (247)</td>
<td>27.9 (120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tattoos are appropriate for a parent</td>
<td>7.9 (34)</td>
<td>15.6 (67)</td>
<td>40.2 (173)</td>
<td>26.7 (115)</td>
<td>9.5 (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tattoos indicate “free spiritedness”</td>
<td>6 (26)</td>
<td>16.5 (71)</td>
<td>41.4 (178)</td>
<td>30.5 (131)</td>
<td>5.6 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tattoos indicate a “partying lifestyle”</td>
<td>14.7 (63)</td>
<td>39.8 (171)</td>
<td>29.8 (128)</td>
<td>14.9 (64)</td>
<td>0.9 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tattoos indicate that the person abuses alcohol or drugs</td>
<td>41.5 (179)</td>
<td>35 (151)</td>
<td>18.6 (80)</td>
<td>4.6 (20)</td>
<td>0.2 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person with a tattoo(s) is “tough”.</td>
<td>20.9 (90)</td>
<td>38.7 (167)</td>
<td>28.8 (124)</td>
<td>10.4 (45)</td>
<td>1.2 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person with piercing(s) with body jewelry is “tough”</td>
<td>29.1 (125)</td>
<td>44.7 (192)</td>
<td>22.1 (95)</td>
<td>4 (17)</td>
<td>0.2 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider a person with a piercing(s) with body jewelry to have a “bad” image</td>
<td>22.2 (95)</td>
<td>38.1 (163)</td>
<td>23.8 (102)</td>
<td>14.5 (62)</td>
<td>1.4 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piercing(s) with body jewelry is appropriate for persons of any age</td>
<td>24.4 (105)</td>
<td>41.2 (177)</td>
<td>18.8 (81)</td>
<td>13.3 (57)</td>
<td>2.3 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of piercings with body jewelry that a person has makes a difference in how he/she is perceived by others</td>
<td>3.3 (14)</td>
<td>4.7 (20)</td>
<td>10 (43)</td>
<td>59.5 (256)</td>
<td>22.6 (97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person with a piercing(s) with body jewelry is aggressive</td>
<td>21.4 (92)</td>
<td>43.7 (188)</td>
<td>30.2 (130)</td>
<td>4.2 (18)</td>
<td>0.5 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piercing(s) with body jewelry indicate “free spiritedness”</td>
<td>10 (43)</td>
<td>26 (112)</td>
<td>39.3 (169)</td>
<td>22.6 (97)</td>
<td>2.1 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piercing(s) with body jewelry indicate that the person abuses alcohol or drugs</td>
<td>35.6 (153)</td>
<td>38.6 (166)</td>
<td>21.2 (91)</td>
<td>4 (17)</td>
<td>0.7 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piercing(s) with body jewelry is appropriate for a parent</td>
<td>14.7 (63)</td>
<td>26 (112)</td>
<td>37 (159)</td>
<td>18.1 (78)</td>
<td>4.2 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piercing(s) with body jewelry indicate a “partying lifestyle”</td>
<td>21.6 (93)</td>
<td>39.1 (168)</td>
<td>28.1 (121)</td>
<td>10.9 (47)</td>
<td>0.2 (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

Items Endorsements in Percentages

*Items in parentheses are frequencies*
Factor 1: Positive Characteristics Associated with Persons Having Body Art Tattoos

The large majority of respondents in the sample (68.1%) expressed the attitude that tattoos can be attractive (combined percentages for responses Agree and Strongly Agree; see Table 3). Although this was a fairly general attitude, there was a statistically significant relationship with gender of the respondents. Specifically, a higher percentage of women (76.7%) as opposed to men (60.3%) either agreed or strongly agreed that tattoos can be attractive, $\chi^2 (4, N = 417) = 14.06, p = .007$. With respect to attractiveness of tattoos on men, a total of 67.4% of the female respondents agreed that tattoos on men are attractive. A significantly smaller percentage, 11.8%, of the men, however, agreed with the statement, $\chi^2 (4, N = 413) = 140.28, p < .001$. Of note is that this finding is nearly identical to that reported earlier by Totten et al. (2009) except that the percentage differences are even larger in the present study as compared to the earlier one. Unlike the earlier study, however, there was no statistically significant relationship of gender to the corresponding item concerning attractiveness of tattoos on women. For this item, 43.5% of respondents overall agreed or strongly agreed that tattoos on women are attractive. In the 2009 study, a significantly higher percentage of men agreed as compared to women.

Consistent with previous findings, the present results indicate that the extent of the presence of tattoos is related to attributions of attractiveness with 51.2% of the sample as a whole disagreeing that extensive tattoos are attractive on men and 69.8% disagreeing that they are attractive on women (see Table 3). Concerning tattoos on men, there was a significant relationship with gender, $\chi^2 (4, N = 413) = 52.20, p < .001$ (see Table 4) wherein more women agreed that extensive tattoos on men are attractive (24.9%) as compared to male respondents (4.1%). It is interesting to note that in the 2009 study significantly more women disagreed that extensive tattoos on men were attractive as compared to male respondents.

There was also a significant relationship of gender to the corresponding item concerning the attractiveness of extensive tattoos on women with 18.8% of the men and 8.8% of the women agreeing or strongly agreeing with this proposition, $\chi^2 (4, N = 417) = 10.29, p = .036$. This cross-gender pattern wherein respondents of the opposite gender consider extensive tattoos on the opposite gender to be attractive with greater frequency than do those of the same gender is similar to the results reported by Totten et al. (2009).

In the present study and in Totten et al. (2009), a specific sub-dimension of attractiveness that was examined is that of sexual attractiveness. This dimension was subsumed in various items by the use of the adjective, “sexy”. In the present case, the majority of respondents, 52.5%, agreed that a small discrete tattoo on a woman is “sexy” while only 17.7% agreed that this was so for a man (see Table 4). Continuing the cross-gender pattern discussed above, in the present study there was a statistically significant relationship between gender and attributions of sexual attractiveness with respect to a small discrete tattoo on women, $\chi^2 (4, N = 417), p = 13.76, p = .008$ In this comparison, 57.1% of men agreed that a small discrete tattoo on women is “sexy” as opposed to 45.6% of female respondents (see Table 4). A similar cross-gender pattern was in evidence for the companion item concerning the “sexiness” of a small discrete tattoo on a man, $\chi^2 (4, N = 413) = 56.8, p < .001$ wherein significantly more women (31.8%) agreed that a small discrete tattoo on a man is “sexy” as compared to men (5.0%) (see Table 4). These patterns are nearly identical to those reported earlier by Totten et al. (2009).
Table 4

Percent Agreement and Disagreement for Items Significantly Related to Gender of Respondent*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tattoos can be attractive</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tattoos on men are attractive</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A small, discrete tattoo is “sexy” on a woman</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive tattoos are attractive on a man</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A man with a tattoo(s) is sexually promiscuous</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive tattoos are attractive on a woman</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A small, discrete tattoo is “sexy” on a man</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A woman with a tattoo(s) is sexually promiscuous</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A small, discrete piercing with body jewelry is “sexy” on a man</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A man with piercing(s) and body jewelry is sexually promiscuous</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A woman with piercing(s) and body jewelry is sexually promiscuous</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piercing(s) with body jewelry on men is attractive</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A small, discrete piercing with body jewelry is “sexy” on a woman</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive piercings with body jewelry are attractive on a man</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>86.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person with a tattoo(s) is aggressive</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider a person with a tattoo(s) to have a “bad” image</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tattoo(s) indicate a “partying lifestyle”</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tattoos indicate that the person abuses alcohol or drugs</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person with piercing(s) with body jewelry is “tough”</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of piercings with body jewelry that a person has makes a</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difference in how he/is perceived by others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piercing(s) with body jewelry indicate that the person abuses alcohol</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piercing(s) with body jewelry indicate a “partying lifestyle”</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Combined responses of Strongly Disagree and Disagree; Strongly Agree and Agree

The majority disagreed that tattoos are appropriate for a person of any age with 24.2% of the sample expressing agreement and 62.4% expressing disagreement (see Table 3), a result virtually identical to that reported by Totten et al. (2009). Concerning the appropriateness of tattoos for a parent, 36.2% endorsed this sentiment while 40.2% were neutral and 23.5% disagreed (see Table 3). Within the present sample, 36.1% agreed that tattoos are indicative of “free spiritedness” while 22.5% disagreed and 41.4% were neutral (see Table 3). There was fairly uniform agreement across the sample for these three items as there were no significant relationships to the demographic variables considered with the exception of whether or not the respondent him/herself reported having body art as discussed below.

As mentioned above, items relating to attributions of sexual promiscuity double-loaded on Factors 1 and 2. In the case of tattoos, most respondents in the present study (51.6%) disagreed that a man with a tattoo is sexually promiscuous (see Table 3). There was a statistically significant relationship to gender as a higher percentage of women (61.1%) expressed disagreement as compared to men (44.5%), χ² (4, N = 413) = 28.9, p < .001 (Table 4). This result is nearly identical to that reported by Totten et al. (2009). As was the case in the previous study, the largest proportion of the sample (45.9%) disagreed that a woman with a tattoo is sexually promiscuous (see Table 3) although this percentage was somewhat lower that in the earlier study. There was a statistically
significant relationship to gender for this attribution wherein more women disagreed (58.5%) with this statement as compared to men (36.2%), $\chi^2 (4, N = 417) = 34.39, p < .001$ (Table 4).

**Piercings**

Like previously reported findings (Totten et al. 2009), the majority of respondents (58.5%) either agreed or strongly agreed that that piercings with body jewelry can be attractive. Further and again consistent with previous findings, this result was relatively uniform as there were no significant relationships of this item to any of the demographic variables considered. Paralleling the finding for tattoos, a much higher percentage of respondents viewed piercings with body jewelry on women to be attractive (54.8%) as compared to the presence of body art on men (5.8%) (see Table 3). Again, there were no statistically significant patterns evident for this item as functions of any of the demographic variables considered indicating relative uniformity of attitude across the sample. A statistically significantly greater percentage of women, however, reported piercings with body jewelry on men to be attractive (10.4%) than did male respondents (1.4 %), $\chi^2 (4, 412) = 37.53, p < .001$ (see Table 4), continuing the cross-gender pattern noted above.

In parallel to the results for tattoos, the extent of the presence of piercings with body jewelry on both men and women were found to be related to attitudes of attractiveness. Overall, the majority of respondents disagreed that extensive piercings are attractive on men (75.6%) and women respectively (73.4%) (see Table 3). This perspective was relatively consistent as there were no statistically significant relationships of this item with any of the demographic variables considered. A considerably higher percentage of respondents indicated that a small, discrete piercing with body jewelry on women is “sexy” (49.7%) with only 7.9% making this attribution with respect to men (see Table 3). Significant cross-gender patterns were present. Specifically, a higher percentage of women (13.5%) as compared to men (2.7%) agreed that a small discrete piercing with body jewelry is “sexy” on men, $\chi^2 (4, N = 413) = 39.84, p = .001$ (Table 4) while the inverse was true for piercings with body jewelry on women with more men (56.2%) as compared to women (43.2%) expressing agreement, $\chi^2 (4, N = 416) = 14.07, p = .007$ (Table 4).

In response to the related item “Piercing(s) with body jewelry is appropriate for a parent,” 22.3% of the respondents agreed while 40.7 % disagreed (see Table 3). There were no statistically significant relationships among these items and any of the demographic variables considered. Although in the earlier study for every variable having to do with the attractiveness or “sexiness” of tattoos or piercings, chi square analysis revealed a statistically significant relationship between these attitudes and whether or not the respondent him/herself reported having body art, such was not the case in the present sample.

**Factor 2: Negative Characteristics Associated with Persons Having Body Art Tattoos**

Most respondents in the present study disagreed that a person with a tattoo is aggressive (55.2%) (see Table 3). For this item there was also statistically significant relationship to gender, $\chi^2 (4, N = 416) = 10.98, p = .027$ with 63.0% of the women and 48.2% of the men expressing disagreement. Most respondents disagreed that a person with a tattoo has a “bad image” (63.4%). In the case of this item, was also a significant relationship to gender with more women (70.8%) disagreeing with the statement than men (57.4 %), $\chi^2 (4, N = 415) = 10.87, p = .023$ (see Table 4), a finding nearly identical to that reported by Totten et al. (2009).

Over half of the respondents (54.5%) disagreed that tattoos are indicative of a “partying lifestyle” with 15.8% agreeing with this statement (see Table 3). In this case as well there was a significant relationship of this variable to gender. A higher percentage of women disagreed
(59.7%) as compared to men (50.0%), \( \chi^2 (4, N = 415) = 11.15, p = .025 \). Otherwise, this view was relatively uniform across the sample as there were no significant relationships of this item to any other demographic variables considered. A relatively small percentage of the sample endorsed the view that a person with tattoos engages in substance abuse (4.8%) with the vast majority disagreeing with this assertion (76.5%) (see Table 3). Again, the sample was quite uniform in this attribution as there were no statistically significant relationships of this variable with any of the demographic variables considered. Most respondents (59.6%) disagreed that a person with a tattoo is “tough.” There were no statistically significant relationships of this variable to any of the demographic items considered.

**Piercings**

Overall, the findings regarding piercings were quite similar to those for tattoos. The majority of respondents disagreed that a person with piercings with body art is “tough” (73.8%) or that piercings are associated with a “bad image” (60.3%) (Table 3). The sample was relatively homogeneous in these beliefs as there were no statistically significant relationships of this variable to any of the demographic items considered. Most respondents (65.5%) disagreed that a person with piercings with body jewelry is aggressive and that a person with piercing with body jewelry abuses alcohol or drugs (74.2%). There was a significant relationship to gender for this later item, \( \chi^2 (4, N = 417) = 10.14, p = .038 \). More women disagreed with the latter assertion (81.3%) as compared to men (68.3%) (Table 4). Similarly, the majority of the sample disagreed that a person with piercings with body jewelry leads a “partying lifestyle” (60.7%) (see Table 3). Again, it is of note that these results are nearly identical to the finding reported by Totten et al. (2009).

As was the case for the items comprising Factor 1, for those items comprising Factor 2 and unlike the results reported by Totten et al. (2009) there were no statistically significant relationships on any items to whether the respondent reported having body art (see Table 6).

**Factor 3: Others’ Attributions Concerning Persons with Body Art**

Three items comprised Factor 3 and appear to represent attributions concerning how others view persons with body art. Among the present sample 90.6% disagreed that people tend to stereotype persons with body art with only 2.6% in agreement. So too, the majority agreed that the number of tattoos makes a difference in how a person is perceived by others (85.3%) and that the number of piercings makes a difference in how a person is perceived by others (82.1%). For none of these items was there a statistically significant relationship with any of the demographic variables considered.

**DISCUSSION**

The present study was conducted in an attempt to update earlier findings by Totten et al. (2009) using the same instrument and sampling procedure to gain an appreciation of the extent to which those findings are consistent with prevailing attitudes among a similar sample of college students. Even though the demographic profiles of the two samples are quite similar the authors fully recognize that given the nature of the sampling procedures and resultant sampling variability, definitive comparison between the two samples is not possible. Nevertheless, it may prove beneficial to utilize the present results to formulate marketing strategies of potential benefit to practitioners.
Perhaps the most compelling and somewhat surprising finding is how well the present results mirror those of Totten et al. (2009) despite the variability in the sampling plans. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) conducted on the two samples reveals nearly identical factor structure. As was the case in the earlier study, significantly more women report having piercings with body art as compared to men while significantly more men report having tattoos. Just as was the case in the earlier study, the strong majority of respondents consistently endorsed positive attributions toward persons with body art both in the form of tattoos and piercings with a relatively low percentage of respondents endorsing negative stereotypes. In the present study, more women reported finding body art to be attractive generally as compared to men. Thus, the majority of the sample were of the opinion that tattoos can be attractive although this sentiment was endorsed by a significantly higher percentage of women than men. It is of note that unlike the results of the earlier study in which it was found that significantly more younger than older respondents found body art in both of its forms to be attractive as compared to older persons, such was not the case among the present sample. This may be indicative that the current sample was more homogeneous in acceptance of body art than was the previous sample.

Also similar to the earlier findings, the majority of those comprising the present sample were of the opinion that that the extensiveness of a person’s tattoos made a difference in terms of attractiveness. The majority of the sample disagreed that extensive tattoos on women and men are attractive. Replicating the findings of Totten et al. (2009), the sex of the individual about whom attributions of attractiveness were made was important. Specifically, the percentage of those disagreeing was much higher for the attractiveness of extensive tattoos on women than was the case for men. These results could be interpreted to mean that extensive tattoos on men is more socially acceptable within this market segment than are extensive tattoos on women. As was the case for tattoos, a much higher percentage of respondents viewed piercings with body jewelry on women to be attractive as compared to the presence on men. Again, paralleling the findings for tattoos, the extent of the presence of piercings on both men and women were found to be related to attributions of attractiveness. The majority of respondents disagreed that extensive piercings are attractive on persons of either sex. In the present sample, and in the results reported by Totten et al. (2009), there was a general consensus that body art of both forms can be attractive as long as they are not overdone. There also was a preponderance of positive attributions made about persons with body art with comparatively few respondents endorsing negative stereotypes.

A particularly interesting finding in the present results that partially replicates Totten et al. (2009) is evidence for a cross-gender effect wherein a higher percentage of persons of one sex reported finding body art on persons of the other sex to be attractive. Thus, a higher percentage of women than men found both tattoos and piercings on men to be attractive. Unlike Totten et al. (2009), however, there was no such relationship of gender when attributions were made for attractiveness of body art in either form on women. This may suggest that the present sample was more in agreement than the earlier one concerning the attractiveness of body art on women. This interpretation is bolstered by other results in the present study. Although the majority of the respondents disagreed that extensive body art is attractive on persons of either sex the cross-gender pattern was in evidence. For instance, unlike the results reported by Totten et al. (2009), significantly more women than men agreed that extensive tattoos and piercings on men are attractive while significantly more men than women agreed that extensive tattoos (but not piercings) are attractive on women.

These findings appear to have implications for marketing managers. For example, there appears to be little reason for concern among managers that persons in their employ with body art
who are visible to the public will be viewed negatively by customers or detract from potential sales, according to our results. This does refute the work by Baumann, Timming & Gollan (2016). The exception may be for company representatives who display extensive body art. The present data suggest that these individuals may not be viewed favorably by consumers. In addition, the make-up of the target market must be considered. Marketing managers should consider revisions to corporate policies regarding the display of tattoos and piercings within reason. Mishra and Mishra (2015, p. 328) recommended that “organizations should be considerate towards the changing values of this generation and bring some flexibilities to the dress code norms.” Ruetzler et al. (2012) found that grooming and business attire were more important indicators in the hiring decision than tattoos and piercings. Managers should also tread carefully in terms of the views of customers versus the rights of their employees to have body art, as noted by Allred (2016): He reviewed several cases that pit the employer against the employee when it comes to hiring and/or disciplining tattooed employees. His conclusion is that, to date, “the courts have been largely sympathetic to the arguments of employers that their interest in a workplace free from undue disruption-or that simply turns off customers- is a rational basis for limiting the display of tattoos on the job.” So, despite the acceptance of tattoos consumer culture, in the workplace, it may still be a battle ground for years to come.

We suggest the need for future research. Researchers should consider exploring how tattoos and/or piercings on front-line employees may be different in different industries (manufacturing versus service) or types of service providers (coffee shop versus a bank) or between different target audiences (clothing companies that target on teens/young adults, like Aeropostale or Forever 21, versus companies that target older consumers, like Macy’s or Eddie Bauer) (see McLeod, 2014).

For instance, Arndt et al (2017) found that hiring managers may be concerned about the “fit” between a service provider with a tattoo and the “image” of the company (study context was dentist office). Dean (2010) found that visible tattoos on white-collar workers were deemed inappropriate while similar tattoos on blue-collar workers were viewed as appropriate. Results are driven by consumer expectations of what a service provider should look like. Both of these studies center on the idea of congruence. Consumers expect service providers to look a certain way. But, hiring managers want their employees to reflect the brand/corporate image.
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TRENDS IN FREQUENCY AND SEVERITY OF FLORIDA HOSPITAL MEDICAL MALPRACTICE CLAIMS

Carlton C. Young, Mississippi State University-Meridian
Yingge Qu, Mississippi State University-Meridian

ABSTRACT

This study examines the relative quality of healthcare services delivery by acute care hospitals within the state of Florida, utilizing data from the Florida Department of Insurance's closed medical malpractice claim database. Closed medical malpractice claims were used as the primary performance metric. We focus on 15 large cities in Florida with the highest number of malpractice claims from 2006 to 2016 to show both the cross-sectional and longitudinal trends of the claim records. The analysis revealed that from 2006 to 2011 the number of malpractice claims per year fluctuated from +13.8% to -18.3%, with the highest number of claims (1,314) occurring in 2007. However, from 2011 to 2016, there was a consistent yearly downward trend. If the number of (a) malpractice claims, (b) death claims from malpractice, and (c) claim ratios can be used to represent healthcare quality, it can be suggested that healthcare quality in the state of Florida has significantly improved over the ten years from 2006 through 2016.

INTRODUCTION

Though the issues of patient safety and medical malpractice have been extensively studied, the use of such studies to inform healthcare organizational management has received much less attention. The development of quantifiable outcome indicators of healthcare quality are vital additions to existing knowledge and necessary implements for the pursuit of improved quality in healthcare (Bij & Vissers, 1999). This study undertakes an examination of closed medical malpractice claims from the state of Florida for the years 2006-2016 (inclusive) in order to establish benchmarks and examine potential trends.

Generalizing from marketing and services marketing literature, as well as healthcare administration literature, suggests that reduction of medical malpractice claims may be expected to result in a lessening of the human and financial costs to patients and providers that result from disputes concluded through a third-party complaint resolution processes, and in particular, the filing and prosecution of medical malpractice claims.

Marketing literature suggests a primary cause of medical malpractice claims is disconfirmation of patient expectations and dissatisfaction with service quality. The intangible nature of service provider interactions with customers makes it difficult to measure the factors comprising the service operation. Smith and Houston (1983) state, “…satisfaction with services is related to confirmation or disconfirmation of expectations”, and when consumers do not perceive services as meeting or exceeding their expectations they have feelings of dissatisfaction with the service operation, technical service quality, or treatment outcomes, often referred to in services marketing literature as negative disconfirmation of expectations (Szymanski 2001). Virshup and Oppenberg opine that “Many malpractice suits are brought not because of malpractice nor even because of complaints about the quality of medical care but as an expression of anger about some
aspect of patient-doctor relationships and communications” (Virshup, Oppenberg, & Coleman, 1999).

Providing quantitative measures, and quantitative peer-based data-driven comparative benchmarks is a principal and accepted tool in the study of healthcare outcomes and performance. Such measures and benchmarks provide constructive information to healthcare managers in their efforts to realize organizational objectives.

Over the past two decades there has been a major focus on the quality and cost of healthcare in the United States. According to Hartman (Hartman, et al, 2018), the United States spends about 18% of its gross domestic product (GDP) on healthcare, which represents approximately $3.3 trillion annually. A significant concern is that such high healthcare expenditures could cause negative impacts on the overall U.S. economy.

Given the vast sums the United States spends on healthcare, healthcare quality has become a persistent concern as waste in the U.S. health care system contributes to the high cost of medical care and deflects resources from other desirable societal goals. (Bentley, Effros, Palar, & Keeler, 2008; Nordgren, Johnson, Kirschbaum, & Peterson, 2004). Leape et al. (Lucian L. Leape, Brennan, Laird, & al., 1991) stated that in 1984, 3.7% of the patients admitted to hospitals in the state of New York sustained some type of injury. Nearly 28% of the injuries were due to negligence. A combined study of 4,000 patients at Brigham and Women’s Hospital and at Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston sought to investigate the relationship between systems failures and the occurrence of medical errors (Bates et al., 1995). In the study, 334 medication errors that led to 264 adverse drug effects were identified.

The Harvard Medical Practice Study declared that more than one million preventable medical errors occur in hospitals throughout the United States each year resulting in 180,000 preventable deaths (Brennan, Hebert, & al, 1991; Lucian L Leape & Brennan, 1991). The Institute of Medicine (Institute of Medicine, 1999) in its publication “To Err is Human: Building a Safer Health System”, estimated the annual number of preventable deaths between 44,000 and 98,000. James (James, 2013) concluded both the Harvard and the IOM studies above underestimated the number of premature deaths associated with preventable harm to patients, and determined it at more than 400,000 per year, with serious harm 10- to 20-fold more common than lethal harm. Zhan and Miller (Zhan & Miller, 2003) found medical error rates in teaching hospitals are greater than in nonteaching hospitals (3.61 per 1,000 patients versus 2.08 per 1,000 patients). Further, larger hospitals with 200 or more beds had a higher medical error rate than smaller hospitals. They also found that serious medication errors decrease when physician work hours are reduced.

Reason (Reason, 1990) discovered that individual human errors are major causes of medical errors. Many of the human errors were caused by faults that existed in the design of work and the conditions that people work in. For instance, work conditions that mandated high workloads and caused fatigue induced errors in the workplace. Improper training of employees also leads to accidents. Reason stated that these errors could be prevented by changing systems, which involves designing tasks that are fool-proof. Fool-proofing requires standardizing tasks, simplifying tasks, and avoiding a reliance on memory to successfully complete tasks.

In response to the troubling number of medical errors, many hospitals have undertaken initiatives targeted toward patient safety (Barry & Smith, 2005). According to Stock (Stock, McFadden, & Gowen, 2007) hospitals have implemented quality programs that have led to a reduction in the frequency and severity of medical errors. Hospitals have implemented a set of Patient Safety Indicators (PSI) developed by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ); Gray et al (Gray, et al 2016) states their study “demonstrated a clear association between
clinically validated PSIs and patient outcomes—LOS, 30-day unplanned readmission, and mortality. These findings have important implications in policy and practice as health care reform dictates improvement in the experience of care, improvement in the health of populations, and reduction in per capita cost of health care—also known as the Triple Aim.”

Errors in medical practice often bring about medical malpractice claims. Medical malpractice has an adverse impact on the healthcare delivery system, increasing healthcare delivery cost and forcing some practitioners into bankruptcy; a consequence is a reduction in access to healthcare services (Young, 2005). According to Williams (Williams, 2008), Florida patients sue for medical malpractice far more often than average for any other state. Hence, it is important to assess the quality of the healthcare delivery to ensure that medical errors that lead to malpractice claims are eliminated.

Young and Williams (Young & Williams, 2010) analyzed hospital susceptibility as it relates to the skill set of human resources (physicians and nurses) and the hospital propensity to medical malpractice claims. Their focus was on 118 acute-care hospitals in the state of Florida. Young’s (Young, 2005) results show that the skill sets of hospital human capital had a significant impact on the number of malpractice claims. Hospitals with a larger number of employed physicians tend to have a lower number of medical malpractice claims than do hospitals with a larger number of resident physicians. Further, hospitals with a higher number of registered nurses had a lower number of claims than do hospitals with a larger number of licensed practical nurses.

The elemental rationale for the existence of healthcare organizations is to deliver healthcare services that are intended to improve health. Medical malpractice is an outcome of this care delivery process and represents a failure to adequately deliver healthcare (Hickson et al., 2002). Occasionally this produces not a benefit, but a detriment to health outcomes. As a malfunction of the hospital health services delivery process, malpractice does not contribute to the organization’s efforts to meet its goals (Mello & Gallagher, 2010). The negative aspects of medical malpractice detract from the ability of hospitals to optimize the access, quality, and cost of healthcare. Malpractice is an indication of ineffectiveness and viewed from this perspective hospital malpractice claims are one metric that may be used to evaluate this negative organizational performance.

This study focused on the assessment of healthcare quality over the decade 2006-2016. The objective was to determine if healthcare quality had improved based on a readily available quantitative peer-based metric, exempli gratia the number of medical malpractice claims in Florida acute care hospitals. Hospitals should be able to explore relationships between their performance as developed by this study and other internally and externally developed performance measures (Bell, Delbanco, Anderson-Shaw, McDonald, & Gallagher, 2011); such studies will inform management’s strategic planning, goal setting, and resource allocation decisions.

**METHODOLOGY**

In this study, the data set from the Florida Department of Insurance’s Medical Professional Liability Closed Claims was used. The sample consisted of general, non-federally owned, acute care hospitals in the state of Florida. The original data set contained 107,413 records. We focus on identifying the trend of medical malpractice claims from 2006 to 2016, which reduce the sample size to 39,049 observations. We reach 21,692 unique medical malpractice claims after removing duplicate observations (each medical malpractice claim was counted once).
In our dataset, the malpractice claims are categorized by cities in Florida. We observe in total 313 cities who have at least one malpractice claim from 2006 to 2016. For instance, Miami has 1798 malpractice claims and is ranked as the top city for malpractice claims (Table 1). Tampa is the next city with the highest number of malpractice claims and has 1409 claim records (Table 1). Of all the cities that have malpractice records, the top 15 cities account for more than 45% of the total claims (Table 1). We are interested in the trend of both the total malpractice claims and the malpractice claims per city. To make the results comparable with each other, we will focus on the top 15 cities that have in total 9900 malpractice claims to present our findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Number of Claims</th>
<th>Percent of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>1798</td>
<td>8.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>1409</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fort Lauderdale</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fort Myers</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Coral Gables</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Boca Raton</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Clearwater</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Gainesville</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ocala</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>West Palm Beach</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td></td>
<td>9900</td>
<td>45.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows the patient severity outcomes resulting from those medical errors. Obviously, the “Death (D)” outcome from the medical error is the most severe and the “Emotional Only (EO)” would be the least severe. This study seeks to determine the healthcare quality over time for all different kinds of severity outcomes with a particular emphasis on the rate of wrongful deaths.

The use of administrative data has proven to be revealing in previous studies and is accepted practice in healthcare research. Administrative data has the notable advantages of lower cost, easier acquisition, large data sets, and in this instance where statutorily mandated data is reported, consistency of reported information and has been the subject of significant development for use in the study of healthcare and adverse events.
Table 2
Severity of Patient outcomes resulting from medical malpractice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Severity Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Death (D)</td>
<td>Permanent: Death.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Only (EO)</td>
<td>Emotional Only - Fright, no physical damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Grave (PG)</td>
<td>Permanent: Grave - Quadruplegia, severe brain damage, lifelong care or fatal prognosis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Major (PMJ)</td>
<td>Permanent: Major - Paraplegia, blindness, loss of two limbs, brain damage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Minor (PMN)</td>
<td>Permanent: Minor - Loss of fingers, loss or damage to organs. Includes non-disabling injuries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Significant (PS)</td>
<td>Permanent: Significant - Deafness, loss of limb, loss of eye, loss of one kidney or lung.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Major (TMJ)</td>
<td>Temporary: Major - Burns, surgical material left, drug side effect, brain damage. Recovery delayed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DATA ANALYSIS

Cross-sectional Analysis

Table 3 is a contingency table that shows the relationship between the cities and the patient severity outcomes result in medical malpractice claims. The table shows that, 18.16% of the medical claims occurred in Miami (Rank #1) and 14.23% of the medical claims occurred in Tampa (Rank #2) and so on. The table also shows that 28.98% of all medical claims were due to wrongful deaths; the next largest medical claims is temporary minor which represent 18.34% of the claims and so forth. Of all the cities, Miami contained the most wrongful death claims at around 18.8%. Wrongful death claims represented about 30% of the all claims occurring in Miami. Compared to Tampa, who has the 2nd highest medical claims, Miami had about 22.7% more wrongful death claims than Tampa. On the other hand, West Palm Beach (Rank #14) and Tallahassee (Rank #15) both had approximate three percent of the claims and less than one percent of the wrongful death claims.

Longitudinal Analysis

Table 4 shows the number of medical malpractice claims per city per year. The table shows that in 2006, there were 1155 medical malpractice claims filed. That number fluctuated from +13.8% to -18.3%, through 2011 with the highest claims of 1314 occurring in 2007. From 2011 to 2016, the total number of medical malpractice claims per year significantly decreased. Miami (Rank #1) consistently had the highest number of claims from 2006 to 2014. In 2015 and 2016, the number of malpractice claims in Tampa (Rank #2) exceeded that in Miami.
### Table 3
Percentage of Medical Malpractice Claim by Severity Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Rank</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>EO</th>
<th>PG</th>
<th>PMJ</th>
<th>PMN</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>TMJ</th>
<th>TMN</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>18.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>14.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>12.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>8.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>7.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>28.98</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>18.34</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4
Number of Medical Malpractice Claims Per City Per Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>1314</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>1292</td>
<td>1055</td>
<td>1097</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>9900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1 shows the year-to-year change in the total number of medical malpractice claims. From Figure 1, we can see the trend of medical malpractice claims over time. Although from 2006 to 2011, the number of claims varied, we still can observe a clear overall declining trend. There was a significant decrease of the malpractice claims in the most recent three years, e.g. from 2014 to 2016.
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**Figure 1**

Year-to-Year Change in Number of Medical Malpractice Claims

Table 5 shows the percentage change in the number claims per year for each city. We find that the performance of cities was not consistent over time. For example, from 2006 to 2007, Miami (Rank #1) has the highest increase of malpractice claims, an increase of 72%; and Plantation (Rank #11) has the highest malpractice claims reduction of 40%. From 2007 to 2008, Gainesville (Rank #12) had the worst performance, an increase of 71% in claims; and West Palm Beach (Rank #14) had the best improvement of a 42% decrease in claims. Starting from 2014, all cities observed a decrease in number of claims filed, yet the most improved cities are not consistent over time. From 2013 to 2014, Coral Gables (Rank #8) has the largest decline of claims at 67%; from 2014 to 2015, Tallahassee (Rank #15) has the largest decline of claims at 81%; and from 2015 to 2016, Ocala (Rank #13) has a claim reduction of 100%.
West Palm Beach (Rank #14) has the best performance of a 71% reduction in the death claims from 2006 to 2007, Miami has the highest increase of death claims, an increase of 114% and

Table 7 shows the percentage change in the number of wrongful death claims per year for number of wrongful death claims varied. For instance, from 2006 to 2007 we observed a 5.9% malpractice claims. Shown in Figure 2, in the beginning three years, e.g. from 2006 to 2009, the total number of death claims continuously declined. Before 2013, none of the cities achieved zero wrongful death claims filed. From 2014 to 2016, we observe 1, 2, and 9 cities with zero death claims respectively. Miami had the highest number of death claims for most of the years, except for in 2006, 2011, and 2013 when it was surpassed by Tampa (Rank #2) and in 2015 when it was outpaced by both Tampa (Rank #2) and Jacksonville (Rank #3).

Table 6 shows the number of wrongful death medical malpractice claims per city per year. The highest total number of 375 death claims were filed in year 2007. Starting from 2009, the total number of death claims continuously declined. Before 2013, none of the cities achieved zero wrongful death claims filed. From 2014 to 2016, we observe 1, 2, and 9 cities with zero death claims respectively. Miami had the highest number of death claims for most of the years, except for in 2006, 2011, and 2013 when it was surpassed by Tampa (Rank #2) and Jacksonville (Rank #3).

Figure 2 shows the year-to-year change in the total number of wrongful death medical malpractice claims. Shown in Figure 2, in the beginning three years, e.g. from 2006 to 2009, the number of wrongful death claims varied. For instance, from 2006 to 2007 we observed a 5.9% increase of death claims; from 2007 to 2008, the death claims number dropped 9.3%; and from 2008 to 2009, the number increase again for 8.8%. For all the following years, the number of wrongful death claims continuously declined. Remarkable decrease of death claims were found from 2013 to 2016. From 2015 to 2016, there was an 83.5% decrease in the number of death claims.

Table 7 shows the percentage change in the number of wrongful death claims per year for each city. The performance of cities on death claims were inconsistent over time. For instance, from 2006 to 2007, Miami has the highest increase of death claims, an increase of 114% and Plantation (Rank #11) has the most reduction of death claims, a decrease of 65%. From 2007 to 2008, Clearwater (Rank #10) has the worst performance of a 250% increase in death claims and West Palm Beach (Rank #14) has the best performance of a 71% reduction in the death claims.
Table 6
Number of Wrongful Death Claims Per City Per Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2869</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2
Year-to-Year Change in Number of Wrongful Death Claims
negligence never leads to a malpractice claim and most claims are not the result of negligence.

Medical malpractice closed-claims data provides a limited view of patient experiences with errors, adverse outcomes, and patient safety. Previous studies have raised the concerns that most negligence never leads to a malpractice claim and most claims are not the result of negligence.

This study has several limitations. Hospital characteristics other than those used in this study may have affected outcomes performance, but were not evaluated in this study. Given the limitations of existing risk-adjustment techniques and data sources, hospital outcomes measures represent an approximation for comparing hospital quality. This study was based on administrative databases, and although this strategy has worked well in other studies, it is not known that the characteristics described by the data encompass the majority of the significant sources of variation in outcomes performance.

The limitation of generalizability is certainly present in this study, as it is composed only of Florida general acute care hospitals. It is anticipated that there will be significant variation between the malpractice claims rates of differing states, given that there is little uniformity in tort law from state to state. Even though all Florida general acute care hospitals were included in the original sample, numerous hospitals were eliminated from the study due to incomplete data fields or for failing to meet the classifications described above. Further study is needed to see if the study’s methodology and findings may apply to hospitals in other states, and types of hospitals other than the one encompassed by this study.

Medical malpractice closed-claims data provides a limited view of patient experiences with errors, adverse outcomes, and patient safety. Previous studies have raised the concerns that most negligence never leads to a malpractice claim and most claims are not the result of negligence.

Table 7
Percentage of Change in Wrongful Death Claims (“D”) Per City Per Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>06--07</th>
<th>07--08</th>
<th>08--09</th>
<th>09--10</th>
<th>10--11</th>
<th>11--12</th>
<th>12--13</th>
<th>13--14</th>
<th>14--15</th>
<th>15--16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>114%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-41%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>-42%</td>
<td>-22%</td>
<td>-56%</td>
<td>-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>-51%</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>-94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>-33%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>114%</td>
<td>-38%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>-63%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>-57%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>-52%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>-71%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-42%</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>-60%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-58%</td>
<td>-73%</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-46%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>-59%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>-70%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-58%</td>
<td>113%</td>
<td>-24%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-75%</td>
<td>-67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-36%</td>
<td>-64%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>-70%</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-64%</td>
<td>250%</td>
<td>157%</td>
<td>-61%</td>
<td>-21%</td>
<td>-27%</td>
<td>-63%</td>
<td>-33%</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-65%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>-27%</td>
<td>138%</td>
<td>-74%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>-53%</td>
<td>-63%</td>
<td>-33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>-63%</td>
<td>129%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>-60%</td>
<td>133%</td>
<td>-50%</td>
<td>-71%</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>175%</td>
<td>-59%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>-58%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-26%</td>
<td>-71%</td>
<td>-40%</td>
<td>300%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-55%</td>
<td>-40%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>-80%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-59%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td>-60%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>-57%</td>
<td>-33%</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>114%</td>
<td>250%</td>
<td>157%</td>
<td>300%</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>113%</td>
<td>133%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>-65%</td>
<td>-71%</td>
<td>-63%</td>
<td>-61%</td>
<td>-74%</td>
<td>-60%</td>
<td>-63%</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LIMITATIONS

This study has several limitations. Hospital characteristics other than those used in this study may have affected outcomes performance, but were not evaluated in this study. Given the limitations of existing risk-adjustment techniques and data sources, hospital outcomes measures represent an approximation for comparing hospital quality. This study was based on administrative databases, and although this strategy has worked well in other studies, it is not known that the characteristics described by the data encompass the majority of the significant sources of variation in outcomes performance.

The limitation of generalizability is certainly present in this study, as it is composed only of Florida general acute care hospitals. It is anticipated that there will be significant variation between the malpractice claims rates of differing states, given that there is little uniformity in tort law from state to state. Even though all Florida general acute care hospitals were included in the original sample, numerous hospitals were eliminated from the study due to incomplete data fields or for failing to meet the classifications described above. Further study is needed to see if the study’s methodology and findings may apply to hospitals in other states, and types of hospitals other than the one encompassed by this study.

Medical malpractice closed-claims data provides a limited view of patient experiences with errors, adverse outcomes, and patient safety. Previous studies have raised the concerns that most negligence never leads to a malpractice claim and most claims are not the result of negligence.
It is not yet advisable to judge quality on administrative data alone in studying comparative hospital performance. Administrative data may well be used for preliminary quality control and evaluation, but until administrative information systems develop further in capturing significant factors responsible for performance variations, no definitive conclusions should be drawn.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This study makes several contributions to the literature, and to the knowledge base of healthcare administration and management scholars. The study’s results corroborated the belief that there was heterogeneity between the malpractice claims performance of the subject healthcare cities. The study established a scientifically-based methodology for the measurement and benchmarking of Florida healthcare districts' malpractice claims performance, and utilizing both cross-sectional and longitudinal analysis to shed light on variations between city-to-city performance on relative healthcare quality. Further research is needed to better explain the characteristics of these variations. The study results do give a plausible explanation for the underlying resource-based view assumption that Florida hospitals and healthcare cities possess distinctive characteristics and capabilities and that further studies of the relationship between hospital characteristics and outcomes is warranted.

This research sought to assess the quality of the healthcare delivery systems within the state of Florida using data from the Florida Department of Insurance's closed medical malpractice claim files. Medical malpractice claims were used as the primary performance metric and we focus on the top 15 cities with the highest number of claims to show the trend of malpractice claims by city over time. The data analysis showed that from 2006 to 2011, the number of malpractice claims oscillated with the highest claims of 1314 happened in 2007. From 2011 to 2016, there was a remarkable downward trend. If the number of (a) malpractice claims, (b) deaths from malpractice, and (c) claims ratios can be used to represent healthcare quality, it can be concluded that healthcare quality in the state of Florida slightly fluctuated from 2006 to 2011 and has significantly improved since 2012.
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