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Abstract

Banks are extremely highly levered due to the nature of their business model and bank capital serves as a source of stability and protection of the society from abuse of the government support (aka safety net). As a result, bank capital is heavily regulated. However, there are economic reasons that prompt banks to hold capital beyond the regulatory requirements. Understanding those reasons is very important for the efficiency in banking regulation, for the risk management of the banks, and for investors’ and customers’ assessment of the bank’s soundness. We study the determinants of bank capital structure using several variable selection methods. We show how every method is appropriate for the right purpose. However, it is essential to ensure that assumptions of the methods are satisfied. We use lasso variable selection and estimation method that is not robust to outliers. To overcome the limitations of this powerful technique, we study samples of banks with only outliers and samples without outliers separately. We find substantial differences in the drivers of capital decisions of bank-outliers. The findings uncover moral hazard effect among Systematically Important Financial Institutions.
Variable selection: a case of bank capital structure determinants.

1. Introduction

Empirical researchers in business disciplines often rely on theoretical conjectures and statistical significance of the independent variables in various regression models as a method of variable selection. Corporate finance is no exception with recent trend leaning towards variables significant in models with fixed effects, which are well known as an aid against endogeneity, a common issue in corporate finance research.

The choice of variable selection method, though, should depend on the purpose of the research. Shmueli (2010) classifies models into explanatory, predictive and descriptive. An explanatory model is best for testing causal explanations of a dependent variable; independent variables are heavily grounded in theory. Predictive models are focused on achieving the practical goal of reliable new or future observations forecasting. Descriptive models are intended for explaining an effect in a compact manner. Both predictive and descriptive models disregard the theoretical basis for independent variables. A model, selected based on contribution to information criterion, is rather a descriptive model.

We perform the study of bank leverage determinants. Studies of capital structure constitute a significant part of the corporate finance literature. However, banks are routinely excluded from such studies, under the assumption that regulatory capital requirements are the most important determinant of bank leverage. We test empirically the determinants of bank capital structure in a large sample of the publicly traded U.S. commercial banks and bank holding companies during the period of 1973-2012 and find that the determinants of bank capital structure are similar to those identified in prior literature for non-financial firms. However, the determinants vary in different regulatory capital requirement regimes. Application of the various regression methods and lasso – a variable selection tool and multicollinearity-robust estimator allows us to test theoretical propositions and to come up with a compact descriptive model of the strongest explanatory factors. Interestingly, lasso helps to uncover evidence of moral hazard in the capital structure of Systematically Important Financial Institutions (SIFIs) demonstrating that their capital structure is independent of risk and collateral.

2. Literature and Methodology.

This research is largely inspired by the work of Gropp and Heider (2010), which serves as a starting point for the experimental design development. According to Gropp and Heider, traditionally, financial firms were excluded from the empirical capital structure literature. Empirical studies of banks’ capital structure were considered unnecessary, since leverage of all banks was, supposedly, determined by regulatory capital requirements. Gropp and Heider study 100 largest U.S. and 100 largest E.U. banks empirically and show, in contrast to common belief, the substantial variation in equity capital ratios of the banks in their sample. Further, they demonstrate plausibility of some of the leverage determinants, borrowed from the general capital structure literature for explaining banks’ leverage. Gropp and Heider find that the most reliable factors of non-financial firms’ leverage, determined by Frank and Goyal (2009), are similarly significant for the leverage of the banks’ in their sample.
We extend Gropp and Heider’s tests to a broader sample of U.S. banks, as described in the “Data” section. The leverage ratios of banks in our sample vary significantly, as in Gropp and Heider’s, supporting the potential presence of discretionary capital, which is determined independently from capital requirements. We also extend the period of study back to 1973, to include time without uniform capital requirements (Pre-Uniform) with uniform capital requirements, but no risk-weighting of assets (Pre-Basel), and time since the initial Basel Accord implementation (Basel). The determinants of leverage are likely not the same across different bank capital regulation regimes. At the time of Pre-uniform and even Pre-Basel capital regulation, different categories of banks were treated more or less differently. In the most recent version of Basel, Basel III, special attention is devoted to SIFIs (Systematically Important Financial Institutions). We test all banks and SIFIs separately within a framework of three bank capital regulation regimes.

The original results for all specifications are obtained using Ordinary Least Square (OLS) and the estimator robust to outliers (M-Estimator) of Huber (1973). The results are further confirmed by including time and bank fixed effects to mitigate endogeneity issues resulting from the usual presence of unobserved explanatory variables, correlated with independent variables included in the model. The outlier analysis and variance inflation factor inspection is performed on all regressions for the proper treatment of the potential data irregularities and multicollinearity. The adaptive lasso method of Zou (2006) produces properly estimated coefficients, adjusted for multicollinearity, and provides the best predictive variables selection.

Frank and Goyal (2009) cite Hastie et al. (2001), as a source of their variable selection method. Following more recent literature on variable selection methods, we use a similar, yet more powerful, modern version of the model – adaptive lasso for linear regression models with weighted approach by Zou (2006). The adaptive lasso combines the benefits of greater variable selection accuracy and estimation precision. The procedure uses SBC criterion along with other information criterion measures, such as BIC and AIC, reported in Frank and Goyal. The lasso method is not robust to outliers; therefore, outliers have to be separated for proper estimation. When a variable of interests is selected as significant, and estimated with the same sign and similar size in both datasets, with and without outliers, we can comfortably conclude that a variable is similarly significant for all observations in our sample. When a variable of interest is selected as a significant predictor in a dataset without outliers, but not selected in a dataset with outliers, or vice-versa, or it changes sign, or the size is substantially different then the variable’s significance is not the same for all banks. Conclusions drawn from results for a dataset without outliers, apply to the majority of banks in a sample. Conclusions drawn from results for a dataset with outliers only, apply to selected banks in a study sample. We compare banks’ characteristics in samples with outliers only and without outliers as a next step. If an obvious pattern can be inferred from a difference in summary statistics, we learn additional information on a correlation between a variable of interest and leverage. If both groups carry similar summary statistics of variables, further analysis of individual observations, identified as outliers, has the potential to uncover interesting facts about individual banks (see, for example, Booth (1982)).

Many of the independent variables in our models are strongly related economically and sometimes correlated statistically. We are concerned with the potential multicollinearity issue in the models. Multicollinearity in a multivariable regression model leads to misattribution of an
effect between variables. An entire model may retain its explanatory power, however, as a result of multicollinearity, size, sign and/or statistical significance of individual estimated coefficients may not be reliable. Traditionally, variance inflation factors (VIFs) analysis shows how much coefficients increase as a result of multicollinearity; the VIFs-based adjustments also help in estimating correct coefficients. The ridge regression method by Hoerl and Kennard (1970) is a trusted consistent estimator in datasets with multicollinearity. While ridge regression produces reliable coefficients, a correct selection of independent variables that carry most information about a dependent variable is also important. Tibshirani (1996) develops lasso, a regression method that combines both the benefits of information on criterion-based variable selection and ridge regression. We check VIFs in the estimated models and find that VIFs (not tabulated) in most cases remain within an acceptable range, below 5. The commonly accepted threshold of VIF=10 was defined by Marquardt (1970). However, there is a substantial debate in statistical literature regarding the methodology of multicollinearity diagnostics, mostly between Marquardt and Belsley - see for example Snee and Marquardt (1984) for details. Although multicollinearity does not appear to be an issue, per the Marquardt’s rule of thumb, a proper variable selection and estimation is of most critical importance in our study - an attempt to choose the most reliable variables among many determinants of capital structure. Lasso, a regression method combining a well-established variable selection procedure based on information criteria and a robust coefficient estimation method, appears to be very appropriate and reliable addition to the methodology.

Based on the underlying empirical and theoretical research on bank leverage determinants, we develop and test the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis I:** Market-to-book, Profit, Size, Tangibility, Dividends and Risk are significant determinants of leverage in the broad sample of US banks;

**Hypothesis II:** the size and sign of the corresponding coefficients are similar to the results of Gropp and Heider (2010) based on their sample of the largest U.S. and European banks;

**Hypothesis III:** risk is not a significant determinant of leverage for SIFIs due to implied guarantee; other coefficients in SIFIs’ specifications are different in size and significant when compared to the results in all-banks’ specifications.

Following Gropp and Heider (2010), we use a core model of leverage determinants with the addition of risk. We test all banks/SIFIs in three bank capital regulation periods, as previously defined. Pre-Uniform, all banks (Specification 1) / Pre-Basel regulation, all banks (Specification 2) / Basel regulation, all banks (Specification 3); Pre-Uniform, SIFIs (specification 4) / Pre-Basel regulation, SIFIs (specification 5) / Basel regulation SIFIs (specification 6). Leverage = β0 + β1MTB + β2Profit + β3Size + β4Collateral + β5Dividend + β6Risk + u (1-6)

All variables in this and further models are specified in Table 1. Following Frank and Goyal (2009), the explanatory variables in this and further models are lagged 1 year.

3. Data

We use COMPUSTAT North America and COMPUSTAT Bank as sources of firm-specific information, CRSP for the stock-related data. The details of the underlying data elements for each variable are provided in Table 1. The broad sample covers forty years of quarterly data between 1973 and 2012. The quarterly data since 1962 is available in COMPUSTAT, but market
data on NASDAQ firms, including a significant number of banks, is available in CRSP starting December 1972 only. We include a significant period with no uniform capital requirements for U.S. banks (prior to 1980), to cover various capital requirements regimes in the U.S. Many data elements, sourced from COMPUSTAT datasets are available for 81,619 firm-quarter observations over the full data period 1973-2012. The full dataset includes a significant number of missing observations. We limit the underlying data for the regressions to the records with non-missing positive major variables: book (market) total leverage, market total leverage, market-to-book, log size and collateral, and non-missing, non-zero profitability (including both positive and negative readings). The resulting dataset consists of 57,583 bank-quarter observations, 1,714 unique banks. The summary statistics of this dataset is presented in Table 2.

4. Results

In Table 3, we present the results of specifications 1-6 (core model with risk) in three periods of bank capital regulation: no uniform requirements period (specifications 1 for all banks and 4 for SIFIs), uniform requirements with no risk-weighting (specifications 2 for all banks and 5 for SIFIs), risk-weighted capital requirements (specifications 3 for all banks and 6 for SIFIs). We confirm that MTB, profitability, size, collateral, dividends and risk are significant determinants of leverage for a typical bank in our sample in the Basel regulation period. Collateral and risk are positively correlated with leverage, while other variables - negatively. There are differences in estimates of OLS and robust regression. In the book leverage specification, the all banks sample, profitability and size only gain significance in robust estimates. For SIFIs, in the Pre-Uniform period, profitability loses significance in robust estimates. In the Pre-Basel period, collateral, dividend dummy and risk are only significant in robust estimates. In market leverage-based specifications, the all banks sample in the Pre-Uniform period, size and dividend become insignificant, while collateral becomes significant in robust regression estimates. In the Pre-Uniform period, the sample of SIFIs, risk becomes insignificant in robust estimates, but gains significance in the Basel period.

The results of lasso are presented in Table 4 (book leverage) and Table 5 (market leverage). Lasso models are sensitive to outliers. Therefore, we separately apply lasso to the samples with outliers only and samples without outliers. We report multicollinearity-robust coefficients selected by lasso and the corresponding SBC (Schwarz Bayesian Information Criterion) of the model, as it increases with the addition of each subsequent variable. The selection process stops when an information criterion of the model reaches an optimal threshold and the addition of new variables does not substantially improve the predictive power of a model anymore. Only variables that contribute most to a model’s predictive power are selected by lasso.

In the Basel regulation period, for the broad sample of banks, all six variables are selected in both book and market leverage specifications. At the same time, in the sample with outliers, only market leverage is determined by all six variables. The book leverage only depends on collateral and risk. In contrast, in the Pre-Basel regulation period, book leverage is determined by collateral, size, market-to-book and risk for a typical bank, and only by market-to-book for outliers. In the market leverage-based specification, we observe the opposite – all six variables are significant in the sample of outliers, and only profit is statistically significant in explaining the market leverage of a typical bank (sample without outliers). The results are much more
uniform for the period before standardized capital regulation: in a broad sample, all variables but dividend dummy add explanatory power to the model. Market leverage only depends on market-to-book and profit for all banks. There must be some unobserved time-varying factor responsible for differences in leverage determinants in the Pre-Basel period. Many variables remain insignificant in a fixed effects specification when time-specific unobserved components are isolated. Possibly, an introduction of uniform capital requirements was an overriding factor itself. The new uniform capital requirements might dominate in banks’ leverage decisions initially, thus creating a perception of bank capital structure being solely determined by capital regulation. In that case, introduction of Basel, and risk-weighted capital requirements, may have relaxed a capital structure decision dependency on regulatory requirements.

The results of lasso selection for the sample of SIFIs are presented in Table 6 (book leverage) and Table 7 (market leverage). They differ significantly across all regulatory environments. In the Pre-Basel sample, none of the six variables are selected as a significant determinant of book leverage. However, market leverage is explained by profit, collateral, market-to-book and risk for a typical SIFI observation. Only profit and size matter for market leverage of an outlier. In the earlier period, with no uniform capital regulation, collateral, market-to-book and profit explain book leverage in the “clean” sample, while only collateral is significant for outliers. In the Basel capital regulation period, all variables in the specification but dividend dummy, contribute to explanatory power of the book leverage model for the “clean” sample, while only collateral is significant for outliers. In the Basel capital regulation period, all variables in the specification but dividend dummy, contribute to explanatory power of the book leverage model for the “clean” sample, while only collateral is significant for outliers. Profit, market-to-book and size contribute most to the explanatory power of the market leverage model for both outliers and non-outliers. Collateral is somewhat important for outliers only. Lasso results confirm that leverage decisions neither depend on risk nor collateral for a typical SIFI in both recent times and in earlier periods. The Pre-Basel period appears to be transitional for bank leverage determinants, possibly due to the introduction of uniform capital requirements, as discussed above.

It is now important to understand how outliers and high leverage data points differ from their majority population counterparts. The comparative summary statistics are presented in Table 8 and Table 9. In the sample of all banks (Table 8), the mean and median values of book leverage are very similar in both subsamples, with outliers only and without outliers, before the introduction of risk weighted capital requirements. In the Basel regulation period, outliers are, on average, less levered; the market leverage mean and median in two samples is similar. The market-to-book ratio of outliers is, on average, higher in the Basel period. The mean, but not median, value of profitability of the outliers is higher than profitability of a typical bank in the Basel regulation period. The banks in the outliers sample were slightly smaller, in terms of assets size, during the first two regulatory regimes. In the Basel period, banks in the outliers sample are larger in terms of assets. The outliers possess less collateral in the two recent periods of Pre-Basel and Basel regulation, in contrast to the period without standard capital requirements, when outlier banks hold more collateral. There is no striking pattern in the summary statistics of the outliers that differentiates them from non-outlier observations in the dataset. It means that different correlations between core factors and leverage for the banks in the outliers sample are not due to differences in those core factors. More information can be derived from detailed bank-specific analysis, which can be a great extension to this study. We only focus on patterns, relevant for a large number of observations.
In the sample of SIFIs (Table 9), book and market leverage of outliers is lower across all periods. The market-to-book value of outliers is only lower in the period before standard capital regulation; later it gets higher than the MTB of a typical SIFI. Outliers were small in the first two periods, before Basel when they catch up in size with the majority population. The collateral of outliers is larger across the first two periods. Some outliers do not pay dividends, with the number of dividend payers increasing substantially between the period without standard capital requirements and the pre-Basel period, and coming back down slightly in the Basel period. Outliers among SIFIs are less risky, especially during the Basel regulation time.

Finally, we estimate the model with bank and year fixed effects. The results are presented in Table 10. The fixed effects model results strongly support the feasibility of the general core model of leverage for banks. All six variables, MTB, profit, size, collateral, dividend and risk are statistically significant determinants of book and market leverage in the most recent period of risk-weighted capital requirements (Basel) for the broad sample of banks.

5. Conclusions

We use the model of core leverage factors, identified by Frank and Goyal (2009) as the most reliable determinants of a non-financial firms’ capital structure, adjust the model similarly to Gropp and Heifer (2010) and apply it to the broad sample of the U.S. banks over the long period of 1973-2012. The period covers different capital regulation regimes: no uniform capital requirements, uniform requirements, based on total capital (without risk adjustment), and the Basel period of risk-adjusted capital requirements. We confirm that the core model is plausible for this sample and the results are consistent with Gropp and Heider (2010). However, the results differ across regulatory regimes. The significant differences are observed in the sample of SIFIs. The risk and collateral factors lost their importance as leverage determinants during the most recent time period. The results are consistent with the moral hazard concept.

We use various regression methods in our study to emphasize that different variable selection are available to researchers in the business fields of study and they are all appropriate for their specific purpose. However, data irregularities must be properly treated for any method to ensure that assumptions are met and results are valid. We demonstrate, based on the case of bank leverage determinants, how separating outliers from non-outlier observations help supporting a significance of theoretically grounded effects for the explanatory models. We also show that well-known and well-implemented methods, such as panel regression with fixed effects, while alleviating valid concerns of endogeneity, may simultaneously rob us from the valuable information that is filtered out along with noisy effects. Lasso, when applied to the datasets with and without outliers separately, provides parsimonious compact model estimates, and uncovers interesting economic effects, otherwise hidden in the one-size-fits-all estimates that work for the whole sample on average.
Table 1. Variable definitions.
The letter-coded names in parenthesis, such as (AT), (DLC), etc. in this table are COMPUSTAT field names.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Leverage**     | *Market leverage*  
The ratio of total debt (debt in current liabilities (DLC) + long-term debt (DLTT)), to market value of assets (MVA).  
MVA is the sum of the market value of equity (price-close (PRCC) × shares outstanding (CSHPRI)) + debt in current liabilities (DLC) + long-term debt (DLTT) + preferred-liquidation value (PSTKL) − deferred taxes and investment tax credit (TXDITC)  
*Book leverage*  
The ratio of total debt (debt in current liabilities (DLC) + long-term debt (DLTT)) to assets (ATQ).  
*Short Term Leverage*  
The ratio of short-term borrowing = Total Assets (ATQ) − Shareholder’s Equity (SEQQ) - Long-Term Debt (DLTTQ)− Deposits (DPTCQ) to assets (ATQ) | Frank, Goyal (2009)          |
<p>| <strong>MTB</strong>          | Market-to-Book ratio. MVA to Compustat item 6, assets. MVA is obtained as the sum of the market value of price-close (PRCC) × shares outstanding (CSHPRI)+ short-term debt (DLC) + long-term debt (DLTT) + preferred-liquidation value (PSTKL) − deferred taxes and investment tax credit (TXDITC) | Frank, Goyal (2009)      |
| <strong>Profit</strong>       | Profitability, the ratio of operating income before depreciation(OIBDP) and assets (AT)                                                                 | Frank, Goyal (2009)      |
| <strong>Ln (Size)</strong>    | Log of assets log of assets (ATQ)                                                                                                          | Frank, Goyal (2009)      |
| <strong>Collateral (Banks)</strong> | (total securities + treasury bills + other bills + bonds + CDs + cash and due from banks + land and buildings + other tangible assets)/book value of assets | Gropp, Heider (2010)    |
| <strong>Dividend</strong> | Dummy variable, equal to 1 when firm pays dividends and 0 otherwise. (based on COMPUSTAT item cash dividends declared on common stock DVCY for banks or CDVCY for all firms) | Frank, Goyal (2009) |
| <strong>Risk (LogRiskM)</strong> | Annual variance of stock returns (based on CRSP stock returns) | Frank, Goyal (2009) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BookLevTotalLead1Y</td>
<td>0.8901787</td>
<td>0.8998736</td>
<td>0.0955702</td>
<td>0.000116949</td>
<td>20.0833333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MktLevTotalLead1Y</td>
<td>0.8814244</td>
<td>0.8885571</td>
<td>0.0680097</td>
<td>0.000858277</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTB</td>
<td>0.2625157</td>
<td>0.2441232</td>
<td>0.123442</td>
<td>0.000610571</td>
<td>2.5271803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>0.0058798</td>
<td>0.0055938</td>
<td>0.0046373</td>
<td>-0.1050478</td>
<td>0.1215623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogSize</td>
<td>7.4261925</td>
<td>7.1961434</td>
<td>1.7391131</td>
<td>1.9273097</td>
<td>15.1711322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collateral</td>
<td>1.061523</td>
<td>1.0581828</td>
<td>0.1919135</td>
<td>0.0292476</td>
<td>2.4840293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividend</td>
<td>0.7353559</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4411473</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogRiskM</td>
<td>-5.2995653</td>
<td>-5.3284475</td>
<td>1.0169245</td>
<td>-12.1732848</td>
<td>0.2413316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Classic determinants of capital structure in various regulatory environments, all banks and SIFIs.

Panel A: All banks, Book leverage (Spec 1-3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Uniform</th>
<th>Pre-Uniform</th>
<th>Pre-Uniform</th>
<th>Pre-Uniform</th>
<th>Pre-Uniform</th>
<th>Pre-Uniform</th>
<th>Pre-Uniform</th>
<th>Pre-Uniform</th>
<th>Pre-Uniform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.91095</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.9276</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.94357</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.9671</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.89596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTB</td>
<td>0.00837</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0054</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.16884</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.0181</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.01844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>3.39786</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>3.4393</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.05909</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7317</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1.61548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogSize</td>
<td>0.00598</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.0064</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.00608</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0052</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.00367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collateral</td>
<td>0.05841</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.0504</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.01758</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.0218</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.04504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividend</td>
<td>0.00167</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.0017</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>-0.00398</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.00762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogRiskM</td>
<td>0.00177</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.0018</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.00437</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.0046</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.00379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>0.2203</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2233</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1533</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1363</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj R2</td>
<td>0.2192</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1523</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00693</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00693</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N obs</td>
<td>4280</td>
<td></td>
<td>4280</td>
<td></td>
<td>4782</td>
<td></td>
<td>4782</td>
<td></td>
<td>48355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Panel B: SIFIs, Book leverage (Spec 4-6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Uniform</th>
<th>Pre-Uniform</th>
<th>Pre-Uniform</th>
<th>Pre-Uniform</th>
<th>Pre-Uniform</th>
<th>Pre-Uniform</th>
<th>Pre-Uniform</th>
<th>Pre-Uniform</th>
<th>Pre-Uniform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.86791</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.8604</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.76011</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.7499</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1.11745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTB</td>
<td>0.04159</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.0459</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>-0.05634</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.0587</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.06049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>-1.2858</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6974</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.61401</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1.6366</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>-1.2287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogSize</td>
<td>0.00099</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00693</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.0076</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.02518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collateral</td>
<td>0.05472</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.0555</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.06422</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.0659</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.00901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividend</td>
<td>0.00132</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0014</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.00068</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.0066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogRiskM</td>
<td>0.00101</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0012</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.00469</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.0053</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.00161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>0.3067</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2964</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2324</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2313</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj R2</td>
<td>0.2932</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2165</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N obs</td>
<td>315</td>
<td></td>
<td>315</td>
<td></td>
<td>298</td>
<td></td>
<td>298</td>
<td></td>
<td>1149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Continued

Panel C: All banks, Market leverage (Spec 1-3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Uniform</th>
<th>Pre-Uniform Robust M</th>
<th>Pre-Basel</th>
<th>Pre-Basel Robust M</th>
<th>Basel</th>
<th>Basel Robust M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.97946 ***</td>
<td>0.9996 ***</td>
<td>1.02043 ***</td>
<td>1.0399 ***</td>
<td>1.03694 ***</td>
<td>1.0538 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTB</td>
<td>-0.04333 ***</td>
<td>0.0273 ***</td>
<td>0.29221 ***</td>
<td>0.1458 ***</td>
<td>-0.22222 ***</td>
<td>0.1962 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>-5.48682 ***</td>
<td>7.7471 ***</td>
<td>2.03499 ***</td>
<td>5.9047 ***</td>
<td>-3.21735 ***</td>
<td>4.3656 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogSize</td>
<td>0.000972 ***</td>
<td>0.0003 ***</td>
<td>0.00906 ***</td>
<td>0.0039 ***</td>
<td>0.0018 ***</td>
<td>0.0013 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collateral</td>
<td>-0.00143</td>
<td>0.0047 **</td>
<td>0.06768 ***</td>
<td>0.0581 ***</td>
<td>-0.05834 ***</td>
<td>0.0606 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividend</td>
<td>0.00213 ***</td>
<td>0.0001 ***</td>
<td>0.00266 *</td>
<td>0.0029 **</td>
<td>0.00215 ***</td>
<td>0.0018 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogRiskM</td>
<td>0.000364 ***</td>
<td>0.0004 ***</td>
<td>0.00349 ***</td>
<td>0.0026 ***</td>
<td>0.00735 ***</td>
<td>0.0083 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>0.2658</td>
<td>0.2779</td>
<td>0.4285</td>
<td>0.2762</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj R2</td>
<td>0.2647</td>
<td>0.4278</td>
<td>0.2499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N obs</td>
<td>4280</td>
<td>4280</td>
<td>4782</td>
<td>4782</td>
<td>48355</td>
<td>48355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Panel D: SIFIs, Market leverage (Spec 4-6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Uniform</th>
<th>Pre-Uniform Robust M</th>
<th>Pre-Basel</th>
<th>Pre-Basel Robust M</th>
<th>Basel</th>
<th>Basel Robust M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.96651 ***</td>
<td>0.9666 ***</td>
<td>1.05404 ***</td>
<td>1.0978 ***</td>
<td>0.89237 ***</td>
<td>0.9199 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTB</td>
<td>-0.02931 *</td>
<td>0.0283 **</td>
<td>-0.2068 ***</td>
<td>-0.145 ***</td>
<td>0.33801 ***</td>
<td>0.2987 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogSize</td>
<td>0.00303 ***</td>
<td>0.0032 ***</td>
<td>0.00628 ***</td>
<td>0.002 ***</td>
<td>0.01146 ***</td>
<td>0.0092 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collateral</td>
<td>-0.00865</td>
<td>0.0054</td>
<td>0.07653 ***</td>
<td>-0.0617 ***</td>
<td>0.00343</td>
<td>0.0045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividend</td>
<td>0.00138</td>
<td>0.0021</td>
<td>0.03332 ***</td>
<td>0.031 ***</td>
<td>0.00993</td>
<td>0.0088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogRiskM</td>
<td>-0.00273 ***</td>
<td>0.0016 ***</td>
<td>0.00896 ***</td>
<td>0.009 ***</td>
<td>0.00156 ***</td>
<td>0.0029 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>0.4813</td>
<td>0.4743</td>
<td>0.5615</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.5465</td>
<td>0.4061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj R2</td>
<td>0.4711</td>
<td>0.5524</td>
<td>0.5441</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N obs</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>1149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Determinants of book leverage in broad sample of banks: lasso selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Pre-Unifrom</th>
<th>SBC</th>
<th>Pre-Baseline</th>
<th>SBC</th>
<th>Basel</th>
<th>SBC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>estimate</td>
<td>SBC</td>
<td>estimate</td>
<td>SBC</td>
<td>estimate</td>
<td>SBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel A: excluding outliers and high leverage data points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.933243</td>
<td>-26193.229</td>
<td>0.920082</td>
<td>-27566.671</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.895879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collateral</td>
<td>0.051746</td>
<td>-26502.101</td>
<td>0.039737</td>
<td>-27755.699</td>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>-1.682741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogSize</td>
<td>-0.007101</td>
<td>-26676.383</td>
<td>-0.004554</td>
<td>-28361.005</td>
<td>Collateral</td>
<td>0.020012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>-4.451077</td>
<td>-27106.327</td>
<td>-0.018453</td>
<td>-28399.301</td>
<td>LogRiskM</td>
<td>0.002396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTB</td>
<td>-0.014979</td>
<td>-27307.242</td>
<td>0.00264</td>
<td>-28448.678</td>
<td>MTB</td>
<td>-0.010922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogRiskM</td>
<td>0.000749</td>
<td>-27325.803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dividend</td>
<td>-0.002213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LogSize</td>
<td>0.000871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel B: outliers and high leverage data points only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.87306</td>
<td>-7201.0776</td>
<td>0.942954</td>
<td>-6352.685</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.819195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collateral</td>
<td>0.042474</td>
<td>-7209.4523</td>
<td>-0.17338</td>
<td>-6570.7851</td>
<td>MTB</td>
<td>0.045698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividend</td>
<td>-0.010475</td>
<td>-7213.2865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LogRiskM</td>
<td>0.003508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>-1.547112</td>
<td>-7331.7532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogRiskM</td>
<td>0.001415</td>
<td>-7375.3222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Determinants of market leverage in broad sample of banks: lasso selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel A: excluding outliers and high leverage data points</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Panel B: outliers and high leverage data points only</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Pre-Uniform estimate</td>
<td>SBC</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Pre-Basel estimate</td>
<td>SBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.856729</td>
<td>2332.8318</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.895157</td>
<td>-1982.8342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collateral</td>
<td>0.052813</td>
<td>2273.9501</td>
<td>Collateral</td>
<td>0.044661</td>
<td>-6174.3727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTB</td>
<td>-0.051199</td>
<td>2334.9616</td>
<td>MTB</td>
<td>0.076802</td>
<td>-6177.9509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>8.392903</td>
<td>27922.719</td>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>10.175776</td>
<td>-26669.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTB</td>
<td>-0.018166</td>
<td>27979.864</td>
<td>MTB</td>
<td>-0.052637</td>
<td>-7658.1006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogRiskM</td>
<td>0.001849</td>
<td>254743.68</td>
<td>LogRiskM</td>
<td>0.005079</td>
<td>-7324.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collateral</td>
<td>0.068586</td>
<td>253433.95</td>
<td>Collateral</td>
<td>0.031134</td>
<td>-38451.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividend</td>
<td>0.007812</td>
<td>25000.5550</td>
<td>Dividend</td>
<td>0.009415</td>
<td>-38487.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel B: outliers and high leverage data points only</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Collateral</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>LogSize</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.866845</td>
<td>-429.7238</td>
<td>0.884881</td>
<td>-392.6988</td>
<td>1.184775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collateral</td>
<td>0.034717</td>
<td>-440.7109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.030633</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Determinants of book leverage in sample of SIFIs: lasso selection
Table 7. Determinants of market leverage in sample of SIFIs: lasso selection

Panel A: excluding outliers and high leverage data points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable</th>
<th>Pre-Unifrom</th>
<th>SBC</th>
<th>Pre-Basel</th>
<th>SBC</th>
<th>Basel</th>
<th>estimate</th>
<th>SBC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.996678</td>
<td>-2035.9632</td>
<td>1.137411</td>
<td>-1705.523</td>
<td>0.976597</td>
<td>-5038.4796</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collateral</td>
<td>-0.076093</td>
<td>-1908.4651</td>
<td>-0.113952</td>
<td>-1929.6929</td>
<td>-0.195204</td>
<td>-5699.2166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTB</td>
<td>-0.113952</td>
<td>-1929.6929</td>
<td>0.005228</td>
<td>-1931.7085</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogRiskM</td>
<td>0.004257</td>
<td>-1931.7085</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Panel B: outliers and high leverage data points only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable</th>
<th>Pre-Unifrom</th>
<th>SBC</th>
<th>Pre-Basel</th>
<th>SBC</th>
<th>Basel</th>
<th>estimate</th>
<th>SBC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.974873</td>
<td>-373.0157</td>
<td>0.850045</td>
<td>-284.747</td>
<td>0.873542</td>
<td>-1216.0414</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>-5.628036</td>
<td>-374.5119</td>
<td>-4.143059</td>
<td>-289.0001</td>
<td>-0.367448</td>
<td>-1360.2944</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTB</td>
<td>-0.065653</td>
<td>-381.2698</td>
<td>0.007234</td>
<td>-294.7847</td>
<td>-2.550129</td>
<td>-1409.6552</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogSize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.008614</td>
<td>-1426.1777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collateral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.021643</td>
<td>-1432.3031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8. Comparative analysis of the characteristics of outliers and high leverage data points in the broad sample of banks

Panel A: No outliers or high leverage data points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BookLev</td>
<td>0.851619</td>
<td>0.961599</td>
<td>0.910615</td>
<td>0.837424</td>
<td>0.964204</td>
<td>0.912542</td>
<td>0.791045</td>
<td>0.899851</td>
<td>0.895851</td>
<td>0.899481</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MktLev</td>
<td>0.887394</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.955249</td>
<td>0.95805</td>
<td>0.995685</td>
<td>0.937172</td>
<td>0.670576</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.871968</td>
<td>0.875946</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTB</td>
<td>0.019236</td>
<td>0.361004</td>
<td>0.159626</td>
<td>0.056356</td>
<td>0.396398</td>
<td>0.210034</td>
<td>0.206815</td>
<td>0.000611</td>
<td>0.640758</td>
<td>0.266217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>0.000715</td>
<td>0.008321</td>
<td>0.004311</td>
<td>0.00129</td>
<td>0.008985</td>
<td>0.005083</td>
<td>0.005083</td>
<td>-0.00121</td>
<td>0.013139</td>
<td>0.005833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collateral</td>
<td>0.815667</td>
<td>1.46042</td>
<td>1.116333</td>
<td>0.700378</td>
<td>1.53419</td>
<td>1.093302</td>
<td>0.529065</td>
<td>1.659841</td>
<td>1.058009</td>
<td>1.050978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Panel B: Outliers and high leverage data points only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BookLev</td>
<td>0.699146</td>
<td>0.973812</td>
<td>0.903236</td>
<td>0.909697</td>
<td>0.261507</td>
<td>2.678213</td>
<td>0.901429</td>
<td>0.000117</td>
<td>20.08333</td>
<td>0.849295</td>
<td>0.874779</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MktLev</td>
<td>0.821227</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.951764</td>
<td>0.956448</td>
<td>0.30564</td>
<td>0.29217</td>
<td>0.944376</td>
<td>0.000858</td>
<td>1.860786</td>
<td>0.885389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTB</td>
<td>0.011095</td>
<td>0.406677</td>
<td>0.152336</td>
<td>0.139569</td>
<td>0.004254</td>
<td>1.27506</td>
<td>0.223133</td>
<td>0.190829</td>
<td>0.001863</td>
<td>2.52718</td>
<td>0.32053</td>
<td>0.278614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>-0.01311</td>
<td>0.024661</td>
<td>0.004525</td>
<td>0.004383</td>
<td>-0.07328</td>
<td>0.060105</td>
<td>0.004983</td>
<td>0.004844</td>
<td>-0.10505</td>
<td>0.121562</td>
<td>0.007031</td>
<td>0.005754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collateral</td>
<td>0.696882</td>
<td>1.509546</td>
<td>1.113072</td>
<td>1.114024</td>
<td>0.044955</td>
<td>1.645189</td>
<td>1.03172</td>
<td>1.066662</td>
<td>0.029248</td>
<td>2.484029</td>
<td>1.036808</td>
<td>1.005467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividend</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.335583</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.409019</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.52754</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*summary statistics of the independent variables presented for outliers and high leverage data points as identified in book leverage-based regressions; analogous statistics from the market leverage-based regressions is the same or very similar and it is not reported
### Table 9. Comparative analysis of the characteristics of outliers and high leverage data points in the sample of SIFIs

#### Panel A: No outliers or high leverage data points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Pre-Uniform</th>
<th>Pre-Basel</th>
<th>Basel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BookLev</td>
<td>0.869538</td>
<td>0.933071</td>
<td>0.904016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MktLev</td>
<td>0.899572</td>
<td>0.98538</td>
<td>0.950858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTB</td>
<td>0.03125</td>
<td>0.452165</td>
<td>0.382186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>0.001853</td>
<td>0.007265</td>
<td>0.004428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collateral</td>
<td>0.877941</td>
<td>1.434326</td>
<td>1.123744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Panel B: Outliers and high leverage data points only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Pre-Uniform</th>
<th>Pre-Basel</th>
<th>Basel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BookLev</td>
<td>0.865891</td>
<td>0.929478</td>
<td>0.911363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MktLev</td>
<td>0.852804</td>
<td>0.978297</td>
<td>0.940973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTB</td>
<td>0.045035</td>
<td>0.391258</td>
<td>0.143796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>0.000568</td>
<td>0.007162</td>
<td>0.004287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collateral</td>
<td>0.958379</td>
<td>1.480666</td>
<td>1.158002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*summary statistics of the independent variables presented for outliers and high leverage data points as identified in book leverage-based regressions; analogous statistics from the market leverage-based regressions is the same or very similar and it is not reported.

### Table 10. Classic determinants of capital structure of banks with bank and year fixed effects

#### Panel A: book leverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All banks</th>
<th>SIFIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BookLev</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MktLev</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogSize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collateral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogRiskM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Uniform</td>
<td>Pre-Basel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTB</td>
<td>-0.01607 ***</td>
<td>0.116627 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>-1.598981 ***</td>
<td>0.695756 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogSize</td>
<td>-0.003292 *</td>
<td>0.014854 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collateral</td>
<td>0.032476 ***</td>
<td>0.012609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividend</td>
<td>0.001421 **</td>
<td>0.000552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogRisk</td>
<td>0.00106 ***</td>
<td>0.001527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.7015</td>
<td>0.4501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj R²</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.4164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N obs</td>
<td>4280</td>
<td>4782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel B: market leverage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All banks</td>
<td>SIFIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Uniform</td>
<td>Pre-Basel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTB</td>
<td>-0.05047 ***</td>
<td>0.231884 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>-1.996959 ***</td>
<td>0.505177 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogSize</td>
<td>0.015005 ***</td>
<td>0.008466 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collateral</td>
<td>-0.001988</td>
<td>0.037437 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividend</td>
<td>0.000174</td>
<td>0.000399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogRisk</td>
<td>-0.000535 *</td>
<td>0.002584 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.7661</td>
<td>0.7679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj R²</td>
<td>0.757</td>
<td>0.7537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N obs</td>
<td>4280</td>
<td>4782</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Abstract

We begin by arguing that the often used algorithm for the discovery and use of disease risk factors, stepwise logistic regression, is unstable. We then argue that there are other algorithms available that are much more stable and reliable (e.g. the lasso). We then propose a protocol for the discovery and use of risk factors using lasso variable selection with logistic regression. We then illustrate the use of the protocol with a set of prostate cancer data and show that it recovers known risk factors. Finally we use the protocol to identify new risk factors for prostate cancer.
On the Discovery and Use of Disease Risk Factors with Logistic Regression: New Prostate Cancer Risk Factors

1. Introduction

As Austin and Tu (2004) remark, researchers as well as physicians are often interested in determining the independent predictors of a disease state. These predictors, often called risk factors, are important in disease diagnosis, prognosis and general patient management as the attending physician tries to optimize patient care. In addition, knowledge of these risk factors help researchers evaluate new treatment modalities and therapies as well as help make comparisons across different hospitals (Austin and Tu, 2004). Because risk factors are so important in patient care it behooves us to do the best job possible in the discovery and use of disease risk factors. Because new statistical methods (Ayers and Cordell (2010), Yuan and Liu (2006), Steyerberg et al (2000), Wiegand (2009), Breiman (1995), Tibshirani (1996)) have been and are being developed, it is important for risk factor researchers to be aware of these new methods and to adjust their discovery and use of risk factor protocols as is necessary. In this paper, we argue that now is such a time. For a number of years in risk factor research a method of automatic variable selection called stepwise regression and its variants forward selection and backward elimination (Chatterjee and Price 1977 (chapter 9)) have been used even as new methods have become available (see Neter, Wasserman and Kutner, 1983, Chapter 12, Kutner et al 5th ed. 2005 P 364ff, Labidi et al 2009, Queiroz et al 2010, Qui et al 2013, and many others). The last three cited are risk factor studies. We do not argue for a change of protocols in risk factor discovery and use simply because newer methods are available. As we will show the older methods are often unreliable and the newer methods are much less so. We point out that the purpose of this paper is the following:

1. To summarize some of the studies that show that stepwise regression and its variants as now used more often than they should be in risk factor studies are unreliable and in fact may cause some of the irreproducibility of life sciences research as discussed by Arnaud (2014) as we shall discuss later.
2. To argue on the basis of current research that there are methods available that are considerably more reliable.
3. To propose a modern statistical protocol for the discovery and use of risk factors when using logistic regression as is commonly done.
4. To illustrate the use of the protocol developed in 3 using a set of prostate cancer data (Cooper et al 2008).
5. To report the finding of new prostate cancer risk factors using the modern procedures.

We further note that nothing in the way of statistical methods is new in this paper. What is new is the introduction of a clear protocol to identify and use disease risk factors that
involve much less problematic methods than stepwise regression. We then use the proposed methodology to identify a known prostate cancer risk factor and then discover two new prostate cancer risk factors.

2. The problems with stepwise regression and an introduction to current variable selection methods.

We first assert that we have not set up a straw man. Stepwise regression is being used at the present time as the above cites show. We list a few modern citations above to make that point and a short session on Google will find many more. In addition, to show that stepwise regression is alive and well, we did a search of Researchgate questions on March 16, 2016 and found about 3,000 questions soliciting help on using stepwise regression. Having made our point that stepwise logistic regression is still commonly used, we now point out the problems. We begin by considering Breiman (1995), who compared 2 shrinkage estimators (of which much more will be said later) with a commonly used alternative to stepwise, the all possible regressions model approach using the Mallows Cp criterion (Neter et al 1983 p 426ff). We first note that Dahlgren (2010) reports that Murtaugh showed that all subsets variable selection is very similar to stepwise regression. What then did Breiman find? Breiman tested all methods (the shrinkage methods were ridge regression and the nonnegative garrote (Breiman (1995)) in two cases which he called x-controlled and x-random which he tested by simulation. We suppose that there are M subset regressions and M regressions for each of the shrinkage estimators. Let’s now look at Breiman’s results. Let ME stand for model error as defined by Breiman. Breiman says:

1. “The ME estimates for subset selection are considerably worse than those for nn-garrote or ridge regression.” We remember that Murtaugh showed that subset selection (all subsets) is a commonly used alternative to stepwise.

2. “In the x-random simulation, the nn-garrote uses almost twice the number of variables as subset selection.” Remember from 1 the nn-garrote had considerably better ME than all subsets. It seems it takes more variables to be selected to get the better ME. This argues that the all subsets model selection is not very good.

3. “Stepwise variable deletion or addition procedures nested subsets of variables. But the sequence of best best…subsets…are generally not nested.” Breiman notes that in this simulation the nn-garotte is “almost always but not always” nested. Remember the nn-garotte had the better ME. Breiman defines instability with respect to small perturbations in the data in the following way. Suppose a subset of predictors has been selected. “Now remove a single data case (Yn, Xn) and use the same selection procedure getting a sequence of subsets.” If the two subsets are vastly different (i.e. unstable selection) then the resulting two prediction equations are vastly different and we would observe the risk factors for one prediction equation are not the risk factors for the other. Which set then would be the best risk factors if the selection procedure is unstable? In section 5.5.2.7 of his paper Breiman reports that the all subsets method is unstable. This along with Murtaugh’s results suggest
that the current methods, all subsets and stepwise are poor performers for selecting risk factors if we are using a standard linear regression model as considered in Neter et al (1983).

However, a standard linear regression model is not usually the case in risk factor studies of disease. Here the most common case is a dichotomous dependent variable e.g. patient has disease, patient does not have the disease and hence a logistic regression model is appropriate (Harrell (2001), Chapt. 10-11). We now must consider the same issues as before but now in the case of logistic regression.

We begin by considering Steyerberg et al (2000). Here, in the context of logistic regression, they compared backward stepwise selection and several shrinkage estimators including the lasso (Tibshirani 1996). We note in passing that Tibshirani gives us an example of a risk factor type study. The lasso will be important to us later. Now let \( \alpha \) be the significance level for backward stepwise selection. Studies much like those of Breiman were conducted except with logistic regression. Steyerberg et al say: “We found that stepwise selection with low \( \alpha \) (for example 0.05) led to a relatively poor model performance, when evaluated on independent data, substantially better performance was obtained with full models with a limited number of important predictors, where regression coefficients were reduced with any of the shrinkage methods…we therefore recommend shrinkage methods in full models including prespecified predictors…when prognostic models are constructed…”

We now briefly consider the work of Wiegand (2010) who looked at using multiple stepwise algorithms for variable selection in linear, logistic and Cox regression models. He says: “To conclude, stepwise agreement is often a poor strategy that gives misleading results and researchers should avoid using SVS algorithms to build multivariable models.”

We now come to the work of Austin and Tu (2004) which drives the nail into the coffin of stepwise selection methods in logistic regression. The entire paper should be read by all those that are using stepwise methods in risk factor studies with logistic regression. We quote from the Abstract, “The objective of this study was to determine the reproducibility of logistic regression models developed using automated variable selection methods.” The abstract continues: “Results: Using 1,000 bootstrap samples, backward elimination identified 940 unique models for predicting mortality. Similar results were obtained for forward and stepwise selection. Three variables were identified as independent predictors of mortality among all bootstrap samples. Over half the candidate prognostic variables were identified as independent predictors in less than half of the bootstrap samples. Conclusion: Automated variable selection methods result in models that are unstable and not reproducible. The variables selected as independent predictors are sensitive to random fluctuation in the data.” At this point it is clear that the time of stepwise and all subsets regression has passed in risk factor studies. Arnaud (2014) reports that a related problem occurs in the
case of finding biomarkers in disease. While the stepwise regression problem is not mentioned in this paper, one might suspect that it lurks there as well and we would suggest studies similar to those we report here be conducted in order to possibly remove an additional source of irreproducibility in these types of studies.

3. What then should replace these automatic variable selection methods?

We have seen so far that shrinkage methods have done well when compared to the current stepwise and all subsets methods and thus we follow the suggestion of Steyerburg et al and look at shrinkage methods. The question then becomes what shrinkage method might we choose as the next variable selection method: we are impressed by the work of Ayers and Cordell (2010) in this regard. First we note that shrinkage estimators are also called penalized estimators. In particular the lasso (Tibshirani 1996) as defined by Zou (2006) can be considered. We note that the factor lambda is said to be the penalty.

Now Ayers and Cordell (2010) studied “the performance of penalizations in selecting SNPs as predictors in genetic association studies.” Their conclusion is: “Results show that penalized methods outperform single marker analysis, with the main difference being that penalized methods allow the simultaneous inclusion of a number of markers, and generally do not allow correlated variables to enter the model in which most of the identified explanatory markers are accounted for.” At this point, penalty estimators (i.e. shrinkage) look very attractive in risk factor type studies.

Another paper (Zou 2006) helps us make our final decision. Zou (2006) considers a procedure called adaptive lasso in which different values of the parameter λ are allowed for each of the regression coefficients. Furthermore, Zou shows that an adaptive lasso procedure is an oracle procedure such that $\beta(\lambda)$ (asymptotically) has the following properties:

a) It identifies the right subset model and
b) It has the optimal estimated rate.

Zou then extends these results to the adaptive lasso for logistic regression. Wang and Leng (2007) developed an approximate adaptive lasso (i.e. a different $\lambda$ for each $\beta$ is allowed) by least squares approximation for many types of regression. Boos (2014) shows how easy it is to implement this software in the statistical language R for logistic regression. Thus, we choose to use the least squares approximation to their adaptive lasso logistic regression in the next section. We note here that a special variant of lasso, group lasso (Meier et al (2008)) is needed for categorical predictor variables.

In the next section, we propose and discuss a protocol for the discovery and use of risk factors in logistic regression models. In the following section we illustrate the use of the protocol using the data of Cooper et al (2008) to look at some risk factors for prostate cancer. We will show that currently known risk factors can be identified as well as new risk factors discovered using these methods.

4. A suggested protocol for using logistic regression to discover and use disease risk factors.
Our suggested protocol is shown below. We discuss the protocol in this section and illustrate its use with prostate cancer risk factors in the following section. This protocol uses the R statistical language.

The Logistic Regression Protocol for use with Risk Factors

1. Ready data for analysis.
2. Input to R.
3. Regress a suitable dependent variable ((say) 0-Control, 1-Has disease) on X (a potential risk factor) as described by Harrell (2001 Chapter 10) for logistic regression.
4. If the regression coefficient of X is significant (we suggest a p-value of 0.25 or less – see Hosmer and Lemeshow (1989), p 86), it identifies a potential risk factor. If an X variable is continuous, we suggest use of the Bianco-Yohai robust (outlier resistant, see Hauser and Booth (2011)) estimator and further suggest putting outliers aside for further analysis as they may give rise to extra information.
5. Now build a full risk factor prediction model.
6. Use potential risk factors (Xs) to form a full model with the appropriate dependent variable (as in 3).
7. If any variables are continuous repeat 4 using the entire potential full model.
8. With any outliers set aside for further study, regress the dependent variable on the logistic regression full model using the adaptive lasso method, least squares approximation, as described by Boos (2014) which is easiest in R.
9. Using a Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) select variables without zero lasso regression coefficients to be predictors in a risk factor based reduced model. If categorical risk factors are present use group lasso regression (Meier et al (2008)). Use graphs like Fig. 1 in Meier et al (2008) to identify the zero lasso regression coefficients that may exist for the categorical variables.
10. Validate the reduced model, with the similar validation of the full model of step 6, if there is any doubt about variables discarded from the full model using bootstrap cross validation (Harrell, 2001) and then check the usual model diagnostics (Pregibon, 1981).
11. Predict with the reduced model containing the appropriate risk factors as described in Harrell (2001), Chapter 11 and Ryan (2009), Chapter 9.

Notes to the protocol.
A. We note that for the genome wide case of predictors one should refer to Li et al (2011) and Wu et al (2009).
B. All logistic regression assumptions should be checked and satisfied as in Pregibon (1981).
5. The prostate cancer example including new risk factors

This example is taken from Cooper et al (2008) where the data and biological system are described. The data set used in this paper is a subset of the Cooper et al data set with all observations containing missing values removed. We note that all potential predictor variables are categorical so no imputation was performed. The coding assignments and the variable definitions are given in the Appendix. The simple and multiple logistic regressions are carried out as described in Harrell (2001). Robust logistic regressions, when needed, are carried out as described in Hauser and Booth (2011). Variable selection is carried out using the adaptive lasso (Zou, 2006) with the least squares approximation of Wang and Leng (2007) for continuous independent variables and by group lasso (Meier et al (2008)) for categorical independent variables. All computations are carried out using the R statistical language. The R functions for variable selection (adaptive lasso and group lasso) along with the papers are available from Boos (2014), and used as described there. The use of the group lasso R function is covered in R help for package grplasso and grpreg. The data sets and R programs are available from the authors (DEB). The variables studied as potential risk factors are listed in the X column of Table 1.

We now follow the protocol and explain each step in detail. We begin by considering the one predictor logistic regressions in Table 1. First note that all potential risk factors in this data set are categorical (factors) so we do not have to consider the Bianco-Yohai (Bianco and Martinez (2009)) estimator of protocol Step 4 for this data. By observing the Table 1 p-values, we note that only smoke-ever fails to meet the Hosmer and Lemeshow criterion and thus smoke_ever is eliminated as a possible risk factor for this data set at this point. Cooper et al (2008) hypothesize a SNP-SNP interaction as a risk factor for prostate cancer. We now test this hypothesis and attempt to answer the question is there such an interaction? In order to answer this question, we first note that the answer is not completely contained in Table 1. Second, we recall that we have a gene-gene interaction of two genes if both affect the final phenotype of the individual together. Thus to show gene-gene interaction we must have two things. To be specific, we now consider the two genes representing the relevant alleles of the SEPP1 and SOD2 genes. If there is a gene-gene interaction, we must see two things statistically. First, the relevant alleles of the SEPP1 and SOD2 genes must both be predictors of the disease state (See Table 1) and, in addition must be selected to be in a reasonable prediction equation for the disease state by the appropriate lasso algorithm (See Figures 1 and 2). The appropriate lasso algorithm here is the group lasso for logistic regression because the predictor variables are categorical. We now note that in our data set we have four candidate predictor variables from which to search for our gene-gene interaction MnSOD_DOM_Final, SeP_Ad_Final, MnSOD_AD_Final and SeP_DOM_Final. Either observation of the Variable Values or a simple trial shows that we cannot include all four variables in the model at once because they are pairwise collinear. Hence we have to separate the variables into the two cases, the models of Figure 1 and Figure 2. We also note that lasso generally does not allow correlated variables to enter the model (Ayers and Cordell(2010)).
We now begin our search with the model of Figure 1. By Table 1 we find that both alleles of MnSOD_DOM_Final are predictors but only SeP_Ad_Final0 is a predictor with p-value 0.039557. This gives us a candidate for an interaction. We then perform the group lasso analysis of Figure 1. Here we must determine if the relevant alleles are included in the group lasso selected prediction equation. Roughly this is the case if the lasso regression coefficients are not zero at the end of the algorithm’s execution as shown on the coefficient path plot of Figure 1. By looking at equation (2.2) of Meier et al (2008) we see that $0 \leq \lambda < \infty$ hence as $\lambda \to \infty$, $s_{i}(\beta) \to 0$ and thus $\beta_{i} \to 0$ but not uniformly. Hence the question is what value of $\lambda$ do we choose to determine if the coefficients are close enough to zero to discard that term from the model as a zero coefficient. Based on Table 2 where we compute the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X_STRATUM</td>
<td>-0.55132</td>
<td>0.005646</td>
<td>&lt;2x10^{-16}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MnSOD_AD_Final</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.4334</td>
<td>0.1241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.2478</td>
<td>0.1157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.3140</td>
<td>0.1233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeP_Ad_Final</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.21219</td>
<td>0.10309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12890</td>
<td>0.10754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.23484</td>
<td>0.15797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MnSOD_DOM_Final0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4334</td>
<td>0.1241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2704</td>
<td>0.1126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeP_DOM_Final</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.21219</td>
<td>0.10309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.14445</td>
<td>0.10568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoke_ever</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00339</td>
<td>0.08161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.03791</td>
<td>0.07016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alco_ever</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.428943</td>
<td>0.142425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.002951</td>
<td>0.062317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMHIST</td>
<td>0.84619</td>
<td>0.09497</td>
<td>&lt;2x10^{-16}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

Optimal $\lambda$s Computed from R Packages grplasso and grpreg for Indicated Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors in Model</th>
<th>$\lambda_{\text{min}}$</th>
<th>$\lambda_{\text{max}}$</th>
<th>$\lambda_{\text{opt}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MnSOD_AD_Final</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>70.55</td>
<td>.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeP_DOM_Final</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MnSOD_DOM_Final</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>83.99</td>
<td>1.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeP_Ad_Final</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: $\lambda_{\min}$ computed by package grpreg using a Bayesian Information Criterion $\lambda_{\max}$ was computed by package grplasso.
Figure 1 – The Group Lasso Coefficient plot for the logistic regression – Containing MnSOD_DOM_FINAL and SeP_Ad_Final

We note that for lambda=λopt none of the paths shrink to zero suggesting that when the p-values of Table 1 are significant, a SNP-SNP interaction, as reported in Cooper et al (2008) exists.
Figure 2 – Grouplasso Coefficient Plot for Model Containing MnSOD_AD_Final and SeP_SOM_Final
optimal $\lambda$ to use we choose $\lambda=1.428$ to be the cutoff point. Hence we can now apply the
two conditions of the previous paragraph. Condition 1 was that both candidate alleles be
significant predictors in Table 1. We see that MnSOD_DOM_Final0 and MnSOD_DOM_Final1 both meet this criterion but only SeP_Ad_Final0 meets the
criterion. We now must check Figure 1 to see which if any of these candidate alleles are
selected for the group lasso prediction equation which was our second criterion. We now
examine the Figure 1 plot at $\lambda_{opt}=1.428$. We note that at this $\lambda$ none of the candidate
alleles have coefficients of zero. Hence using our two criteria we can summarize as
follows:

1. We need both Table 1 significance and Figure 1 selection to show interaction.
   SeP_Ad_Final0 was Ala/Ala so this is one allele that qualifies.
2. Both MnSOD_DOM_Final0 and MnSOD_DOM_Final1 (i.e. Ala/Ala and +/Ala)
satisfy so this shows that for MnSOD the result is +/Ala. Hence the identified
interaction alleles are
   \[
   \begin{array}{ll}
   \text{SEPP1} & \text{SOD2} \\
   \text{Ala/Ala} & +/Ala
   \end{array}
   \]
   which agrees with the Cooper et al (2008) finding on a gene-gene interaction risk
factor.

We now repeat this analysis for the model which contains the other possible candidate
alleles. By the first criterion and Table 1 all three of the MnSOD_AD_Final values are
significant while only SeP_DOM_Final0 is significant. By criterion 2 for gene-gene
interaction we also need $\beta_i \neq 0$ for $\lambda_{opt}=0.635$, from observing Table 2. Now by observing
Figure 2 we see that for MnSOD_AD_Final the 0, 1 and 2 values meet the criteria while for SeP_DOM_Final only the 0 allele
does because of lack of significance for SeP_DOM_Final1. By consulting the Appendix
we see that

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{SeP_DOM_Final0} & \text{Ala/Ala} \\
\text{MnSOD_AD_Final0} & \text{Val/Val} \\
1 & \text{Val/Ala} \\
2 & \text{Ala/Ala}
\end{array}
\]

and all of these were significant in the Table 1 regressions. Hence we conclude that we
have an additional two gene-gene interactions that are risk factors, since one combination
was identified using the first model.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{SEPP1} & \text{SOD2} \\
\text{Ala/Ala} & \text{Val/Val} \\
\text{Ala/Ala} & \text{Val/Ala}
\end{array}
\]

Neither of these has been reported in the prior literature as far as we can determine.

We can now make prediction equations using our now known risk factors which will give
our predicted diagnosis of whether or not a patient is at risk for prostate cancer based on
our variable values assuming that we use a new observation not one which is included in
our current data set. We recommend the use of bootstrap cross validation to validate this
equation and full details are included in (Harrell, 2001). As a final reminder, all of the
other assumptions of logistic regression need to be checked each and every time. The
reader is referred to Pregibon (1981) for further details. These new risk factor results are particularly important since the SEPP1 gene product is in the same metabolic path as a tumor suppressor for prostate cancer (Ansong et al 2015).

6. Limitations of the proposed Protocol and Future Research

As much as we would like this to be the last word on the discovery and use of disease risk factors with logistic regression, it is not. We will mention a few possible limitations and our hope for some future work perhaps by us or others that we would like to see.

First, Ayers and Cordell (2010) mention a limitation of this suggestion, the fact that there is no known way to get confidence intervals and p-values for lasso estimates. Fortunately this is changing. Currently, there is a paper by Lockhart et al (2012) entitled “A significance test for the lasso”. While this is a complicated paper that doesn’t solve all problems a strong beachhead has been established.

Next, we discussed the advantages of adaptive lasso earlier (esp. the oracle property) but no algorithm currently exists to solve the adaptive group lasso problem in the case of logistic regression. We conjecture based on the results of the linear regression case extended to the logistic case that if we could extend adaptive lasso to the group lasso for logistic regression cases that the same desirable properties of adaptive lasso would hold, especially the oracle property.

Finally the usual problems of outliers, etc., as always, raise their head. The Bianco-Yohai algorithm (Bianco and Martinez (2011) ) is a start but this hasn’t been extended to any penalized shrinkage regression method. We conclude that there is much work to be done and fully expect to see other papers like this one in the future and hopefully statistical practice can continue to evolve and even better solutions can be applied to these interesting and important problems.

7. Conclusion

We have attempted in this paper to bring up to date statistical thinking to the problem of the identification and use of disease risk factors, where stepwise regression is still too often used. Much remains to be done, but we hope that the ideas presented here will improve statistical practice in this very important area. In the process of bringing this thinking up to date, we have shown that we recover a currently known risk factor and identify two new risk factors which suggest the value of our approach. These new risk factor results are particularly important since the SEPP1 gene product has recently been shown to be in the same metabolic pathway as a tumor suppressor for prostate cancer (Ansong et al 2015)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INCLUSIONSTATUS</td>
<td>Cancer status at inclusion</td>
<td>0 = Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_INCLUSIONAGE_YRS</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1 = Cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENTSTATUS</td>
<td>Updated cancer status</td>
<td>0 = Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>T- Stage</td>
<td>1 = Cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N - Stage</td>
<td>Staging 1 to 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>M - Stage</td>
<td>-1 = Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFF</td>
<td>Tumour Differentiation</td>
<td>9 = No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLEASON</td>
<td>Gleason Score</td>
<td>Staging 1 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA</td>
<td>Prostate specific antigen</td>
<td>-1 = Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>Advanced stage cancer in at least one of the above markers (TNM, Diff,</td>
<td>99 = No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gleason, PSA) See below for how the cancers were classified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_STRATUM</td>
<td>Stratification of data based on age and geographical location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMHIST</td>
<td>Family history</td>
<td>0 = No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smokeEver</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alcoEver</td>
<td>Alcohol consumption</td>
<td>0 = Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_BMI</td>
<td>Body Mass Index</td>
<td>1 = Ever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MnSOD_AD_Final</td>
<td>SOD2 Genotype</td>
<td>99 = Data missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MnSOD_DOM_Final</td>
<td>SOD2 Dominant Model</td>
<td>-1 = No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeP_Ad_Final</td>
<td>SePP1 Genotype</td>
<td>1 &lt; BMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeP_DOM_Final</td>
<td>SePP1 Dominant Model</td>
<td>0 = Val/Val</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inclusion_age_banded</td>
<td>Age banded within 10 years</td>
<td>1 = Val/Ala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad_control_100_final</td>
<td>Aggressive and Control. All other cases excluded</td>
<td>2 = Ala/Ala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc_control_100</td>
<td>Non-aggressive and Control. All other cases excluded</td>
<td>1 = Val/Ala and Ala/Ala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cases were classified as either non-aggressive at diagnosis (tumor stage 1 and 2, Gleason score < 8, Differentiation G1-G2, NP/NX, MO/MX, PSA < 100 μg/L; NPC) or aggressive at diagnosis (tumor stage 3-4, Gleason score ≥ 8, Differentiation G3-G4, N+, M+, PSA ≥ 100 μg/L; APC).
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ABSTRACT

As the global data explosion is driven in part by the social media phenomenon, every enterprise needs to build capabilities to leverage the explosion of data and data analytics to stay competitive. Merchant review sites are one of social media’s big data sources. Merchant review sites such as Yelp and Angie’s List create value by allowing consumers to easily post their reviews on merchants and helping merchants promote their businesses. Currently, a large amount of merchant review data are available at these merchant review sites, and more and more consumers are using other consumers’ reviews for their purchasing decisions. A big data analysis of these merchant review data is challenging, since they are large, complex, and unstructured. In light of this phenomenon, this paper reviews big data and data analytics, and develops a research model for analyzing the relationship between WOM factors of Groupon users’ review and the usefulness of the review to viewers.

INTRODUCTION

The technological developments in big data-related infrastructure, software, and services allow enterprises to transform themselves into data-driven companies which leverage tremendous amount of data about their business activities to make timely informed decisions. Statistics shows that big data has the potential to become a game changer in the near future. The International Data Corporation (IDC) (2015) forecasts that big data technology and services market will grow at a compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of 23.1% over the 2014-2019 period with annual spending reaching $48.6 billion in 2019.

As one of the more promising big data sources, various social media platforms have creates a paradigm shift in the way organizations operate and collaborate. User-generated content has flooded social media sites to share ideas and exchange information. A variety of big data created at social media sites, such as Facebook and LinkedIn, have created new business opportunities and revenue models. Consumer review is one of the big data sources. Consumer review became an integral marketing source that led to high involvement and attention from consumers, especially in an online retailing context (Petrescu, 2016). Reviews written by consumers are perceived to be less biased than the information provided by advertisers or product experts and can provide impartial information for viewers to make purchasing decisions. The review credibility can be further enhanced by providing a feedback function for other consumers to rate the
usefulness of the particular reviews. With the explosive growth of consumer reviews at various merchant/product review sites and social media sites, electronic Word-of-Mouth (eWOM) as a contributor of social media has drawn much attention from researchers and practitioners. eWOM is referred to as the spreading of online reviews, arguments, and recommendations to potential customers concerning personal experiences with specific products or service providers (Hennig-Thurau, Gwinner, Walsh, & Gremler, 2004). eWOM proved to have a significant impact on consumers’ product selection (Casaló, Flavián, & Guinalíu, 2010).

Compared with online advertisement, positive eWOM is more effective for building reputation and credibility that can increase consumer acquisition and brand loyalty (Dellarocas, 2003). On the other hand, consumers have more concerns on negative eWOM than on positive eWOM (Shih, 2016). Yelp, TripAdvisor, and Angie’s List are specialized merchant review sites that enable consumers to generate eWOM in the form of online product reviews, merchant reviews, blogs, and social tagging. Consumers’ reviews are written comments that are qualitative and review scores are quantitative in nature. These two pieces of information put together facilitate the decision making process for viewers. For example, Yelp enables a consumer to rate a particular merchant based on a numerical scale of 1 to 5. Yelp provides viewers with reputation information including an aggregated score for positive, negative, and neutral review scores, along with the facility to read related comments.

Merchant review data is part of big data. Big data is an all-encompassing term for any collection of data sets which are so large, complex and unstructured, that it becomes difficult to process using traditional data processing applications (Chen, Tao, Wang, & Chen, 2015). Big data is collected for many different purposes such as fraud detection, web content analysis, and national security. Before the advent of cloud computing, traditional information systems were hardly able to handle big data. The big data analytics involves analytical methods for traditional data and big data, big data storage technologies, data processing optimization technologies, and software tools used for mining and analysis of big data. Data analysis is the final and most important phase in the value chain of big data, with the purpose of extracting useful values, providing suggestions or decisions (Chen, Mao, Zhang, & Leung, 2014). It is challenging to analyze merchant review data since merchant data are large, complex and unstructured with texts, images, and videos.

With the widespread adoption of merchant reviews and e-WOM, merchants must find ways to capitalize on consumer reviews to improve their products and services. An in-depth understanding of eWOM factors of consumer reviews on its usefulness for viewers will help merchants make timely and effective responses to customers’ needs and concerns. However, there are a paucity of eWOM studies on the merchant review, and many merchants are in need of practical guides in managing their review data. In light of the current gap in theories and practices in this area, this study will review big data and data analytics, and investigate the eWOM factors that affect the usefulness of the merchant reviews posted by Groupon users. This study uses select review data posted at Yelp.
BIG DATA

Laney (2001) suggested that Volume, Variety, and Velocity (or the Three V’s) are the three dimensions of challenges in data management. While a number of attributes of big data have been presented, the Three Vs have emerged as a common framework to describe big data (Chen, Chiang, & Storey, 2012; Kwon, Lee, & Shin, 2014). For example, Gartner defines big data as high-volume, high-velocity and/or high-variety information assets that demand cost-effective, innovative forms of information processing that enable enhanced insight, decision making, and process automation (Gartner, n.d.). The following describe the Three V’s and select attributes of big data presented by others.

Volume
Volume refers to the amount of data a company or an individual generates. Big data sizes are considered to be in multiple terabytes and petabytes. While currently one terabyte is the minimum size of big data, the size qualified as big data is a function of time and technological advancement. One terabyte stores as much data as would fit on 1500 CDs or 220 DVDs, enough to store around 16 million Facebook photographs (Gandomi & Haider, 2015). New data has been added at an increasing rate due to technological advances over time. More sources of data are added on a continuous basis as more devices are connected to the Internet for data collection and processing. Business transaction systems, social media, and IoT sensor data generate high volume text, audio, images, and video. It is expected that 40 zettabyte data will be created by 2020 (about 43 trillion gigabytes), a 300 times increase from 2005.

Variety
Variety refers to the number of types of data. Technological advances allow firms to use various types of structured, semi-structured, and unstructured data. Pure text, photo, audio, video, web, GPS data, and sensor data are examples of unstructured data, which sometimes lack the structural organization required by machines for analysis. Semi-structured data is a type of data that does not conform to a relational database data format, but can be defined to accommodate certain structural needs of data. An example of semi-structured data is Extensible Markup Language (XML). Structured data refers to the defined data found in spreadsheets or relational databases. As big data is evolving, the variety of data increases and unstructured data are generated at a much faster rate than structured data. As new analytics techniques are developed for unstructured data, the data format is no longer the impediment for the analysis. Currently, widely used data for analytics include content at various social media, web server logs, various sensor data, audio data, clickstream data, the content of web pages, images, and videos. In addition to the Three V’s, other dimensions of big data have also been proposed by IBM, SAS, and Oracle.

Velocity
Velocity refers to the speed at which data are generated and processed. The velocity of data increases over time. Initially, companies analyzed data using a batch process because
the speed of data collection was slower than the processing. With real-time collection of data from social media, mobile devices and sensors, the batch process breaks down due to unacceptably delayed responses to events. In 2015, Facebook users sent on average 31.25 million messages and view 2.77 million videos every minute. Passenger airplanes are generating half a terabyte of data per flight. While data can be streamed into the server for a batch processing, many business situations demand real-time or near real-time responses. Data streams at this unprecedented speed must be dealt with in a timely manner for the result to be useful. Gartner (2015) forecasts that 6.4 billion connected things will be in use worldwide in 2016, up 30 percent from 2015, and will reach 20.8 billion by 2020. In 2016, 5.5 million new things will get connected every day, all developed to collect, analyze, and share data. The enhanced real-time processing capability for steaming data will continue to accelerate the velocity.

IBM added Veracity as the fourth V, which represents the unreliability and uncertainty inherent in some sources of data. IBM states that one third of business leaders do not trust data they use for their decision makings. Poor data quality costs the US economy $3.1 trillion per year. Customer sentiments in social media are uncertain in nature due to subjective human opinions. Yet they carry valuable information about customers’ preferences and behaviors. The imprecise and uncertain data is analyzed using tools and techniques developed for processing uncertain data. SAS added two additional dimensions to big data: Variability and Complexity. Variability refers to the variation in the data flow rates. In addition to the increasing velocities and varieties of data, data flows can be highly inconsistent with periodic peaks and troughs. Event-triggered peak data are challenging to manage effectively with limited resources. On the other hand, investment in resources based on the peak-level computing demand will be highly costly due to overall low utilization of the resources given the investment. Complexity refers the number of data sources. Big data comes from numerous sources, which makes it difficult to collect, cleanse, store, and process heterogeneous data across different systems. It is necessary to reduce the impact of the complexity with open sources, standard platforms, real-time analysis of streaming data, high-performance storage systems, and high-performance data analytics. Finally, Oracle introduced Value as a defining attribute of big data. Enterprises need to understand the strategic importance of using big data to their competitive advantage, but at the same time the cost aspect of big data. Data itself without analysis would be low value. Data analytics will transform low value data into high value information. Explosive amounts of data will be generated in the near future and IT professionals need to assess the value and cost of running data analytics on big data and minimize the analytics for analytics activities, and provide value-added information to make critical, data-driven decisions.

This paper proposes one additional attribute, decay of data, to the big data community. Decay of data refers to the declining value of data over time. In times of high velocity of data generation, the timely processing and acting on the analysis is all the more important. Social media is generating large amounts of data real-time, so more and more data analytics require continuous real time processing. Negative comments about merchants’ service will spread quickly through social networking sites and the comments may have a devastating effect on the reputation of the merchants, if not responded to
quickly. The relevance and usefulness of information collected from social media will decline quickly after the creation of the contents. In general, the value of user-generated contents will depend on the timeliness of the data processing and responses.

SOCIAL MEDIA ANALYTICS

Social media analytics supports content mining, usage mining, and structure mining activities in various social media settings. Social media analytics analyzes and interprets human behaviors at social media sites, providing insights and drawing conclusions from a consumer’s interests, web browsing patterns, friend lists, sentiments, profession, and opinions. By understanding customers better with social media analytics, companies can develop more tailored marketing campaigns to target customer segments and improve customer relationships. For example, large insurance companies are analyzing clients’ comments about their service experiences and satisfaction and examining clients’ online social networks to find key influencers using social media analytics. Unlike online analytical processing for structured data, social media analytics is challenging in that social media data are heterogeneous and unstructured and is comprised of natural language that is heavily context dependent (Hu & Liu, 2012). The worldwide social media analytics market is growing rapidly from $1.60 billion in 2015 to $5.40 billion by 2020, at a compound annual growth rate of 27.6%. This growth is attributable to the technological changes from traditional business intelligence (BI) to advanced analytics and the increase in the number of social media users (PRNewswire, 2106). Some of the social media analytics software is provided as a cloud-based service with flexible fee options such as monthly subscription or pay-as-you-go payment.

Sentiment Analysis

Sentiment analysis is one of the major techniques used by social media analytics. It uses text analysis, natural language processing, and computational linguistics to identify and extract user sentiments or opinions from various source materials. Sentiment analysis can be done on an entity level, sentence level, and document level. An entity level analysis identifies and examines individual entity’s opinions reported in one document. A sentence level analysis identifies and examines each sentiment expressed in sentences. A document level analysis identifies a single top-level sentiment expressed in the while document. While deeper understanding of sentiment and more accuracy of analysis remain to be seen, subjective information extracted about various topics has been used successfully for real world tasks including predicting stock market movements, determining market trends, analyzing product defects, and managing crises (Fan & Gordon, 2014).

Lexical-based methods and machine learning methods are two widely used methods for sentiment analysis. Lexical-based methods use a predefined set of words where each word carries a specific sentiment. They include simple word (phrase) counts; the use of emoticons to detect the polarity (i.e., positive and negative emoticons used in a message) (Park, Barash, Fink, & Cha, 2013); sentiment lexicons (based on the words in the lexicon that have received specific features marking the positive or negative terms in a message) (Gayo-Avello, 2011); the use of psychometric scales to identify mood-based sentiments.
One of the challenges of the lexical-based methods is to create a lexical-based dictionary to be used for different contexts.

Machine learning methods often rely on the use of supervised and unsupervised machine learning methods. While one advantage of learning-based methods is their ability to adapt and create trained models for specific purposes and contexts, their drawback is the availability of labeled data and hence the low applicability of the method on new data (Gonçalves, Araújo, Benevenuto, & Cha, 2013). In addition, labeling data might be costly or even prohibitive for some tasks. While machine learning methods are reported to perform better than lexical methods, it is hard to conclude whether a single machine learning method is better than all lexical methods across different tasks. In addition, both simple and sophisticated methods of sentiment analysis can be effective or flawed. Sampling biases in the data can badly skew results as in situations where satisfied customers remain silent while those with more extreme positions incessantly voice their opinions (Fan & Gordon, 2014).

**Social Network Analysis**

Social network analysis is the process of analyzing structures of social networks through the use of network and standard graph theories. Social network analysis was originally developed before the advent of social media to study patterns of relationships that connect social actors in modern sociology. A social network analysis focuses on measuring the network structure, connections, the importance of nodes, and other properties. A social network consists of actors and associated relationships among actors. The relationships are typically identified from user links directly connecting two actors or inferred indirectly from tagging, social-oriented interactions, content sharing, and voting. Marlow (2004) employs social network analysis to describe the social structure of blogs. He has explored two metrics of authority: popularity measured by bloggers’ public affiliations and influence measured by citation of the writing. Social networking sites such as Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn have provided fertile grounds for advancing online social network theories and practices. Although these sites feature much of the same content that appears on personal web pages, social network sites provide a central point of access and bring structure in the process of personal information sharing and online socialization (Jamali & Abolhassani, 2006).

Social network analysis provides both a visual and a mathematical analysis of actor relationships within a network by modeling social network dynamics and growth (network density, network centrality, network flows, etc.). It is used to identify substructure within a superstructure in terms of groupings or cliques. The number, size, and connections among the sub-groupings within a network can shed useful insights on the likely behavior of the network as a whole, allowing for greater effectiveness in segmented marketing efforts. Social network analysis uses a variety of techniques pertinent to understanding the structure of the network (Scott, 2012). These range from simpler methods (such as counting the number of edges a node has or computing path lengths) to more sophisticated methods that compute eigenvectors to determine key nodes in a network (Fan & Gordon, 2014).
ELECTRONIC WORD OF MOUTH (eWOM)

Word-of-mouth (WOM) occurs when consumers in a network generate a message or trend through conversations (Bass, 1969). WOM is one of the factors that shape consumers’ attitudes and behaviors in their purchasing decisions. In the travel industry, WOM is one of the most often sought information sources by travelers (Yoon & Uysal, 2005). Many travelers are adventure-seekers and plan to visit new areas. They heavily rely on other travelers’ experiences for their decision making. Electronic word-of-mouth (EWOM) refers to WOM taking place over the Internet in the form of online reviews, online recommendations, or online opinions. While WOM usually occurs on a one-on-one basis without much interference from marketers (Kozinets, Valck, Wojnicki, & Wilner, 2010), eWOM takes advantage of various social media and product/merchant review sites. Social media serve as a fertile ground for marketers’ and advertisers’ intervention in the formation and diffusion of eWOM. Realizing that online reviews can affect a company’s performance, companies are increasingly seeking to understand the factors that influence the use of eWOM by viewers (Cantallops, Salvi, & Cardona, 2016).

Previous studies encompass determinants of eWOM adoption (Cheung, Luo, Sia, & Chen, 2009), motives for eWOM (Brown, Barry, & Dacin, 2005; Hennig-Thurau and Walsh, 2003-4; Shih, Lai, & Cheng, 2013), and the eWOM on sales (Amblee & Bui, 2011-12; Chevalier & Mayzlin, 2006). eWOM is created not only for an information exchange (Cheung et al., 2009; Shih et al., 2013), but also for a social exchange driven by social influence (Aral, 2014). Various types of eWOM can be identified with a two-dimensional scheme: a) communication scope: from one-to-one (emails), one-to-many (review sites) or many-to-many (virtual communities); and b) level of interactivity: from asynchronous (emails, review sites, blogs) to synchronous (chatrooms, newsgroups, instant messaging) (Cantallops, Salvi, & Cardona, 2016). Companies which manage eWOM effectively will have a competitive advantage, directing their resources to target customer groups, acquiring new customers who could be potentially loyal to their products, and maintaining existing customers (Loureiro & Kastenholz, 2011). Positive eWOM can enhance the market reputation of the company as well as the possibility of raising price premiums (Yacouel & Fleischer, 2011). On the other hand, negative eWOM can reduce consumer interest in the products/services and damage the brand image.

MERCHANT REVIEW

Social media is one of the big data sources and has drawn significant attention from researchers and practitioners. Users of social media create big data. For example, Facebook users send on average 31.25 million messages and view 2.77 million videos every minute. Companies use data analytics to process the massive amount of user-generated content and to tailor products and services to customers’ needs and interests. Merchant review sites are one of the big data sources where users post experiences about products and services of merchants.

Papathanassis and Knolle (2011) suggest that consumers engage in information-seeking activities to minimize the risk related to the purchase of an intangible and inseparable
service bundle. A key actor/friend plays a major role in the information dissemination within, between, and among social network members (Katona, Zubcsek, & Sarvary, 2011) and is a nexus for information-seeking consumers. Review helpfulness is one of the metrics used to measure the value of peer-generated evaluations (Mudambi & Schuff, 2010). Baek, Ahn, and Choi (2012-13) define review helpfulness as the degree to which other consumers believe the review is helpful in making a purchase decision. Factors for review helpfulness include content or target of reviews, the overall tone or valence of the reviews (as a collection), the framing of the review set (what is read first), and easy-to-process peripheral information such as consumer generated numerical ratings (Cantallops et al., 2016).

Peer-to-peer communication is valuable when consumers need to choose among similar products and brands. Peer-to-peer communication is also useful for promoting credence and experience goods (Datta, Chowdhury, & Chakraborty, 2005; Derbaix & Vanhamme 2003). Peer-to-peer communication is in general considered more credible than commercial communication because peers are people who usually have a better image and higher trust potential than an advertiser (Allsop, Bassett, & Hoskins, 2007). Chiu, Hsieh, Kao, and Lee (2007) suggest that consumers trust their strong ties in their social networks more than their weak ties, and are more influenced by strong ties in their purchasing decisions. Cheung and Ho (2015) find that consumers are more likely to trust a reviewer who has a higher number of followers and higher word count. Product rating made by peers in online forums has a great viral effect on a purchasing decision (Moe and Trusov, 2011).

Merchant review sites such as Yelp, TripAdvisor, and Angie’s List enable consumers to generate online product reviews, merchant reviews, blogs, and social tagging. Many review sites provide metrics such as number of “likes”, the number of “useful” or number of “cool” and “funny.” It is still the case that merchants fail to fully exploit and translate product reviews into business values, when these reviews can be used to improve their service. In this light, it would be interesting to understand the relationship between the eWOM characteristics of merchant reviews and the viewers’ responses to these characteristics. Against the backdrop of the previous studies, this study attempts to understand the relationship between eWOM factors and the usefulness of product reviews in the context of Groupon users’ merchant reviews.

THE ANALYSIS OF GROUNON USERS’ MERCHANT REVIEWS AND PERCEIVED USEFULNESS

Based on the literature review in the previous section, five factors of merchant reviews were identified that may influence the usefulness of the review. The five factors include the review score of a reviewer, the number of friends of a reviewer, the cumulative number of reviews made by a reviewer, the number of words in a review, and the existence of images/photos. The dependent variable is the number of usefulness votes. The number of usefulness votes is used to measure the usefulness of the review.
A multiple regression model is used to identify the factors that are strongly associated with the number of usefulness votes. Multiple Regression (v1.0.32) from Free Statistics Software is used for the analysis (http://www.wessa.net/rwasp_multiplemregression.wasp/). 108 healthcare merchants launched Groupon promotions from the fifty largest U.S. cities between June and July of 2011. Healthcare refers to anything from a haircut salon and spa to a fitness or yoga training. We visited Yelp in July 2015 to collect Groupon users’ review data. Groupon users were identified at the Yelp’s web pages of the 108 healthcare merchants, and their reviews were transcribed for further analysis. Out of 589 reviews, we removed 189 reviews which do not have any response from viewers. 400 reviews were analyzed using a multiple regression model. The descriptive statistics are shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Merchant Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review Score</td>
<td>3.365</td>
<td>1.5705</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Friends</td>
<td>72.0675</td>
<td>165.3403</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Reviews</td>
<td>96.37</td>
<td>168.382</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Words</td>
<td>221.9625</td>
<td>163.2673</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image/Photo</td>
<td>0.0375</td>
<td>0.1899</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Number of Usefulness Vote</td>
<td>4.0525</td>
<td>4.9091</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Analysis on Healthcare Services**

A regression was run on the six variables. Table 2 shows the beta coefficients of these variables as well as their *p*-values. The regression was run with a 5% level of significance.

Table 2. Results of the Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>T-STAT H0: parameter = 0</th>
<th>2-tail p-value</th>
<th>1-tail p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>+3.189</td>
<td>0.8144</td>
<td>+3.9160e+00</td>
<td>0.0001061</td>
<td>5.306e-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>score</td>
<td>-0.6327</td>
<td>0.1469</td>
<td>-4.3080e+00</td>
<td>2.083e-05</td>
<td>0.0007305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friend</td>
<td>+0.005573</td>
<td>0.001739</td>
<td>+3.2050e+00</td>
<td>0.001461</td>
<td>0.0007305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>review</td>
<td>+0.001353</td>
<td>0.001692</td>
<td>+7.9920e-01</td>
<td>0.4247</td>
<td>0.2123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word</td>
<td>+0.00922</td>
<td>0.001384</td>
<td>+6.6610e+00</td>
<td>9.169e-11</td>
<td>4.585e-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>image</td>
<td>+0.7173</td>
<td>1.203</td>
<td>+5.9620e-01</td>
<td>0.5514</td>
<td>0.2757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>+0.001929</td>
<td>0.001976</td>
<td>+9.7620e-01</td>
<td>0.3296</td>
<td>0.1648</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results show that the review score, the number of friends of a reviewer, and the number of words in a review are significant predictors of the number of usefulness votes. The cumulative number of reviews made by a reviewer and the existence of images/photos do not have impact on the number of usefulness votes. It is noted that as the review score increases, the number of usefulness votes decreases. The review score’s inverse relationship the number of usefulness votes indicates when review scores are low, viewers are more interested in the review. Viewers give more credibility to reviewers who have more friends in their network. Therefore, merchants need to pay more attention to a strong network leader in terms of the number of friends than a weak network leader. This result is consistent with a finding that consumers are more likely to trust a reviewer who has a higher number of followers (Cheung & Ho, 2015). Finally, the number of words has a significant positive effect on the number of usefulness votes. This variable plays a significant role, since the higher number of words indicates that more information is available to viewers and leads to the reduced information asymmetry between the merchant and the potential customers. This result is also consistent with the previous findings (Baek et al., 2012-13; Cheung & Ho, 2015).

CONCLUSION

The main purposes of this study are to review big data and data analytics, and to understand Groupon users’ merchant reviews and their usefulness to viewers. This study attempts to answer an important question in the context of a big data setting - “What are the factors that affect the usefulness of merchant reviews made by Groupon users?” We collected the review data four years after the initial Groupon promotions were launched by the healthcare merchants and were able to answer the above-mentioned question.

Our analysis shows that the number of usefulness votes has a high correlation with (1) the review score, (2) the number of friends of a reviewer, and (3) the number of words in a review. Based on the analysis, we recommend merchants to develop online review metrics and analyze the metrics to improve services and product performances. Key
metrics may include the number of social connections and followers, the number of reviews and review scores, the number of comments, and response time to comments.

This study is the first research attempt in understanding Groupon users’ reviews and their usefulness to viewers, and therefore makes significant contributions to research and practice. However, as is typical in many empirical studies, this study is not without limitations. First, while we limited the analysis of merchant review to the six factors, additional variables may exist. These additional variables may also influence the number of usefulness votes. Therefore, future research needs to identify such variables to build a comprehensive model while maintaining the conciseness of the model. Second, this study focused mainly on healthcare services. Future research needs to address other types of businesses, such as restaurants and entertainment, and compare differences between them.
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**ABSTRACT**

Matlab, Python and R have all been used successfully in teaching college students fundamentals of mathematics & statistics. In today’s data driven environment, the study of data through big data analytics is very powerful, especially for the purpose of decision making and using data statistically in this data rich environment. Matlab can be used to teach introductory mathematics such as calculus and statistics. Both Python and R can be used to make decisions involving big data. On the one hand, Python is perfect for teaching introductory statistics in a data rich environment. On the other hand, while R is a little more involved, there are many customizable programs that can make somewhat involved decisions in the context of prepackaged, preprogrammed statistical analysis.
MatLab vs. Python vs. R

INTRODUCTION

This paper compares the effectiveness of MatLab, Python (Numpy, SciPy) and R in a teaching environment. In this paper we have tried to establish which programming language is best to teach operations research and statistics to students in a college setting. We have also attempted to determine which skill is most desirable to have knowledge about in the workplace.

To begin, Python is a type of programming language. The most common implementation to this programming language is that in C (also known as CPython). Not only is Python a programming language, but it consists of a large standard library. This library is structured to focus on general programming and contain modules for os specific, threading, networking, and databases.

Next, Matlab is most highly regarded as not only a commercial numerical computing environment, but also as a programming language. Matlab similarly has a standard library, but its uses include matrix algebra and a large network for data processing and plotting. It also contains toolkits for the avid learner, but these will cost the user extra.

Lastly, R is a free, open-source statistical software. Colleagues at the University of Auckland in New Zealand, Robert Gentleman and Ross Ihaka, created the software in 1993 because they mutually saw a need for a better software environment for their classes. R has certainly outgrown its origins, now boasting more than two million users according to an R Community website (“What is R?” 2014).

Although both Python and R are open source programming languages, you do not have to be a programmer to utilize them. While programs such as Excel and SPSS may be simpler and faster to learn, their computational abilities are far inferior to those of Python, R, and Matlab, which require only basic programming knowledge. Between these three programs, when it comes to usability, Python may be a better choice because the syntax it uses compares more similarly to other languages. However, many programmers believe the syntax used by R to be easily learned and understood without explicit instruction. Kevin Markham, a data scientist and teacher, suggested in his article on software learnability that Python and R have comparable learning curves for students without any prior programming experience. Despite this similarity, there is an argument that Python can be easier to learn because its code is read more like regular human language (Markham). There is a tradeoff between the simplicity of closed-source preprogrammed software and the more complicated yet empowering open-source software. If all you require is straightforward, small data analysis, you may not need to look any further than Excel and SPSS. The extent of Python, Matlab, and R, however, reaches numerous additional dimensions of big data analysis capability. Universities may wish to pursue offering instruction on these programs as they are better suited for working with big data and more widely used in the workplace.
MATLAB VS. PYTHON

Figure 1: MatLab vs. Python

Basics of Matlab

Matlab is a programming language used mostly by engineers and data analysts for numerical computations. There are a variety of toolboxes available when first purchasing Matlab to further enhance the basic functions that are already available upon purchase. Matlab is available on Unix, Macintosh, and Windows environments, but is also available for student usage on personal computers.

Advantages of Matlab

Matlab has a large number of committed users which include many universities and a few companies who have the budget to buy a license for the program. Even though it is used in many universities, Matlab is easy for beginners who are just starting to learn about programming language because the package, when purchased, includes all that you will need. When using Python you are required to install extra packages. One part of Matlab is a product called Simulink, which is a core part of the Matlab package for which there does not yet exist a good alternative in other programming languages.

Basics of Python

Python is another available programming language that can be accessed and used easily by the most experienced programmers, but also by novice students. Python is a programming language that can be used for both major and smaller projects. This is due to its adaptable and being a well-developed programming language. It is a widely used program due to its efficient nature of programming features. Python has also simplified debugging for the programmer due to its built-in debugging feature. Python has
ultimately helped programmers become more productive and efficient with their time and has made their developments better.

Advantages of Python

Using Python has many advantages to the programmers. The first is that Python is free to the public and to anyone who wants to use the program. This gives an advantage because it allows anyone who has the motivation to learn the program to use it as they please. It is also an easy program to learn and to read. It is much more generic than Matlab which originally started as a matrix manipulation package that later added a programming language to it. Python is also much easier to make your original ideas into a coding language. With this free program it comes with libraries, lists, and dictionaries that will help the programmer achieve their ultimate goal in a well-organized way. It is used by working with a variety of modules, which allows it to start up very quickly. When using Python it is soon realized that everything is an object, so each object has a namespace itself. This helps give the program structure while keeping it clean and simple. This is why Python excels at introspection. Introspection is what comes from the object nature of Python. Due to Python’s easy and clear structure mentioned earlier, introspection is easy to do on this program. This is key in being able to access any part of the program, including Python’s internal structures. String manipulation is also simple, easy, and efficient when using Python. Due to Python being virtually available to everyone because of its free of cost nature, it can run on any type of system. These include: Windows, Linux, and OS X. On Python functions and classes can be defined and used wherever the user would like and programmers can design as many as they deem necessary. With Python a user can personally create an application that they think looks good and works well for them. A programmer can choose from a variety of the available GUI (graphical user interface) toolkits.

Advantages of Python over Matlab

As one who has become thoroughly familiar with the range of both Matlab’s and Python’s capabilities through years of use, Phillip Feldman offers the following reasons as to why the qualities of Python are advantageous to those of Matlab despite the their numerous comparable qualities.

1. Python code is more compact and easier to read than Matlab code.
   a. Unlike Matlab, which uses end statement to indicate the end of a block, Python determines block size based on indentation.
   b. Python uses square brackets for indexing and parentheses for functions and methods, whereas Matlab uses parentheses for both, making Matlab more difficult to differentiate and understand.
   c. Python’s better readability leads to fewer bugs and faster debugging.
2. While most programming languages, including Python, use zero-based indexing, Matlab uses one-based indexing making it more confusing for users to translate.
3. The object-oriented programming (OOP) in Python is simple flexibility while Matlab’s OOP scheme is complex and confusing.
4. Python is free and open.
   a. While Python is open source programming, much of Matlab is closed
b. The developers of Python encourage users to input suggestions for the software, while the developers of Matlab offer no such interaction.

5. There is no Matlab counterpart to Python’s `import` statement.

6. Python offers a wider set of choices in graphics package and toolsets

**Utilization of Python**

Python has been gaining momentum as being the programming language for novice users. Highly ranked Computer Science departments at MIT and UC Berkeley use Python to teach their novice programming language students. The three largest Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) providers (edX, Coursera, and Udacity) all use Python as their programming language for their beginning courses in programming. A variety of professors in other disciplines now utilize the need for novice students to understand Python and its key features.

**Analysis for Python vs. Matlab**

The graph below (Figure 2) accurately shows the top 39 computer science departments that use introductory languages in their curriculum. The seven introductory languages evaluated were Python, Java, Matlab, C, C++, Scheme, and Scratch. The two that we will be concentrating on are Python and Matlab.

**Figure 2:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number of Departments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Python</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Java</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matlab</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C++</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scratch</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comparison of Python to other programming languages**

Python is clearly the most popular introductory language that was being taught, from the selection on this list. It surpassed Java, that was until recently the most used introductory teaching language over the past decade. Python has been added to most schools teaching
curriculum due to its easy to learn and use programs and features. With Python, beginning students do not have to focus their energies on details like types, compilers, and writing boilerplate code, and other algorithms. Python allows the students to easily code the and make the program accomplish the tasks that they want to see achieved. Matlab was the next most popular programming language after Python and Java. It was mostly entered into the curriculum for science and engineering. This is due to its more advanced features and language characteristics.

R VS. PYTHON

When beginning to use R the programmer reads their data into a data frame, used a built-in model by using R’s formula language, and then can later look back at the model summary output. When getting started with Python, the programmer has many more choices to make. These can include choosing how they would like to read their data, what kind of structure they should use to store their data in, what machine learning package they should use, and what type of objects does the package even allow to be in the input. Other concerns for the programmer when starting Python could include what shape should the previous talked about objects be in, how does the programmer include categorical variables, and how does the user even access the model’s output? There are many beginning questions for Python because it is a general purpose programming language, On the other hand, R specializes in a smaller subset of statistical data and tasks so it is much easier for a programmer to get started.
As seen above, data miners use R, SAS, and SPSS the most. Because 47%, 32%, and 32% percent of respondents use R, SAS, and SPSS, respectively, it can be inferred that these are the software skills that the greatest proportion of employers will continue to look for (Ozgur, 2015). Surprisingly, schools do not teach students the same software that businesses look for. In his article that measures the popularity of many data analysis software, Robert Muenchen notes that discovering the software skills that employers are seeking would “require a time consuming content analysis of job descriptions” (Muenchen, 2014). However, he finds other ways to figure out the statistical software skills that employers seek. One of these methods is to examine which software they currently use. Muenchen includes a survey conducted by Rexer Analytics, a data mining consulting firm, about the relative popularity of various data analysis software in 2010. The results of the survey are pictured in Figure 1. As seen, data miners use R, SAS, and SPSS the most. Because 47%, 32%, and 32% percent of respondents use R, SAS, and SPSS, respectively, it can be inferred that these are the software skills that the greatest
proportion of employers will continue to look for. However, this method only examines
the software that employers might seek if they are hiring, so it does not accurately
measure the software that they currently look for. Muenchen’s other method does this,
studying software skills that employers currently seek as they try to fill open positions. In
this approach, Muenchen puts together a rough sketch of statistical software capabilities
sought by employers by perusing the job advertising site, Indeed.com, a search site the
comprises the major job boards—Monster, Careerbuilder, Hotjobs, Craigslist—as well as
many newspapers, associations, and company websites (Muenchen, 2014). He
summarized his discovery in Figure 2.

Figure 4: Jobs requiring various software (Muenchen, 2014)

As seen—in contrast to R’s greater usage by companies over SAS, illustrated in Figure
3—job openings in SAS substantially lead open positions that require any other data
analysis software. For employers, SPSS and R skills finish in second and third place. This
second estimation method of Muenchen measures the software skill deficits in the job
market. It seems that the demand for people with SAS skills outweighs the number of
individuals with this capability. One reason for this disconnect could be that colleges and
universities are not teaching SAS skills in proportion to the demand for these skills.

PERSONAL EXPERIENCE

One of the authors has had experience with each program (MatLab, Python, and R)
within a business class setting. In the next few paragraphs he will be talking about his
experiences in each of these programs in addition to a brief discussion of SPSS, SAS, and
Excel. The pros and cons of all the various applications will be discussed from a
student’s perspective including a description of how the programs are being used in
today’s classrooms to enhance the overall educational experience. Although SPSS, SAS,
and Excel are not the major software applications being discussed in this paper, it is
necessary to briefly discuss them since they are also major competitors that students may
encounter after graduation.
Microsoft Excel was probably the most commonplace software that was used in all of my business classes to prepare students for performing everyday analytics in their future career. Excel specifically can be used by small businesses to perform data mining for smaller data sets that consist of up to a few thousand rows. Excel is extremely easy to use and since students are often times introduced to the software in elementary school, it becomes second nature to go to the program for everyday needs. Excel is so widely used that during an internship with a Fortune 50 company, I used Excel daily to help me with basic analytics. Another pro of Excel is that in later versions, you can use add-ins such as MegaStat that help with data analytics. Microsoft has since decided to incorporate many analytical tools such as regression analysis, time-series, and descriptive statistics into its Microsoft 2016 software. The major con of Excel is that it cannot be used with big datasets and therefore is not a viable option when working with big data.

SPSS is considered a medium sized analytical tool since it can be used with bigger datasets up to 2 billion cases. Although, SPSS is used for larger projects, it is still very easy to use since it is menu driven. These menu options makes SPSS a software that is quick to learn and since it has many similarities to Excel, there is hardly any learning curve. This makes it a very good option for business analytics classes since professors will not be required to spend copious amounts of time acquainting students to a new program. I used SPSS in an Econometrics course while handling an Enterprise Survey Dataset that contained approximately 12 million cases. A con of SPSS that might not make it extremely attractive to be taught is that it can be difficult to perform data cleansing. Unlike using a programming language like R, SAS, or Python, the user has to manually clean the dataset.

SAS is an extremely popular analytics software that has been around for numerous years (first limited release was in 1971). My experience with SAS in the classroom environment was in an introduction to data analytics course and during a SAS Shootout Competition with other schools nationwide. The biggest pro of SAS is that it can handle as many cases as your computer has memory to process. This makes it an extremely useful analytical tool because essentially no data set can be too big. I once asked a SAS representative how many cases SAS could handle and their response was to ask me how many I needed. If your computer cannot handle the billions of cases in a dataset then you can use SAS Cloud Analytics and have near unlimited amounts of space. SAS was also the major analytical tool that my Fortune 50 employer used during my internship, and certification in the program was greatly desired. As a student the biggest con of SAS is that you need to understand the programming language. This creates a learning curve and unless a student is committed to the software it can take several weeks to begin to understand how to even import a dataset and perform basic analytics or data cleaning on a dataset.

R is a major analytical tool that I believe directly competes with SAS. My experience using R was during my internship for the Fortune 50 corporation, where R was the second largest widely used analytical tool for mining big data. I notice that the most difficult part of using R is the natural programming syntax. When teaching to students this would need to be kept in mind because it can be difficult to learn and use. On the
contrary, R has a massive amount of open source coding available online that can help users get started. This is useful for those who have difficulty understanding the language because it offers a stepping stone into the use of the program. Although R might be difficult to understand, once the user has a grasp on the software, the computing capabilities allow the program to process billions of cases quickly.

MatLab is an interesting program that I used in both calculus and differential equations courses. My main usage of MatLab was for basic computations and for graphing equations in three dimensions. These are probably the biggest pros of MatLab in my opinion. It can be used as a sophisticated calculator while also offering the user aesthetically pleasing graphical representations of data. As a student I can say that the biggest downfall of MatLab is the lack of open source code online for the program. Since the usage of the software requires a license to operate the amount of code online is scarce. This means that you have to learn the coding for every use of MatLab on your own without being able to use others preexisting code. Although this could be seen as a pro since it forces the user to emerge themselves in learning syntax, it can become cumbersome if a specific command is not working.

Python was the first programming language that I ever learned and the program was actually taught to me during a computer software course in high school. I later used the program in an Economic Development Council Internship to perform basic analytics. This brings up one of the biggest pros of Python, in my opinion, and that is that it is fairly easy to learn and offers many add-on programs. For example, I have used Pandas, which is an open source analytical tool that runs through Python. When you combine this ease of use with wide-sweeping applications, that makes Python extremely attractive both in classrooms and in work environments. You do not have to be a programmer to program in python. The commands are extremely simple and you can run commands in Python to read datasets in other statistical software such as SAS. Cons of the Python software include speed and the program’s inability to identify and fix semantic errors which could be extremely frustrating when dealing with large quantities of code to perform numerous actions. From a classroom perspective, the major con of Python would be that although it is considered an introductory programming language, this might turn away students who struggle to grasp syntax. However, I would like to note that learning Python is much easier than learning SAS or R, but more difficult to learn than SPSS or Excel.

CONCLUSION

In this paper we have discussed the pros and cons of Python, MatLab, and R. We have compared and contrasted each of the languages to one another, while also talking about the educational value of each program in a teaching environment. After reviewing all three of the programs in depth, we have reached the conclusion that Python is the best language to be taught in a classroom environment. This is because it is easy to use and will allow students access to open source coding that can be found online when performing more difficult analysis. However, we would like to note that R might be a better program to teach to students since it is widely used in corporations around the nation for data mining. Having knowledge of a program like R could provide students
with a competitive advantage while looking for a job upon graduation. In addition to R, SPSS or SAS could also be viable alternatives which should be considered when teaching big data analytics to students.
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Abstract
Debate continues between the contribution of education level and clinical expertise in the nursing practice environment. Research suggests a link between Baccalaureate of Science in Nursing (BSN) nurses and positive patient outcomes such as lower mortality, decreased falls, and fewer medication errors. **Purpose:** To examine if there a negative correlation between patient falls and the level of nurse education at an urban hospital located in Midwest Illinois during the years 2010-2014? **Methods:** A retrospective cross-sectional cohort analysis was conducted using data from the National Database of Nursing Quality Indicators (NDNQI) from the years 2010-2014. **Sample:** Inpatients aged ≥ 18 years who experienced a unintentional sudden descent, with or without injury that resulted in the patient striking the floor or object and occurred on inpatient nursing units. **Results:** The regression model was constructed with annual patient falls as the dependent variable and formal education and a log transformed variable for percentage of certified nurses as the independent variables. The model overall is a good fit, F (2,22) = 9.014, p = .001, adj. R² = .40. **Conclusion:** Annual patient falls will decrease by increasing the number of nurses with baccalaureate degrees and/or certifications from a professional nursing board-governing body.
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An Exploratory Study of Patient Falls

Research Problem

Clinical nursing expertise is essential to quality patient care. Debate continues between contribution of education level and years of experience to clinical expertise in the nursing practice environment (McHugh & Lake, 2010). Current research suggests a link between BSN (Baccalaureate of Science in Nursing) nurses and positive patient outcomes as demonstrated with decreased mortality, decreased falls, and fewer medication errors. Advanced education enhances both the quality of patient care delivery and clinical competency (American Association of Colleges of Nursing [AACN], 2014). In 2010, the Institute of Medicine (IOM) released the Future of Nursing: Leading Change, Advancing Health, which proposed an 80% baccalaureate-prepared nursing workforce by 2020 (Haverkamp & Ball, 2013). Currently, the percentage of BSN nurses in the U.S. ranges between 55%-61% (AACN, 2014). One area that nursing impacts is patient fall outcomes, as suggested by the growing body of research, reveals that education has a strong impact on a nurse’s ability to practice effectively. Evidence implies there is a connection between improved patient outcomes, such as lower levels of falls, when compared to non-BSN nurses.

One of the most widespread and serious threats to the safety of hospitalized patients is falls. Within the U.S., the ratio of patient falls in relation to patient days is 3.3 to 11.5 (Bouldin et al., 2013). Accidental patient falls comprise approximately 2% of hospital stays and are reported to be most common form of falls. The National Quality Forum (NQF) adopted patient falls as one of the eight patient outcomes to be included in the measures of nursing care performance (Lake, Shang, Klaus, & Dunton, 2010). There are many interventions in place to keep patients safe from falling during their hospital stay, but despite this endeavor patients remain at risk (Lake et al., 2010).

There are many variables that contribute to patient falls such as lack of adequate staffing, staff inexperience and knowledge, and sudden patient health events (National Database of Nursing Quality Indicators [NDNQI], 2013). A systematic review of literature was performed to collect data relating to nurse education level including BSN, patient falls, patient outcomes, the Iowa model, and ethical issues. Numerous studies have been conducted which demonstrate how nursing impacts patient safety and outcomes (Kalisch, Landstrom, & Williams, 2009).

Study Purpose

With the demands of an evolving healthcare environment and to meet the changing needs of patients, nurses must achieve higher education levels (AACN, 2014). Research indicates that many of today’s nurses are undereducated and underprepared to deal with the complexities of a changing health care environment (McHugh & Lake, 2010). The nursing profession has an obligation to society to provide quality patient care, but needs to change with the times and support baccalaureate education for nurses (AACN, 2014).
Magnet designated organizations have successful programs in place that contribute to a strong culture of patient safety. These programs have education initiatives that increase the number of nurses with BSN degrees, as well as, patient-focused initiatives such as reductions in patient falls and central line infection rates (Swanson, & Tidwell, 2011). Magnet hospitals typically employ a higher proportion of BSN nurses, 59%, compared to 34% at other hospitals (AACN, 2014). The purpose of this proposed study is to determine if there a negative correlation between patient falls and the level of nurse education at an urban hospital located in Midwest Illinois during the years 2010-2014?

**Literature Review**

A systematic literature review was performed searching electronic databases for potentially relevant articles published from January 2009 through May 2014. The search criteria contained the following keywords and subject headings in electronic databases: nurse education levels and falls or nurse education and patient safety or nurse education and patient outcomes, BSN and falls, BSN and patient outcomes or BSN and patient safety, Iowa Model, and moral and ethics in research. Eligible articles included original publications, in addition, to utilizing information from reputable nursing websites such as: AACN, ANA, and NDNQI.

Kalisch et al. (2009) conducted a qualitative study to determine which nursing care is regularly missed on medical-surgical and intensive care units (ICUs) and the reasons nursing staff imparted for missing care. One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to examine differences by hospitals, years of experience, education, and full-time or part-time status. Results concluded that associate degree nurses (ADN) had higher rates of missed care as opposed to BSN or greater nurses (p =0.023). This study has implications for nurse leaders who can use this information to focus interventions on patient areas to impact the amount of nursing care being missed to improve patient outcomes.

Wynn, Engelke, and Swanson (2009) performed a descriptive, cross-sectional, correlational study to examine relationships between nurse characteristics and rapid response team (RRT) calls. The study found that educational preparation was a strongest predictor of calling the RRT and that BSN nurses were five times more likely to call an RRT than ADN nurses (p =0.03). The relevance of this article is useful in validating the evidence that indicates nurse education background enhances both patient care delivery and clinical competency (AACN, 2013). This study has implications for clinicians and managers in health care facilities that rely on RRTs.

Lake, Shang, Klaus, and Dunton (2010) performed a retrospective cross-sectional observational study to determine the relationships between Magnet hospitals, nursing unit staffing, and patient falls. The authors theorized that adequate support, evaluation, and patient supervision to prevent falls depend on having a sufficient amount of well-educated and prepared registered nurses (RNs) and other nursing staff such as licensed
practical nurses (LPNs), nursing assistants, and unlicensed assistive personnel. Multivariate results indicate that Magnet hospitals had a 5% (3.75/1000 patient days [pd]) lower patient fall rate than non-Magnet hospitals (3.92/1000 pd). This study has implications for research, policy, and management. Healthcare facilities can improve patient safety by creating environments that are consistent with Magnet standards, which can yield cost savings. Nursing unit managers can use the fall and staffing statistics to support their staffing decisions.

Bouldin et al. (2013) explored the prevalence and trends of adult patient falls in medical, surgical, and medical-surgical nursing units to determine fall trends in hospitals before the implementation of the rule that hospitals will not be reimbursed for care by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) relating to hospital fall injuries. The study revealed that the lowest rate of falls occurred in surgical units (fall rate=2.76/1000 pd) and the highest fall rates occurred in medical units (fall rate=4.03/1000 pd).

Akien et al. (2011), investigated how patient outcomes are associated with nurse education level, nurse-to-patient staffing, and nurse work environment. The results indicated that better patient outcomes, like lower patient mortality, are associated with higher nurse education levels ($p < 0.01$).

Schreuders, Bremner, Geelhoed, and Finn (2012) investigated registered nurses’ perceptions of the relationship between nursing care and clinical outcomes based on nurse education levels. The results of this study suggest nurses’ educational background and work role may influence their perception of the impact of nursing care on patient outcomes. Postgraduate degree nurses had significantly higher mean scores compared with nurses who had not completed postgraduate degrees on the effect of nursing care on patient outcome (median=3.0, mean=3.6, SD=0.53; $p =0.0005$).

**Research Question**

The research question for this study investigates: Is there a negative correlation between patient falls and the level of nurse education at an urban hospital during the years 2010-2014? The null hypothesis being tested is that increasing the number of BSN nurses and/or the percentage of certified nurses in the patient care units lead to improved patient outcomes as measured by the number of falls reported by the inpatient units. Nurses at an urban health care facility were assessed along with the fall rates of patients that qualified for the NDNQI definition of a fall. The type of nursing degree and the percentage of certified nurses are the independent variables and the fall rate is the dependent variable. Extraneous variables to be identified and considered would include nurse patient ratio, patient acuity and case mix index. Other variables to consider would be day of the week and even month of the year as these can be associated with census and staffing.

**Methodology**

This retrospective cohort study utilized cross-sectional data (2010-2014) from the National Database of Nursing Quality Indicators (NDNQI), which represents both the
nursing population and the patient fall population of an acute care hospital in the Midwest. The NDNQI established a measurement for falls that is endorsed by the National Quality Forum (NOF) as the national standard. According to NDNQI (2013), the definition of a patient fall “is a sudden, unintentional descent, with or without injury to the patient, that results in the patient coming to rest on the floor, on or against some other surface (e.g., a counter), on another person, or on an object (e.g., trash can)”. Only patient falls on eligible nursing units are counted by NDNQI. There were five eligible adult care units that qualified for the study.

The defined unit(s) consisted of: medical unit, surgical unit, critical care unit, rehabilitation unit and medical-surgical unit. These units were selected based on the availability of complete data. Fall rates and data analysis from the intensive care unit were excluded from this study to limit statistical variance and to control extraneous variables such as high patient acuity i.e. patients on ventilators and patients on PCA (patient controlled anesthesia) pumps. The focus of this study was to examine the relationship between the number of patient falls and the education level of nurses. The level of education was considered from two perspectives.

The first perspective was a traditional view measured by the highest degree obtained for a nurse from an academic institution. Four different degrees were used in the study as follows: Diploma Nurse, Associate Degree, Bachelor Degree, and Master Degree; although PhD was originally included as a fifth level of degree, it yielded zero responses. Since the dependent variable (number of patient falls) was recorded at the medical unit level, the two independent variables (degree and certification) also needed to be consistently recorded. Unit calculations included the percentage of nurses with each degree for every year of the study; these numbers were not prorated to show mid-year transfers but represent a snapshot of each unit at a given point in time. The four degrees were then assigned nominal values of 0,1,2,3 respectively and weighted by their corresponding percentages to yield a level of degree for each unit by year.

The second perspective of education level was a functional view determined by whether or not a nurse was certified. Certification is defined as one that sat for and passed an exam from a professional nursing, governing body. A medical unit’s certification level was simply the percentage of nurses in the unit that were certified. As with the level of degree previously described, these numbers were not prorated to show mid-year transfers but represent a snapshot of each unit at a given point in time.

**Moral and Ethical Issues**

The Code of Ethics for Nurses Provision 3.3 was established and the sponsoring organizational institutional review board approval was obtained for this study protocol (protocol FWA#00000521). In this retrospective cross-sectional study, possible moral and ethical issues were considered and addressed. No potential breaks in personal integrity were uncovered since data did not involve the use of any personal information from the nursing sample or from patient’s medical records. The primary investigator is CITI trained as an investigator (CITI ID 2920984) in research with exemption status and
has CITI report number 8217284 (Exp. 07/09/2017) as well as Physical Science Research
CITI report number 8217285, exam date 07/10/2012.

Analysis

Primary analysis of descriptive statistics was obtained as well as the relationship between
the dependent variable (annual number of patient falls, labeled as FALLS) with the two
independent variables (DEGREE, CERTIFICATE) using multiple regression. The
statistical program SPSS version 22 was used to conduct all analyses.

Descriptive Statistics

The total number of patient falls is a right skewed distribution (skewness = .932); skewness values with a magnitude less than one are generally considered to be very good. The mean number of patient falls is 25 with a median of 21. Individual values range from a minimum of 2 to a maximum of 64. A histogram for the total number of falls is provided in figure 1.

![Figure 1: Total Patient Falls](image)

The independent variable, DEGREE, which is a weighted average of the highest degree
obtained for nurses in a given medical unit, is a near normal distribution (skewness = -
0.179) with a mean of 1.39 and a median of 1.41; a value of 1.41 indicates that on
average the highest degree obtained for a medical unit is between that of an associate’s
and a bachelor’s degree. Individual values range from a minimum of 1.00 to a maximum
of 1.74. A histogram for the variable DEGREE is provided in figure 2.
The independent variable, CERTIFICATE, which is the percentage of nurses in a medical unit with a certification, is a right-skewed distribution (skewness = 1.581); although the skewness value exceeds one, some practitioners believe magnitudes less than two are still acceptable. The mean percentage of nurses with a certificate is 9.3% with a median value of 8.3%. Individual values range from a minimum of zero to a maximum of 30.8%. A histogram for the variable CERTIFICATE is provided in figure 3. The observed departure from normalcy along with a skewness value significantly different from zero, surfaced as a problem with heteroskedacity in the subsequent regression analysis. This problem was remedied with a logarithmic transformation of the variable CERTIFICATE. The new variable, LNCERT, formed a near normal distribution (skewness = -0.100) with a mean of 2.29 and a median of 2.40. Individual values range from a minimum of 1.00 and a maximum of 3.51. A histogram for the variable LNCERT is provided in figure 3.
Regression Analysis

Multiple regression is commonly used as a tool for predictive purposes but the goal herein is not to predict rather to gain a better understanding of the impact that a nurse’s education has on patient falls. In fact, the hope was to gain an understanding of how much of the variance in patient falls can be explained by the two measures of education level (DEGREE, LNCERT). In order to have confidence in the results, it is important that the underlying assumptions of a regression analysis are validated and adjustments made where necessary. A discussion of this task follows in the next few paragraphs.

The first validation focused on the relationship between the variables of interest in the study. To test that the study satisfied the assumption of a linear relationship between the dependent variable (FALLS) with each of the independent variables (DEGREE, LNCERT), partial regression plots and Pearson correlation coefficients were examined. Partial regression plots are provided in figure 4.
Figure 4: Partial Regression Plots

These plots show a reasonable assumption that a linear relationship exists for each of the independent variables with the dependent variable. A linear relationship between FALLS and DEGREE appears to be weak whereas a linear relationship between FALLS and LNCERT is more evident; these observations are confirmed in Table 1. Pallant (2013, p. 164) suggests a value of at least $r = 0.3$ (Pearson Correlation) to justify a linear relationship; the LNCERT variable met this threshold ($r = -0.608$) while DEGREE did not ($r = -0.172$). To further explore the hypothesis, it was elected to proceed with DEGREE as a model variable since it did not show any other cause for concern and the aforementioned threshold is a preference not a constraint. Multicollinearity between the two independent variables is also not a concern. To avoid multicollinearity problems, Anderson, Sweeney and Williams (2012, p. 662) caution using independent variables with correlation coefficient magnitudes greater than 0.7; the relevant value herein is -0.316 which meets this threshold. The tolerance of the collinearity statistics for the two independent variables were each reported as $\text{Tol} = 0.969$. Tolerance indicates the amount of variability not explained by the other independent variable; a value of less than 0.10 suggests the possibility of multicollinearity (Pallant, p. 164). This tolerance value
supports the findings from the correlation coefficients that multicollinearity should not be a concern.

Table 1: Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>FALLS</th>
<th>DEGREE</th>
<th>LNCERT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>FALLS</td>
<td>-.172</td>
<td>-.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEGREE</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LNCERT</td>
<td>-.175</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is assumed in a linear regression model that each predicted value is independent of the others. There was no reason to suspect that independence would be a problem since this was not a time-series study. Nonetheless, independence was easily verified, as assessed by a Durbin-Watson value of 1.6; a value of 2 indicates the error terms are independent.

It is also assumed in a linear regression model that residuals have equal variance; also known as homoscedasticity. This assumption is verified with a visual inspection of a residual plot; see figure 5. The plot on the left is from a regression model that included the two independent variables: DEGREE and CERTIFICATE. There is a u-shaped pattern in the left-most scatterplot, which is undesirable. The scatterplot on the right is from a regression model that used a logarithmic transformation of the variable CERTIFICATE. As can be seen, the u-shape pattern is removed and the overall plot appears more random; the effects of heteroskedasticity have therefore been minimized.
Figure 5: Residual Plots

A complete residual analysis includes a confirmation that the errors are normally distributed. A histogram and normal P-Plot of the residuals are provided in figure 6. These plots show a slight departure from normality but they are not severe given the small sample size.
A final analysis before discussing the regression model results is to check for unusual and/or influential observations. Standardized residual values with a magnitude greater than three are considered very unusual, there were no observations in this category. Cook’s distance measure was also used to determine whether or not any observations carried undue influence; values greater than one are generally considered influential. The largest value for Cook’s measure was 0.43; there were no influential observations.

Now that the assumptions have been verified and adjustments made where necessary (log transformation), the regression results may be discussed. The regression model was constructed with annual patient falls (FALLS) as the dependent variable and formal education (DEGREE) and a log transformed variable for percentage of certified nurses (LNCERT) as the independent or explanatory variables. The model overall is a good fit, \( F(2,22) = 9.014, p = .001, \text{adj.} R^2 = .40 \). The purpose of this effort was to gain understanding of how much of the variance in patient falls can be explained by the two measures of education level (DEGREE, LNCERT). The coefficient of variation (R²), measures the percentage of variation in the number of patient falls (FALLS) that is
explained by the explanatory variables (DEGREE, LNCERT). Another measure adjusted $R^2$, accounts for the number of independent variables in the model and for mathematical reasons not explained herein, adjusts $R^2$ accordingly. In this case, approximately 40% of the variation in the number of annual patient falls can be explained by the nursing staff’s level of education; this number is low for predictive purposes but acceptable to gain an understanding of the impact the explanatory variables have on the dependent variable.

Both explanatory variables were found to be statistically significant using a 10% level of significance or better as seen in Table 2. A discussion of the regression coefficient for each explanatory variable follows. Interpretation of the average formal education level for a medical unit (DEGREE) is straightforward. Annual patient falls will decrease by approximately 27 falls per year by increasing the level of education by one unit, ceteris paribus. For example, a medical unit with an average education level of one (Associate’s degree) could reduce annual falls on average by as much as 27 falls by increasing the average education level to two (Bachelor’s degree).

Table 2: Summary of Multiple Regression Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>100.741</td>
<td>24.327</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEGREE</td>
<td>-26.767</td>
<td>14.935</td>
<td>-.288</td>
<td>-1.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNCERT</td>
<td>-16.873</td>
<td>4.112</td>
<td>-.659</td>
<td>-4.104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interpretation of the certification component is not as straightforward since the model includes a logarithmic transformation of the original variable: percentage of certified nurses (CERTIFICATE). In transformations where the original variable has valid zero values, a constant is added to avoid undefined transformations. The natural log was used herein to transform the percentage of certified nurses as follows: $LNCERT = \ln(CERTIFICATE + 2.178)$. The most straight forward method to assess the impact on the dependent variable when a change is made to an independent variable is simple substitution into the regression model.

The ceteris paribus assumption must also be considered which requires that all else remains constant, in other words only one variable may be changed at a time. Since the average level of formal education was 1.4, an example will be shown holding this variable (DEGREE) constant. Using algebra, the original regression model is modified as follows:

$$FALLS = 100.7 - 26.8\, DEGREE - 16.9\, LN(CERTIFICATE + 2.178)$$

$$= 100.7 - 26.8(1.4) - 16.9\, LN(CERTIFICATE + 2.178)$$

$$= 64.3 - 16.9\, LN(CERTIFICATE + 2.178)$$

To see the improvement in patient falls by increasing the percentage of nurses with a certification, one only needs to substitute the values of interest. For example, using the
average value for the original variable (CERTIFICATE = 9.3) as a current state, the expected number of patient falls is approximately 24 as shown below.
\[
\text{FALLS} = 64.3 - 16.9 \ln(9.3 + 2.178) = 23.79
\]

If the departmental goal is to increase the percentage of nurses with a certificate to 20%, the expected improvement is a decrease of approximately 13 falls per year as shown below.
\[
\text{FALLS} = 64.3 - 16.9 \ln(20 + 2.178) = 11.25 \\
\text{Improvement: } 23.79 - 11.25 = 12.54
\]

One caveat is worth noting. The purpose of this study was to gain a better understanding of the impact that a nurse’s education has on patient falls not to predict. Since only 40% of the variability in patient falls is explained by the model variables, it will not produce accurate forecasts. It does, however, show that the independent variables help to explain the fluctuations in observed in patient falls.

**Implications**

Higher education levels enhance both clinical competency and patient care delivery. Clinical nursing expertise is essential to quality patient care and quality outcomes. Numerous research studies have been conducted which demonstrate how nursing variables such as nursing education level, hours worked on the unit, and overall experience impact patient fall rates. This study can influence selectivity in nurse hiring and substantiate the need for more hospitals to migrate towards Magnet status, which can influence higher nursing education within organizations. This study suggest that patient safety outcomes in relation to falls can be influenced by potentially reducing fall rates as more nurses acquire bachelor degrees in nursing and/or obtaining national certifications from a professional nursing board-governing body. As healthcare transitions into the value based purchasing model, reimbursement can be influenced by reducing patient falls and improving nurse driving indicators.

**Recommendations for future studies**

Approximately 40% of the variability in patient falls is explained by the model found herein which means that 60% of the variability remains unexplained. Future studies should seek to include other explanatory variables such as nurse experience, seasonal factors, and nurse-patient ratios. A larger sample size is also desirable. The small sample size used to conduct this analysis limits the ability to control for variables such as the medical unit.

**Conclusion**

This study is different from previous studies because it examines nurses’ formal education at four different increasing levels; previous studies have focused on two or three. A multiple regression was run to enhance the understanding of the impact a nurse’s education has on patient falls. The assumptions of linearity, independence,
homoscedasticity, normality of errors, and unusual observations were met by using a log transformation on one of the independent variables. The two independent variables, level of formal education and percentage of nurses with a certification, were shown to be statistically significant ($p = 0.09, p < .005$). The model overall was a good fit, $F (2,22) = 9.014$, $p = .001$, adj. $R^2 = .40$. A negative correlation between patient falls and the level of nurse education was validated for a Midwest facility during the years 2010 – 2014. In conclusion, annual patient falls will decrease by increasing the number of nurses with baccalaureate degrees and/or certifications from a professional nursing board-governing body.
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Abstract

The international society of healthcare developed standardized guidelines for the medical management of sepsis to help battle this life-threatening healthcare problem that is directly related to high rates of mortality. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the relationship of septic patient outcomes when early interventions when instituted within an emergency department. This retrospective cohort study on adults aged ≥ 18 years who were hospitalized with sepsis, septicemia or septic shock and had the international classification of diseases–9 [ICD-9]; 038.0- 038.9, was conducted within an emergency department of an acute care hospital located in central Illinois. It was found, that for 156 patients, the time from patient arrival to the drawing of a blood culture sample had a statistically significant effect on the outcome of the patient ($p = .0265$) and statistically significant difference between the mean time between patient arrival and antibiotic infusion start time from the day to the night shift ($p=0.0038$). Evidence supports that early recognition and intervention improves patient outcomes and shortens hospital length of stay.

Key words: Sepsis, guidelines, evidence-based practice, patient outcomes
Evaluating Sepsis Guidelines and Patient Outcomes

Introduction

Sepsis is defined as a systemic inflammatory response to a bacterial or viral infection and is an exceedingly dangerous condition that is non-discriminatory. When sepsis is inappropriately managed it causes circulatory collapse, which advances to tissue damage, multi-organ system dysfunction, systemic shock and eventually death. Kleinpell, Aitken, and Schorr (2013) define septic shock as the continuation of hypotension even after aggressive fluid resuscitation. Sepsis and Septicemia affects approximately 30 million people per year worldwide and is the number one cause of death (Rory Staunton Foundation, 2016). Sepsis accounts for 20% of all intensive care unit admissions and it is the leading cause of mortality within the medical / non-cardiac intensive care unit (Levy et al., 2010). Patients who are hospitalized with a diagnosis of septic shock can experience unplanned medical issues, which may increase length of stays (LOS) when compared to other medical diagnosis. Hospitalized patients with the diagnosis of sepsis experience a 75% increase in LOS compared to those patients who were hospitalized with any other medical condition (Hall, Williams, DeFrances, & Golosinskiy, 2011).

To diagnosis and combat this medical cascade, the international medical society implemented the Surviving Sepsis Campaign (SSC). Physicians around the globe developed programs grounded in evidence-based guidelines to enhance the medical management of sepsis. There are two primary areas within the bundled guidelines that this research proposal will focus on: Obtaining the appropriate blood cultures before antimicrobial therapy is initiated (< 45 minutes) and the initiation of intravenous antimicrobial(s) within 3 hours of diagnosis. This study further looks at whether the time of day affect the time between hospital arrivals and obtaining first blood cultures within the 45-minute window?

Literature Review

Levy et al. (2010) explored the Surviving Sepsis Campaign (SSC) guidelines and evaluated the performance improvement initiative within hospitals in Europe, the United States, and South America. The focus of their investigation was on changing the clinical actions of physicians and medical institutions by implementing SSC guidelines. SSC guidelines were evaluated based on two independent sections. The first section evaluated the resuscitation bundle. The resuscitation bundle included obtaining serum lactate levels, blood cultures before administration of antibiotics, and administration of broad-spectrum antibiotics within three hours of hospital arrival or within one hour to the ICU arrival. The management bundle is the second section of interest. These are interventions that needed to be completed within 24 hours of hospital arrival. The management bundle items include administering low-dose steroids, maintaining glucose levels greater than the normal low limit but less than 150, and maintaining inspiratory plateau pressures less than 30cm H20 for patients on a ventilator.
Data was submitted (n=15,022) from 165 sites. Levy et al. (2010), reported that early detection of sepsis and drawing blood cultures on arrival, administration of broad-spectrum antibiotics, while keeping blood glucose levels under control were specifically linked to lower hospital mortality. Furthermore, the unadjusted hospital mortality rate dropped from 37.0% to 30.8% during a two-year period ($p = 0.001$). Levy et al. (2010) concluded that during the same time period, the adjusted odds ratio for mortality significantly improved in relationship to the length of time a site was enrolled in the Campaign; resulting in an adjusted absolute drop of 0.8% per quarter and a total decrease of 5.4% over that same 2-year span (95% CI, 2.5–8.4%). This suggested that hospitals that utilized the SSC guidelines experienced a mortality rate decrease.

Gaieski et al. (2010) evaluated outcomes of patients with severe sepsis and septic shock in association with the timing of antibiotic therapy. This exploratory study examined early goal-directed therapy within emergency department patients (n=261). Results suggested a significant decrease in mortality when door to antibiotics were administrated in less than 60 minutes. Furthermore, it is suggested that these patients had a 19.5% mortality rate (CI 0.11-0.83; 95%) as compared to those who received antibiotics greater than 60 minutes experienced a 33.2% mortality rate (CI 0.29-1.03; 95%). This study supports that rapid sepsis identification; administration of antibiotics within 60 minutes is the best treatment strategy.

Zachar et al. (2011) experienced similar findings as Gaieski et al. (2010). Zachar et al. (2011) state that “early use of appropriate antimicrobials was associated with lower mortality in the community-acquired (0.64 [0.51–0.8], p < 0.05), hospital-acquired (0.72 [0.58–0.88], p < 0.05), and ICU acquired (0.79 [0.64—0.97], p = 0.05) categories” (p.1890).

Burney et al. (2011) identified barriers to early goal directed therapy by surveying nurses and physicians (n=101) in an emergency department of Columbia University Medical Center. The goal was to identify knowledge and confidence in identifying sepsis, current treatment, and problems in managing patients with sepsis. According to the nurses, the greatest identified barrier to implementing the SSC guidelines includes a delay in diagnosis of sepsis. For the physicians, nursing delays and waiting to get the patient to the ICU were the most significant barriers. Even though these barriers were addressed, the participants stated that having a written protocol would be helpful in improving treatment of sepsis in their emergency department. In conclusion, more education regarding sepsis management towards both the nurses and physicians was recommended along with a written protocol (Burney et al., 2011).

Winterbottom et al. (2011) investigated how implementing standardized order sets to care for patients with severe sepsis and septic shock affect outcomes of patients. A team of various healthcare professionals was assembled to help improve the early diagnosis of sepsis. Over a process of six months, staff was educated and sepsis bundle order sets in compliance with the SSC guidelines were implemented. There were six hundred seventy-four patients who were diagnosed with septic shock or severe sepsis in the ICU or ED of a 563-bed academic medical center in May of 2008 to October of 2010. The
results implied that using order sets significantly helped to meet the goals ($p<0.001$). The use of order sets helped to provide evidence-based care to patients with sepsis. In addition, assistance from hospital leadership and using multidisciplinary teams to implement these changes can help to make the goals more effective.

Within the review of literature, each controlled study emphasized the importance of early recognition and intervention using evidence-based protocols such as the SSC bundles to decrease patient mortality and improve the outcomes significantly.

**Problem and Purpose**

The Surviving Sepsis Campaign (SSC) was created to help educate healthcare providers and clinicians about the established evidence-based guidelines in managing sepsis, septic shock and septicemia. The campaign’s philosophy provides structured guidelines for the care of the septic patient starting with the entry to emergency services and then throughout the hospitalization as well as coping with life after sepsis. The empirical portion of the SSC was the promotion of early diagnosis and interventions by all team members involved in the care of the septic patient.

In defining care teams, the nurse is the primary advocate for the patient. Nurses are generally the first person to communicate with the patient when they enter the ED and determine the urgency of the patients’ care needs. Through education and knowledge, nurses must provide a triage assessment and communicate the finding to the physician promptly so early recognition and management can be initiated. Corfield et al. (2014) recognized that by using an early warning system in the triage, the physician and nurses could quickly intervene to reduce the risk of mortality. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the relationship of septic patient outcomes when early interventions such as blood cultures drawn within 45 minutes, antibiotics administered within 60 minutes and what shift did the patient arrive on as defined by day shift (6am to 6pm) and night shift (6pm to 6am), when instituted within emergency services.

**Methodology**

This retrospective cohort study was conducted within the ED of an acute care hospital located in central Illinois. Data were retrieved via secured Health Information Management Services (HIMS) and the Electronic Medical Record (EMR) via the ED staff. All data were de-identified by the sponsoring organization. Approval from the sponsoring organizational institutional review board was obtained for the original version of the study protocol (protocol RMC 174). As there was no patient contact or patient personal identification obtained, patient consent was not required, and an expedited exemption approval was granted. The sample consisted of adult patients who entered the ED with diagnosis of sepsis, septicemia or septic shock. The sample included men and women aged ≥ 18-years who were hospitalized with sepsis, septicemia or septic shock (International Classification of Diseases–9 [ICD-9]; 038.0- 038.9). Patients with the above ICD-9 codes 038.0- 038.9 as the primary code and had a secondary code associated with a complication (i.e., chronic renal failure, cerebral vascular accident, end...
stage renal disease, cardiovascular) were also included to the sample to increase the amount of subjects entered into the study.

Patients were admitted to the hospital from the ED to the following units; ICU, medical-surgical unit, and telemetry unit. Any patient admitted to the observation unit or as an observation (outpatient) patient was excluded from the study to maintain validity between subjects. Outcomes data was determined based on the disposition post hospitalization. Each outcome was weighted based on the severity. Outcome criteria were defined as being discharged to home, nursing home, rehabilitation center, and medical university or expired (morgue).

**Statistical Analysis and Results**

Utilizing the capabilities of Excel and the Excel add-in, Minitab, results were obtained through the use of a t-test and simple regression analysis. The initial research question asked whether or not the time it took to obtain the appropriate blood cultures had an effect on the patients’ ultimate outcome. This question was answered using a simple regression analysis, which describes the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable.

The independent variable in this study was the time taken (in minutes) for a patient’s blood culture to be drawn, starting from when the patient was admitted to the hospital. The dependent variable was the outcome of the patient at the end of his or her respective treatment or stay. Possible outcome in this study included “home,” “inpatient rehab,” “hospice,” “nursing home,” “transfer,” and “expired.” In table 2, the independent variable refers to the time between patient arrivals and drawing of the patient’s blood culture. For the purpose of regression analysis, the hypotheses are as follows;

Null hypothesis \( (H_0) = \) There is no relationship between the time it took to obtain the appropriate blood cultures for a patient and the patient’s outcome.

Alternative hypothesis \( (H_a) = \) There is a relationship between the time it took to obtain the appropriate blood cultures for a patient and the patient’s outcome.

This test was conducted at a confidence level of .95, or an alpha level equal to .05. The output for the regression analysis is shown in table 1, below. It was found, that for 156 patients, the time from patient arrival to the drawing of a blood culture sample had a statistically significant effect on the outcome of the patient \( (p = .0265) \), hence the null hypothesis was rejected, suggesting that there is a relationship between early blood culture collection and patient outcomes.

**Table 1 - Regression output and analysis of variance table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>680.4095</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>4.4182</td>
<td>154.0015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>702.5897</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regression output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>std. error</th>
<th>t(df=154)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The secondary research question compares the time between patient arrival and antibiotic infusion for day and night shifts. Day shifts at the acute care hospital last from 6am to 6pm, while night shifts last from 6pm to 6am. A t-test is implemented to compare the means of two shifts. When constructing the t-test to answer the secondary research question, the hypotheses were defined as follows;

Null hypothesis \((H_0)\) = the mean time between patient arrival and antibiotic infusion start time does not differ from the day to the night shift

Alternative hypothesis \((H_a)\) = there is a difference between the mean time between patient arrival and antibiotic infusion start time from the day to the night shift.

This test was conducted at a confidence level of .95, or an alpha level equal to .05. The output for the t-test is recreated in table 2, below. The results suggest that the probability was observed and significant \((p=0.0038)\), predicting that the difference in the data was 0.38% due to chance. It can be inferred that there must exist some other cause for this difference, hence the null hypothesis can therefore be rejected, indicating that there is a statistically significant difference between the mean time between patient arrival and antibiotic infusion start time from the day to the night shift. It took an average of 184.86 minutes (3.081 hours) to start antibiotic infusion from the time a patient arrived, during the day, versus, 149.14 minutes (2.486 hours) during the night. It took an average of 35.72 minutes longer during the day shift to administer antibiotics from the time a patient arrived as compared to the night shift.

Table 2 - Hypothesis Test: Independent Group (t-test, pooled variance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Night</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>184.86</td>
<td>149.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>std. dev.</td>
<td>80.33</td>
<td>*66.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference (day-night)</td>
<td>*35.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled Variance</td>
<td>5620.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>2.941</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-value (two-tailed)</td>
<td>.0038</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Time (minutes) from patient arrival to antibiotic infusion during
day shift (6am-6pm) versus night shift (6pm-6am)

Discussion

This retrospective cohort analysis used an EMR database of adult emergency service patients who were hospitalized with sepsis, septicemia or septic shock with an ICD-9; 038.0- 038.9. The mean age in years for the overall sampled population was 71.2667 (n=157) with the mean age of the patients treated during the day shift versus night shift was 69.766 (n=92); 74.053 (n=65), respectfully. The length of stay (LOS) also varied significantly compared to the specific shifts. The overall sampled population had a mean LOS in days of 7.42, while the patients who were treated and admitted during the day shift had an increase LOS 7.606 (+0.186) compared to the sampled mean, while the patients treated and admitted during the night shift had a decrease in LOS 7.107 (-0.313) compared to the sample mean. In fact, the difference between the means represents almost a half-day difference in the LOS (0.499). These findings are significant since evidence supports that early recognition and implementation of sepsis bundles such as early blood culture drawn and antibiotics administered within 60 minutes of recognition have been shown to improve sepsis outcomes. Patients for who were identified and diagnosed with sepsis within the ED experienced improved outcomes as defined by disposition and also experienced a shorter LOS if arrived and admitted during the night shift (6pm-6am).

There are several prospective reasons for these finding. First, patients that were diagnosed promptly in the emergency department during the night shift were perhaps streamlined through the admission process – either to the hospital units (telemetry, surgical or medical-surgical) or to the ICU. Early recognition and disposition are key components of the sepsis treatment protocol. Secondly, when the trained emergency department nursing staff identify the sepsis patient, pre-set protocols are initiated, allowing them to active sepsis protocols and quickly progress the patient through the formalized decisional algorithm. Implementation of the SSC evidence based guidelines has led tertiary care centers to develop standardized ED protocols, which improve outcomes of patients experiencing sepsis and sepsis shock. Lastly, the findings suggest that when patients in the ED are identified as having sepsis during the triage process and early protocol initiation can improve patient outcomes, while shortening the hospital LOS.

Limitations

Limitations to this study were identified in two-folds. First the clinical database was segmented into several sections. First, was the EMR to collect the information of the prospective sepsis population utilizing the ICD-9 codes. These codes (ICD-9; 038.0-038.9) were used to identify sepsis cases and are dependent to documentation and accuracy of physician coding. It is to be noted that only these codes were accepted when used as the primary diagnosis, which limited the population at hand. Secondly, once the sepsis patients were identified, the categorical collection of time was gathered by hand and entered into the excel database for analysis. This is subjected to human error in
interpreting the time of arrival to the emergency department, time of blood cultures being drawn, time of antibiotics initiated and time patient was admitted to the hospital. The antiquated EMR system did not allow for time downloads between variables gathered.

Conclusion

Sepsis, if not identified nor managed swiftly, can be a primary contributor to a hospital’s morbidity and mortality. It is imperative that sepsis management is at the forefront for a hospital’s quality improvement initiatives. Evidence supports that early recognition of sepsis and consistent implementation of sepsis evidence based guidelines; the overall outcomes of the patient at time of discharge improve and are associated with reduced LOS during admission. This study adds to the body of knowledge of sepsis management, supporting the fact that the time from patient arrival to the drawing of a blood culture sample had a statistically significant effect on the outcome of the patient \( p = .0265 \), while early antibiotic administration also contributed to the decreased LOS as the results suggest that the probability was observed and significant \( p=0.0038 \). Lastly, this study supports the SSC and advocates for hospitals to implement sepsis bundled protocols and incorporate these protocols with emergency nursing education, enhancing nursing autonomy and collaboration among emergency physicians.

References


Giacisi, D., Mikkelsen, M., Band, R., Pines, J., Massone, R., Furia, F.,… & Goyal, M. (2010). Impact of time to antibiotics on survival in patients with severe sepsis or septic shock in whom early goal-directed therapy was initiated in the emergency department. *Society of Critical Care Medicine, 38*(4), 1045-1053. DOI: 10.1097/CCM.0b013e3181cc4824


An Exploration of Intended Use of Augmented Reality Smart Glasses

Philipp A. Rauschnabel  
University of Michigan – Dearborn

Jun He  
University of Michigan – Dearborn

Young Ro  
Associate Professor of Operations Management  
University of Michigan – Dearborn

Abstract  
Numerous market research studies and an inspection of recent press releases among leading IT companies indicate that a new form of wearable device might soon influence the technology landscape: Augmented Reality Smart Glasses, that is, digital eye glasses that integrate virtual information in one’s view-field. Yet, little is known about this nascent technology. In this research, we draw upon prior technology acceptance research and present the results of a large-scale cross-sectional study among 1,682 US-consumers. The study identifies Usefulness, Ease of Use, Entertainment, Design, and Public Privacy Issues as antecedents to usage intention. However, the strength of these effects differs between usage contexts (at home, in public, at work). Implications for Scholars, Managers, and Policy Makers are discussed.

The contribution of this study is as follows:

- Identification of yet unknown drivers to smart glasses adoption
- Exploring the privacy paradox
- Presenting valuable pre-market knowledge of smart glasses for manufacturers, app developers, and policy makers
An Exploration of Intended Use of Augmented Reality Smart Glasses

Introduction

Recently, Samsung, Facebook, Amazon, Microsoft and many other established and start-up companies have launched or announced glasses-like devices that offer what is termed as Augmented Reality (AR) technology to integrate virtual information into a user’s field of vision. These ‘smart glasses’ offer tremendous opportunities, for example, in marketing, logistics, product development, manufacturing and production, medical care, cultural management, and others (Rauschnabel, Brem & Ro, 2015; Muensterer et al., 2014; Eisenmann et al., 2014). A recent study by Goldman Sachs (2016) concludes that “as the technology advances, price points decline, and an entire new marketplace of applications (both business and consumer) hits the market, we believe VR/AR has the potential to spawn a multi-billion dollar industry, and possibly be as game changing as the advent of the PC”.

Besides their practical importance, augmented reality smart glasses are also very interesting from a theoretical perspective: smart glasses are worn like traditional glasses. Thus, factors that are known from fashion adoption and that are typically not integrated in technology adoption models might be relevant to smart glasses. Second, smart glasses’ AR component breaks the boundaries between reality and virtuality (Craig, 2013). Except for a few AR applications for current devices, this is very novel to consumers, especially since smart glasses integrate various types of information realistically within the perception of visual reality. Third, in order to integrate virtual information, various sensors (e.g. cameras) capture and process real world information. Consumers and media widely criticize privacy concerns (Eisenmann et al., 2014) because smart glasses can capture the personal aspects of a user as well as others (e.g. identifying other people with face recognition software). Consequently, as smart glasses differ tremendously from other mobile and wearable technologies, research is needed to understand consumers’ reactions towards them.

Grounded in the literature on technology acceptance, privacy risks and uses and gratification theory, we develop a model to tackle the following research question: Which factors drive the adoption of smart glasses? This model is then tested based on a broad sample of 1,682 US consumers, and results provide insights into the mechanisms that relate to smart glasses adoption intention.

The study has several contributions. On the theoretical front, we extent prior technology acceptance, uses & gratification, and privacy concerns research. For example, while prior research has studied privacy concerns as a threat to a user, we extent this by also looking at threatening other peoples’ privacy. Likewise, we show that the design is an important factor in smart glasses adoption, a factor that has been widely unstudied in related technologies. Another contribution is that we compare the strength of the proposed relationships between different usage contexts – at home, in public and at work. Results show that the strength of our findings different between these contexts. On the
managerial front, this study provides valuable insights for manufacturers of smart glasses by exploring factors that might determine their success. Policy makers can use our findings to work on for the development of particular laws.

The remainder of this paper is as follows: After defining smart glasses and comparing them with related technologies, we provide an overview of three relevant research streams: Technology acceptance, uses & gratifications, and IT privacy. We then combine these streams to develop a theoretical model consisting of X hypotheses and various control variables. This model is then tested on a sample of 16XX US consumers. After a discussion of the findings, we outline the implications for theory and practice as well as avenues for future research.

**Definition of Augmented Reality Smart Glasses**

Computer Technologies, in the very early beginning, started as very task-oriented and utilitarian devices to be predominantly used in work-related contexts. Surely, IT companies and consumers quickly realized the potential of computer applications, including the Internet, in personal settings (e.g. personal use of office software, gaming, etc.) and IT diffused to consumer markets. With the raise of mobile technologies (laptops, cellphones, smartphones, tablets etc.) and mobile Internet, an ‘always and everywhere online mentality’ has developed. Recently, companies have developed a new generation of mobile devices that are fixed to a user’s body – wearables. Most wearables imitate the physical characteristics as existing accessories (e.g. watches or bracelets), and prominent examples are the Apple Watch (smartwatch) or FitBit (smart bracelet).

Applications on stationary devices typically provided a digital and virtual environment. For example, while using applications such as Facebook or Instagram, users often immerse in this virtual world and blind out what happens around them in the real-world. Virtual Reality devices even go a step further. For example, VR glasses (such as Oculus Rift) are wearable devices that worn like huge glasses and close-off completely from the real-world. When using VR glasses, a user is presented as being in a virtual 3D world.

During the recent years, applications were developed that aimed at integrating virtual elements in the physical environment. According to Craig (2013, p.20), Augmented Reality (AR) is defined as a “medium in which digital information is overlaid on the physical world that is in both spatial and temporal registration with the physical world and that is interactive in time”. For example, smartphone users can use AR smartphone app Wikitude and look at a famous building. Wikitude can then automatically identify the building and include Wikipedia information about the building on the screen. Thus, in contrast to VR, AR is not closed off from reality, but melts the real-world with the virtual world.

Recent developments in IT aim at combining AR with wearables in glasslike devices. Microsoft HoloLens, Google Glass (now: project aura), EverySight Raptor, ODG R-7 and Epson Moverio are prominent examples of these developments, and Samsung, Zeiss, Google, Amazon and other established and new companies have filed patents for, and announced the launch of a technology that we term “Augmented Reality Smart Glasses”. These technologies have gained high attention in the industry (REF), and in the recent
academic literature (REFS), and are termed Augmented Reality Smart Glasses: “Augmented Reality Smart Glasses are defined as wearable Augmented Reality (AR) devices that are worn like regular glasses and merge virtual information with physical information in a user’s view field.” (Rauschnabel, Brem & Ro, 2014). Synonyms are AR glasses, smart glasses, or data glasses.

Theory
Overview of Prior Research

Scholars in other disciplines, including IT and medicine, have studied the technological aspects of smart glasses, and its applications in various medical settings. However, not much research has been done to understand the adoption and use of smart glasses from a business or consumer/user perspective.

These few exceptions include a recent study from Rauschnabel, Brem and Ivens (2015), which studied the awareness and adoption intention of smart glasses. Using the example of Google Glass, topenna and conscientiousness were personality traits positively associated with the level of knowledge consumers have about smart glasses. Furthermore, the authors showed that functional benefits and descriptive social norms were positively associated with adoption intention, whereas the strength of these effects differed between different personality types. Weiz et al (2016) conducted a similar study and showed that usefulness and social norms influence actual use of Google Glass. Eisenmann et al. (YEAR) conducted a case study on google glass and discussed various technological and social factors – such as being insulted as a ‘glass hole’ while wearing them. They also discussed applications in business. Hein & Rauschnabel (2016) echoed the potentials of smart glasses in enterprise settings and discussed new opportunities for Enterprise Social Networks. A core factor of their model was data security – both from a user (privacy) and from a company perspective, and called for research in this vein. Rauschnabel & Ro (2016) studied the relationship between Google’s reputation in handling user data, and consumer’s reaction towards Google Glass. However, no significance was found. This could either be because the authors measured a very abstract privacy image of the manufacturer brand, rather than to the risks associated with the specific technology, or because privacy concerns matter more with regards to other people (i.e., wearing smart glasses threatens other people’s privacy) rather than to the risk of a user’s privacy. Usefulness, ease of use, social norms, consumers’ attitude towards the brand Google, and their level of technology innovativeness were found to be associated with adoption intention.

However, a lack of research on privacy issues in smart glasses research is not the only gap the extant literature. Various other antecedents have not yet been studied. For example, manufacturers advertise that smart glasses could fulfill entertainment needs. For example, Microsoft (2015) just recently announced the opportunities of fighting against virtual enemies in one’s home. Likewise, wearables in general (and thus also smart glasses), are visible worn and thus influence a user’s appearance. However, empirical examinations of the expected entertainment value and the design remain scarce. Stock
and colleagues (2016) found perceived enjoyment as a determinant of intention to use Google Glass, and that enjoyment is negatively influenced by health risk.

Another stream of research has studied other wearables. For example, Kim & Shin (YEAR) developed an acceptance model based on a sample of users of wrist-wearable devices and included design and comfort factors in their model. Chuah and colleagues (2016) studied smartwatches among non-users and found that people perceive smartwatches as a technology, fashion, or both. They also found that visibility of the smartwatch is a core determinant of acceptance and adoption intention of smartwatches. Summarizing this research, we propose that at least three theoretical streams need to be incorporated in order to better understand smart glasses adoption: Technology Acceptance, Privacy Concerns, and uses and Gratification Theory. Before using these theories to develop and test a conceptual model, we will provide a brief overview in the following sections.

Technology Acceptance Research

Individuals’ acceptance of information technologies has been subject to research since the advent of the personal computer. Of the various theories and approaches that have been put forth to address the issue, Technology Acceptance Model or TAM (Davis 1986, 1989) has received arguably the most research attention in the field of information systems research (King and He 2006). Meta-analytic studies have concluded that TAM is a parsimonious and powerful model to explain people’s behavioral intention to adopt and use a new technology (King and He 2006).

TAM has its theoretical roots in behavioral research about behavior formation (e.g., Theory of Reasoned Action) and psychology research about behavior regulation and change (e.g., Social Cognitive Theory) (Davis 1989, Davis et al. 1989). The core model of TAM postulates that one’s behavioral intention (BI) to adopt/use a certain technology is determined jointly by two important perceptions that the person has formed toward the target technology, i.e., perceived ease of use, defined as ‘the degree to which a person believes that using a particular system would be free of effort’ (Davis et al, 1989, p. 320), and perceived usefulness, defined as “the degree to which a person thinks that using a particular system would enhance his or her job performance” (Davis et al, 1989, p. 320); in addition, perceived usefulness partially mediates the relationship between perceived ease of use and behavioral intention.

The parsimony of TAM, although a distinguished strength, also represents a common criticism of the theory that various aspects of decision making across different technologies are neglected (Bagozzi, 2007). Researchers have attempted to extend TAM by incorporating other factors such as task (Chau and Lai 2003), social (Venkatesh & Davis 2000, Lewis et al., 2003), culture (Huang et al 2003), and demographics (Venkatesh & Morris 2000). A notable example is the proposal of unified theory of acceptance and use of technology (UTAUT, Venkatesh et al., 2003) in which TAM is integrated with seven other decision making theories. Empirical testing results conclude a complex model with the addition of two determinants including social influence and
facilitating conditions, and four moderators of key relationships. Venkatesh et al. (2012) further extend UTAUT in a consumer context by incorporating three constructs of hedonic motivation, price value, and habit as antecedents of behavioral intention. Prior research on smart glasses as well as in most technology acceptance research has treated adoption intention as a single construct. That is, these studies did not distinguish between the use of a technology (e.g. smart glasses) at home, at work, or even public. However, one could argue that the likelihood of using a technology differs in different usage contexts.

Privacy Concerns Research

Business researchers have long noticed that the development of information technology poses a number of threats to individual privacy (Mason, 1986; Rothfeder, 1992). As pointed out in Collier (1995), “(privacy concerns) is about the perceived threat to our individual privacy owing to the staggering and increasing power of information-processing technology to collect vast amounts of information about us… outside our knowledge, let alone our control” (p. 41). As technologies become increasingly personal, ubiquitous, and pervasive (Ackerman, 2004), privacy concerns are often amalgamated with the design and development of new technologies. “In these highly personalized technological settings, talking about technology without considering the privacy implications, and vice versa, will be fruitless” (Junglas et al., 2008; p. 390).

Accordingly, many researchers conceptualize privacy concerns as general concerns that reflect individuals’ inherent worries about possible loss of personal information from using a target technology (Lally, 1996; Malhotra, Kim, & Agarwal, 2004). Privacy concerns affect the perceived trustworthiness of the technology and create a psychological barrier of risk, which involves both uncertainty (Lewis and Weigert, 1985) and vulnerability (Barney and Hansen, 1994), and therefore affect one’s willingness of adopting and using the technology (Connolly and Bannister, 2007).

Centering on personal information in the conceptualization of privacy, however, leaves a gap in the context of many new technologies that are designed for social interactions among and beyond users. Users of social network sites often post information about people they know without asking their permission (Nissenbaum, 2010; Viegas, 2005). For Tweeter, it is found that any retweeted tweet reaches an average of 1,000 users regardless of the number of followers of the original message’s creator (Kwak et al., 2010). The Apple iCloud security incident serves as another example. On August 31, 2014, various celebrity iCloud accounts were compromised. The incident drew public criticism from both users and non-users of Apple iCloud service. The breach may have been caused by the exploit of “Find My iPhone” (Engadget, 2016). These examples demonstrate that people are living in a technology-enabled connected world, where one’s network serves as a node of another’s network to form a much larger network. The flow of information is beyond the comprehension and control of any individual, and can be affected by a technology even if the person does not use the technology. As such, it is probable that one’s use of a technology leading to privacy concerns of others may affect the person’s acceptance and use behavior of the technology. This issue, however, has not been investigated in the existing privacy research literature.
Uses and Gratification Theory

Espoused by communications scholars, Uses and Gratification Theory was originally applied to address how and why people accept new forms of media (e.g. mobile phones, internet, social media, etc.) but has grown in prevalence among technology adoption scholars (e.g. Ko, Cho, & Roberts, 2005; Ruggiero, 2000; Stafford, Stafford, & Schkade, 2004; Eighmey & McCord, 1998; Leung & Wei, 2000). Uses and Gratification Theory concerns itself with an individual’s motivations to use or adopt a particular technology or media (Ruggiero, 2000; Stafford, Stafford, & Schkade, 2004; Mondi, Woods, & Rafi, 2008) since potential users seek different gratifications from various technologies and media (Sheldon, 2008). The various categories of needs or gratifications individuals seek for can be divided into groups such as diversion (release from problems and stress), personal relationship (social advantage and connection), personal identity (understanding of self and values), and surveillance (observation and sense-making of the environment) (McQuail, Blumler, & Brown, 1972). In later years, scholars have even researched and added a few other categories (Sheldon, 2008). Uses and Gratification Theory has been questioned for concentrating too restrictively on the individual user (Elliot, 1974) and not explaining the reasons for which potential users adopt a certain technology or medium, or even how different types of gratifications result from the adoption of technology or media (Sheldon, 2008). But in general, Uses and Gratification Theory addresses motivational drivers for technology and media use, determinants that impact these drivers, and consequences from technology- and media-related behaviors (Sheldon, 2008).

Model Development
Model overview

To better understand consumers’ adoption of smart glasses, we propose the following model: For simplicity and as proposed by the latest technology acceptance theories, we model direct effects from antecedents to usage intention. Furthermore, we look at the influence on the adoption intention as a whole, as well as in specific contexts, particularly at home, in public, and at work in post hoc analyses. Finally, we consider various control variables in the model.

Hypotheses
Usefulness and Ease of Use

Replicating the robust findings of TAM and its extensions, we propose that the degree to which consumers perceive a technology to be ‘useful’ and ‘easy to use’ should determine its adoption intention. For the purpose of this context, we define usefulness as the degree to which a technology helps a consumer to make his/her life more efficient – for example, by organizing appointments, receiving particular information, and so forth. Thus:

H1: Perceived usefulness is positively related to usage intention.
H2: Perceived ease of use is positively related to usage intention.
Privacy Concerns

One of the core criticisms of smart glasses is the potential threat to privacy. We see two possible threats to privacy: Threatening the privacy of a user (H4) and of people associated with a user (H5). The former is derived from the existing literature of privacy research; the latter, as aforementioned in the theory section, comes from our notion of intensive social interactions among users and non-users of a new technology, a typical use environment for smart glasses.

A user’s privacy could be threatened if, for example, hackers get access to a device and see what a user sees. The concern of privacy being threatened thwarts the development of trust in the technology and results in a perceived risk of losing privacy from using the technology (Connoly and Bannister 2007). As people generally care about their privacy, the risk of losing their personal privacy is likely to be barrier to adoption.

As smart glasses automatically screen and process a user’s environment, this does not only affect a user’s privacy, but also the privacy of the people around them. In decision making, people often take into account how other people perceive their behavior. Likewise, most people are generally interested in maintaining their social relationships and avoiding interpersonal conflicts. In the context of smart glasses, newspapers have reported various cases where Google Glass users were physically attacked by non-users who feared their privacy was being threatened (Eisenmann et al., 2014). Thus, the extent to which a consumer thinks that smart glasses threaten the privacy of other people, termed as public privacy in our study, is postulated to negatively influence adoption intention.

H3: The risk of threatening a user’s privacy is negatively related to smart glasses adoption.

H4: The risk of threatening the privacy of other people is negatively related to smart glasses adoption.

Perceived Loss of Control

Scholars studying the role of new technologies have studied user’s fear of being controlled for decades (e.g., Park et al., 2012), often in the context of users’ perceived autonomy (e.g. Walter & Succi Lopez, 2008). Particularly, users’ fears that a technology takes control over a user – for example, by leading them to wrong decisions – was found to be negatively related to technology adoption and use. This perceived loss of control seems to be plausible among smart glasses, too – especially, as smart glasses integrate information in one’s view field (Rauschnabel, Brem & Ro, 2015; Eisenmann et al., 2013). That is, the negative consequences of having ‘wrong’ information realistically integrated in one’s perception of the reality could be much more likely to lead a user to make wrong decisions.

H5: Perceived loss of control is negatively related to smart glasses use.
Entertainment

With regards to the hedonic notions of entertainment and enjoyment, TAM, in and of itself, does not strongly account for the potential motivating effect of hedonic factors (Taylor, Lewin, & Strutton, 2011). However, subsequent extension of the initial TAM suggests that a factor termed perceived enjoyment (Venkatesh, & Bala, 2008) serves as an antecedent to technology adoption. Perceived enjoyment describes the extent to which “the activity of using a specific system is perceived to be enjoyable in its own right, aside from any performance consequences resulting from system use” (Venkatesh, 2000, p. 351). In addition to this extension of TAM, Uses and Gratification Theory, as an alternate theory of technology adoption and use, does take the motivating influence of hedonic factors into account (Taylor, Lewin, & Strutton, 2011). As described previously, entertainment and enjoyment are non-utilitarian gratifications that motivate potential users to adopt a new technology (Nysveen, Pedersen, & Thorbjornsen, 2005). Scholars from communication science have even found that enjoyment is an important motivational determinant of the use of new technology and media (Igbaria, Parasuraman, & Baroudi, 1996; Dabholkar & Bagozzi, 2002; Johnson, Zinkhan, & Ayala, 1998).

Like wise, adding virtual information in one’s view-field could offer tremendous opportunities to entertain - for example, as advertised by Microsoft in their HoloLens trailer. Thus:

H6: Entertainment Benefits are positively related to smart glasses use.

Negative Influence on Self-Presentation

“Smart glasses are, as any wearable devices, also a new form of fashion accessory for users.” (Rauschnabel, Brem & Ro, 2015, p. 13). Thus, psychological similarities between what is known from fashion adoption and smart glasses are very likely. A recent study by Kim & Shin (2015) on smart watches has shown that subcultural appeal – that is, the extent to which using a smart watch helps a user differentiate and stand apart from others, drives user’s intention to reuse their smart watch. Likewise, Chun et al. (2016) support this view by showing that people tend to evaluate wearables based on the level of usefulness and visibility. Likewise, we propose that people who think that wearing smart glasses improves their appearance will be more likely to use them. The theoretical rationale for this is as follows:

As smart glasses are worn like regular glasses, they are visible to other people, similar to cloths and other accessories are. Nowadays, social interactions are often very short. Thus, individuals are forced to make judgements about other people very briefly. In these situations, fashion aspects, including clothes, cosmetics or trinkets, are of particular importance (e.g., Douty, 1963; Holman, 1980; Judd, Bull, & Gahagan, 1975; Tunca & Fueller, 2009). Bierhoff (1989) echoed this view and outlined that initial person judgements are predominantly driven by visible cues (here: smart glasses in a user’s face) than less visible cues (e.g., a smartphone). Finally, Belk (1978, p. 39) concludes
that “[i]n virtually all cultures, visible products and services are the bases for inferences about the status, personality, and disposition of the owner or consumer of these goods.” (Belk 1978, p.39)

While there is agreement that people make use of visible cues to judge other people, there is also evidence that people intentionally manage visible cues. For example, consumers tend to buy luxury products that are visible for other for symbolic reasons. These symbolic reasons include reflecting their actual or desired social status (Wilcox, Kim, & Sen, 2009) or one’s personality. People also tend to ‘like’ brands on Facebook that reflect who they are or want to be (REF). Not surprising, research on decision making in fashion settings found that consumers’ liking of the design plays a crucial role in clothing adopting (REF). Finally, Kim & Shin argue that people have a more positive attitude towards their smartwatch if they think it can help them differentiating from others. Echoing these findings suggests that the evaluation of the design of smart glasses should be a particular role, especially since influences how other people perceive a user while wearing smart glasses. Currently, available smart glasses (e.g. ODG R-7 or Microsoft HoloLens) are still characterized by being somehow ‘technological’ and ‘bulky’

H7: Negative Influence on Self-presentation is negatively related to smart glasses use.

Control variables:

As smart glasses technology is still relatively new, the degree to which a consumer is familiar with the technology might influence adoption intentions. Familiarity is defined as the degree of a person’s direct and indirect experience with smart glasses (Coupey, Irwin, & Payne, 1998; Kent & Allen, 1994). It represents the mental knowledge structure consumers have about smart glasses. Thus, consumers with more (versus less) knowledge might have a better (vs. lower) level about the opportunities and use cases associated with smart glasses. Including familiarity as a control variable could parcel out this variation. Likewise, age and gender are included in the model as they represent common control variables (Chang & Zhu, 2012; Correa, Hinsley, & De Zuniga, 2010).

Methodology and Research Design

In order to cover a broad sample of respondents, we applied an online survey with the help of a commercial market research institute. A sample consisting of 1,682 respondents covered a broad range of demographics, as shown in table X. Respondents perceived financial compensation for participation.

The questionnaire began with a short description and a few example pictures of smart glasses (see appendix). Then the quantitatative measures followed. As length restrictions limited the amount of questions in the questionnaire, we applied a single-item measure approach (for a justification of this approach, see Bergkvist & Rossiter, 2007). Although not without criticism (c.f. Diamantopoulos et al. 2012 for a discussion), using single items in robust theoretical frameworks, such as TAM (Rossiter & Braithwaite, 2013; Kang & Kim, 2006), is not new and can be associated with advantages such as reduced response fatigue and enable larger samples. Additionally, Nunnally (1978) and
Venkatraman and Grant (1986) defend the use of single-item measures if constructs, as in this study, are unidimensional.

Rather than focusing on the respondent (“smart glasses can make my life more efficient”), we focused neutrally on the technology (“Smart glasses can make a user’s life more efficient”). This is based on the assumption that the evaluation of a technology in neutral terms reduces the risks of being biased by one’s overall evaluation. For example, if a user, for any reason, is totally against the technology, this user’s negative evaluation might influence his reply on the personal usefulness. By focusing on the technology (rather than including the user) before measuring the user-specific dependent variables, we hope to parcel out this variance. In addition, by parceling out this variance, common method variance might decrease.

To identify appropriate single-item measures, we reviewed the existing technology acceptance and adoption literature. Based on this, we identified items with either high factor loadings or items that covered the constructs completely (rather than just one particular aspect). For example, to measure perceived usefulness, we first identified related studies in a personal context. For example, in UTAUT2 (Venkatesh, Thong & Xu, 2012) performance expectancy, an equivalent to perceived usefulness, is measured with three items that cover (1) the usefulness in a user’s daily life, (2) to help a user accomplish his/her goals, and (3) increases a user’s productivity. In short, all of them cover the degree to which a technology makes a user’s life more efficient’. Thus, we proposed a single item “Smart glasses can make a user’s life more efficient”. These steps were conducted for all constructs.

In the second step, we conducted two pre-studies. In the first pre-study, twenty-seven undergrad students of a North-American University answered the questionnaire (paper-pencil) and were asked them to answer the questionnaire and to comment on anything that was unclear to them. This led to some minor adjustments. Then, this adjusted version was discussed with three undergrad students who were not involved in pre-study 1. One of these students had a high level of knowledge on smart glasses from a prior class-project, whereas the others did not. Respondents were asked to re-write each item using different words. For example, the responses for usefulness were “These glasses will make a user’s life easier, tasks will become easier”, “smart glasses can make everyday tasks easier” and “smart glasses can help people be more productive overall”. A further verbal discussion with these students and an assessment of the semantic equivalence of their replies with established TAM items revealed semantical equivalence. These procedures were conducted for all items.

As in any study with self-reported data, common method variance could threaten the results. A model ($\chi^2$ (54df) = 2031.545; CFI=.663; TLI=.589; SRMR=.118, RMSEA =.148) in which all continuous variables loaded on a single factor had a significantly ($\Delta \chi^2 = 105.484; \Delta \text{d.f.}=36; p<.001$) worse fit than the overall framework ($\chi^2$ (18df) = 105.484; CFI=.973; TLI=.954, SRMR=.016, RMSEA=.044; continuous variables included only) and a very low average variance extracted (AVE = .30). Thus, common method variance is unlikely to threaten our results.
Results

We applied structural equation (SEM) and path modeling in MPlus 7.2 to analyze the data, applying a Maximum Likelihood Estimator with robust error terms. We first started with a SEM in which the three usage variables (at home, in public, at work) were modeled as a reflective latent construct. The evaluation of this overall usage construct shows adequate psychometric characteristics. Particularly, all standardized path coefficients of the confirmatory factor analysis were significant (p<.001) and above .8, exceeding the recommended threshold of .5. Furthermore, with an AVE = .721, the average variance extracted exceeded .50, indicating that the variance due to measurement error is lower than the variance due to the usage-construct. Thus, convergent validity is given. Finally, Cronbach’s Alpha (α=.885) and Composite Reliability (C.R.=.886) exceed .7, and thus reveal satisfactory reliability and internal consistency.

We then modeled the influence of the proposed independent variables on the usage construct. Although the $\chi^2$ of 107.10 (20df) was significant (p<.001), the evaluation of the overall model did not indicate any concerns, as reflected by an acceptable model fit (RMSEA = .051; CFI=.973; TLI = .956; SRMR = .015).

RQ1: Hypotheses Testing

Table 1 presents the standardized coefficient of the structural equation model. The results support H1, H2 and H3 by showing that both traditional TAM variables, perceived usefulness ($\beta=.427$; p<.001) and perceived ease of use ($\beta=.101$; p<.001) positively relate to overall smart glasses use intention, as well as entertainment value ($\beta=.121$; p<.001). Neither the risks of potential negative consequences of one’s privacy ($\beta=.012$; p=.673), nor the risk that smart glasses take control over a user ($\beta=-.013$; p=.551) showed significant effects, rejecting H4 and H6. However, the fact that smart glasses influence other people’s privacy ($\beta=-.086$; p=.002) showed a significant path coefficient, supporting H5. All control variables (familiarity with smart glasses technology: $\beta=.268$; p<.001; age: $\beta=-.101$; p<.001; gender: .083; p<.001) showed significant effects. All variables together explained 60.7% of the variance in overall use intention.

| Table 1: Structural Equation Model |
|----------------------|-----|-----|
| **DV: Overall Use Intention** | **Beta** | **p** |
| H1: Perceived Usefulness | .427 | <.001 |
| H2: Perceived Ease of Use | .101 | <.001 |
| H3: Entertainment Value | .121 | <.001 |
| H4: Personal Privacy Concerns | .012 | .673 |
| H5: Public Privacy Concerns | -.086 | .002 |
| H6: Negative Influence on Self-Presentation | -.149 | <.001 |
| H7: Perceived Loss of Control | -.013 | .551 |
| **Control Variables** | | |
| Familiarity with Smart Glasses Technology | .268 | <.001 |
| Age | -.101 | <.001 |
Gender \[.083 \quad \text{<.001}\]

R squared \[.607 \quad \text{<.001}\]

Note: standardized coefficients presented only.

**RQ2: Difference in Adoption Contexts**

Although the analysis of the use construct shows a high internal consistency, one could argue that different theoretical mechanisms drive consumers’ intention to use smart glasses at home, in public, and at work, respectively. Thus, we ran an additional path model with three independent single item measures. We applied an MLR estimator in Mplus to estimate the path model (TLI=1.0; CFI=1, SRMR=.0). To account for shared variance in the three dependent usage-variables, we modeled correlations between their error variances.

**Table 2: Path Model with three dependent variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DV: Use Intention</th>
<th>In public</th>
<th>At home</th>
<th>At work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Usefulness</td>
<td>(.367 \quad \text{&lt;.001})</td>
<td>(.344 \quad \text{&lt;.001})</td>
<td>(.381 \quad \text{&lt;.001})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Ease of Use</td>
<td>(.089 \quad \text{&lt;.001})</td>
<td>(.105 \quad \text{&lt;.001})</td>
<td>(.058 \quad .025)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment Value</td>
<td>(.111 \quad \text{&lt;.001})</td>
<td>(.148 \quad &lt;.001)</td>
<td>(.038 \quad .134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Privacy Concerns</td>
<td>-.005 .870</td>
<td>.007 .812</td>
<td>.034 .263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Privacy Concerns</td>
<td>(-.091 \quad .001)</td>
<td>(-.088 \quad .001)</td>
<td>-.033 .259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Influence on Self-Presentation</td>
<td>-.168 \quad \text{&lt;.001})</td>
<td>(-.116 \quad \text{&lt;.001})</td>
<td>(-.088 \quad \text{&lt;.001})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Loss of Control</td>
<td>.008 .700</td>
<td>-.014 .532</td>
<td>-.031 .159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Control Variables:**

| Familiarity with Smart Glasses Technology | .231 \quad \text{<.001}\) | .178 \quad \text{<.001}\) | .285 \quad \text{<.001}\) |
| Age | -.046 .015 | -.111 \quad \text{<.001}\) | -.107 \quad \text{<.001}\) |
| Gender | \(.064 \quad .001\) | \(.076 \quad \text{<.001}\) | \(.073 \quad \text{<.001}\) |

R squared \[.468 \quad \text{<.001}\) | \(.446 \quad \text{<.001}\) | \(.417 \quad \text{<.001}\) |

Note: standardized path coefficients presented only.

The results show some differences and similarities between the three variables. First, perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use seem to be important for all three application scenarios; however, the influence of perceived ease of use in work settings is relatively low and only significant at a 5%-level. Entertainment is important for usage at home (\(\beta=.148, \text{p}<.001\)) and in public (\(\beta=.111, \text{p}<.001\)), but not at work (\(\beta=.038, \text{p}=.134\)). The risk of losing one’s privacy or that smart glasses take control over a user were insignificant in all scenarios. The risk of negatively influencing public privacy, however, was significantly related to usage intention in public (\(\beta=-.091, \text{p}<.001\)) and at home (\(\beta=-.088, \text{p}=.001\)), but not at work (\(\beta=-.033, \text{p}=.259\)). Again, all control variables were significantly related to all three dependent variables. An interesting finding is that familiarity with smart glasses technology is much stronger related to usage intention at
work ($\beta=.285; p<.001$) than to usage intention in public or ($\beta=.231; p<.001$) at home ($\beta=.178; p<.001$).

**Robustness Tests**

We conducted several robustness tests to assess the stability of our findings. First, we ran traditional OLS regression analysis and replicated the basic patterns of all findings. Second, rather than investigating each of the three use variable in a combined model, we calculated three independent models in which each independent variable was assessed independently. The results were quite similar. Third, we replicated the second step, but included the other dependent variables as control variables. For example, when assessing usage intention in public, we added usage intention at home and at work as additional covariates in the model. These results were quite similar, but effect sized decreased. An alternative approach of this assessment is to estimate the factor score of the overall use construct and to include this as a control variable in the model. By controlling for this score, the shared usage variance is parceled out. That is, the remaining variance consists of the context specific variance and the error variance. Both approaches replicated our findings. Fourth, we ran the model only with the influence on public privacy, and only with influence on personal privacy. The results remained stable, indicating that potential mediating effects of these two variables did not influence our results. Fifth, we excluded familiarity from the model and ran all analyses independently for high versus low levels of familiarity. A comparison of these two equally large sub-groups did not indicate any substantial differences, indicating that the novelty of the technology did not bias our results noticeably. Sixth, one could argue that respondents who are currently not working might bias the results for the work related use. Therefore, we re-estimated the effects of the path-model only for the respondents who are currently fulltime or part-time employed, or self-employed. The weak effect of perceived ease of use of $\beta=.058$ reported above decreased to $\beta=.038$ and became insignificant ($p=.244$), but all other effects were very similar. Finally, we re-estimated all analyses and robustness tests using different estimators, leading to very similar effects. In sum, all robustness tests indicate that the findings reported above seem to be stable.

**Discussion**

**Summary of the findings**

The results show that basic TAM patterns were replicated among smart glasses: Particularly, the results reported above clearly show that perceived usefulness and perceive ease of use are stable findings for usage intention. Entertainment value was found to be important for the intention to use smart glasses at home and in public, but not in work-related contexts. The fear that smart glasses could threaten a user’s privacy or even take control over him/her did not significantly relate to any of the dependent variables. However, influencing other people’s privacy as well as presenting oneself in a negative way decreased the propensity to adopt smart glasses.

**Theoretical Implications**
Not much research has been done to understand the theoretical mechanisms of smart glasses adoption. The findings on this study extend our knowledge by shedding additional light into existing mechanisms, and new ones. These findings are discussed below.

**Perceived ease of use and usefulness**

TAM has its roots in work-related environments, and thus, traditionally, perceived usefulness covered aspects such as getting one’s work accomplished in a more economical or faster way. In this research, we redefined perceived usefulness to a personal context. Particularly, we defined PU as the degree to which smart glasses help making a user’s life more efficient. However, in line with traditional TAM research, PU was found to be significantly related to usage intention, which is in line with prior smart glasses research (Rauschnabel & Ro, 2016; Hein & Rauschnabel, 2016; Rauschnabel, Brem & Ivens, 2015).

**Privacy Issues**

Privacy issues for a user do not relate to adoption intention. This is in line with Rauschnabel & Ro (2015) who did not find a relationship between Google’s data privacy image and consumers’ intention to adopt Google Glass. However, this study extended these findings by looking at how smart glasses influence the privacy of other people. Our results indicate that consumers who think that smart glasses influence the privacy of other people are less likely to use smart glasses, especially at home or in public. A possible theoretical explanation could be norms. Prior research has shown that social norms play an important role in predicting technology adoption. That is, if people think other people expect them to use smart glasses, they are more likely to adopt them. It could be the case that public privacy concerns negatively influence social norms, and thus lead to a lower adoption intention. However, testing this mediating role of social norms is up for future research.

**Entertainment**

Prior research has not yet looked at how the expected entertainment value of smart glasses is related to the adoption intention. Our study shows that consumers already perceive a high entertainment value (as reflected by a mean of 4.70), that also drives usage intention at home or in public. This finding is in line with smart phone usage, which shows that consumers use smart phones to organize their life (i.e. perceived usefulness) and to be entertained. The effects of entertainment value on intention reported above are much lower than for ease of use; however, this could be due to the novelty of the technology. For example, when the first cell phones in the 1990s were provided, they mostly satisfied needs related to perceived usefulness. Not surprisingly, business people were most likely to adopt cell phones that time. Later, when cell phone technology was further developed, manufacturers communicated the potential of cell phones to satisfy entertainment needs to potential customers outside the professional setting.
Influence on Appearance

In contrast to most other technologies, smart glasses are extremely visible to other people. Thus, whereas a smart phone, tablet, or even smart watch can somehow be ‘hidden’, smart glasses – like regular glasses – are worn very central on a user’s face. In other words, smart glasses are not only a technology, they also represent a fashion component. This is reflected by the influence of self-presentation. Particularly, those individuals who think that wearing smart glasses makes them look ‘strange’ are less likely to use them, especially in public. This is an important finding, as the relatively high mean (m=4.78) suggest that a majority of people perceive smart glasses as having a negative influence on their physical appearance.

Managerial contribution

Although building AR technologies, and getting them to a size that fits into glasses-like devices is a masterly performance of engineers, and developers deserve credit for recent developments in applications that can be easily used and make user’s lives more efficient, new challenges arise for smart glasses (and other wearables, too). Whereas traditional devices have not been ‘used’, smart glasses are also worn. Thus, manufacturers of smart glasses need to be aware of the design and the (perceived) influence smart glasses have on other people. Rather than focusing isolated on the technological component, the fashion component needs to be addressed when developing and managing smart glasses. We did not find any potential negative consequences of being associated with a risk of threatening a user’s privacy. However, IT security still remains a challenge to be addressed by managers. Lacks could lead to negative publicity, an overall negative image of the technology, and so forth. Finally, the biggest potentials for smart glasses, in the current stage of development, are in work-related contexts. Here, increased in the efficiency seems to be the core driver, and aspects such as user-friendliness and design seem to be at least less important than in public contexts. Thus, similar to laptop computers, cell-phones and many other technologies, starting in a professional contexts (for example, see Hein & Rauschnabel, 2016) seems to be a promising strategy. Subsequently, manufacturers should focus on improving design and user-friendliness of smart glasses, and forcing the development of apps that satisfy personal needs – such as entertainment.

Limitations and Future Research

As any research, this study has some limitations. There has been a huge discussion of whether single item measures are appropriate or not. Although this approach has been established in prior TAM studies, and our measures have been developed very carefully and validated in pre-studies, a risk that some items did not cover the each construct entirely remains. Furthermore, this study focused on direct effects only, and several moderating and mediating effects were not studied. Finally, although a large cross-sectional US-based sample provides a good overview of how Americans think about smart glasses and what drives their intentions, this cultural focus and the focus on intentions (rather than actual behavior in the future) remain limitations.
Besides addressing these limitation, several other areas for future research arise. For example, the role of privacy issues. Is privacy really unrelated to adoption or might there be indirect routes, maybe mediated by perceived risk? And, in line with our theorizing, are public privacy concerns mediated by social norms? In line with this, groundwork is needed to better understand the evaluation of smart glasses from the view of non-users who interact with users. Once more smart glasses will be launched and opportunities will arise to study these questions in practice. Finally, we have shown that design factors play an important role. However, what remains unknown is: What does “good design” mean when it comes to smart glasses? Should it incorporate aspects of a fashion accessory, or a technology for ‘geeks’ and ‘nerds’, or more commonplace like everyday spectacles? Further exploratory research is needed to understand this.

**Conclusion**

To the best of the authors’ knowledge, this is the first large-scale study that explores and investigated theoretical mechanisms of smart glasses in various usage contexts. The findings reported in the current research contribute to our understanding of this new type of devices – however, rather than talking about a technology, the fashion components suggest to talk about a ‘fashnology’.
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### Appendix

**Appendix A: Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct and Definition</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage Intention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... in public</td>
<td>I could imagine using smart glasses in public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... at home</td>
<td>I could imagine using smart glasses at home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... at work</td>
<td>I could imagine using smart glasses at work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Independent Variables</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Usefulness</td>
<td>The extent to which smart glasses can increase a user’s efficiency of daily tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smart glasses can make a user’s life more efficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment Value</td>
<td>The extent to which smart glasses are associated with providing an entertainment value to a user.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smart glasses can offer new forms of entertainment to users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Ease of Use</td>
<td>Understanding how to use smart glasses is easy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The amount of cognitive effort that is associated with using smart glasses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Privacy Concerns</td>
<td>Using smart glasses would threaten a user’s privacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The perceived risk that using smart glasses could threaten a user’s privacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Privacy is an established overall term that covers various aspects to personal information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Privacy Concerns</td>
<td>Using smart glasses would threaten other peoples’ privacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Influence on Self-Presentation</td>
<td>Wearing smart glasses makes people look strange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The extent to which wearing smart glasses negatively influences how a user is perceived by other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Loss of Control</td>
<td>Smart glasses could take control over a user.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity with Smart Glasses Technology</td>
<td>I am familiar with smart glasses technology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Seven point Likert scales, anchored from 1=totally disagree, 2, 3, 4 = moderately agree, 5, 6, 7 = totally agree*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Usage in Public</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.86</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: Usage at Home</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.735</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: Usage at Work</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.717</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: Perceived Usefulness</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Entertainment Value</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Perceived Ease of Use</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: Personal Privacy Concerns</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8: Public Privacy Concerns</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9: Negative Influence on Self-Presentation</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10: Perceived Loss of Control</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11: Familiarity with SG Technology</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12: Age</td>
<td>46.50</td>
<td>15.78</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13: Gender</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Value represents percent of males; SD is not applicable for binary variables.
## Appendix B: Sample Statistics

### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>46.5 (15.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 24</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 or older</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total household income before taxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 29,999</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000-59,999</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000-84,999</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85,000-124,999</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125,000-199,000</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000-499,000</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000 or more</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Job Situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work full-time for an employer</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work part-time for an employer</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed but desire to work</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay-at-home parent</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College student - on parent's insurance policy</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College student - not on parent's insurance policy</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired (not working and under age 65)</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired (not working and over age 65)</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ethnicity (multiple responses possible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian or White</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American or Black</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic partnership</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/separated</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=1,682, USA
Appendix C
Smart Glasses Survey

Smart glasses are smart, wearable miniature computers that utilize various sensors—such as cameras, microphones, and GPS to capture a user’s physical environment. This information can then be processed and understood by the smart glasses and overlaid with digital information in the user’s view field. This creates an “Augmented Reality Technology.”

For instance, smart glasses can recognize buildings, landscapes, texts, or human faces. This physical information can then be augmented by additional virtual information. Some examples of how this works include:

- A user can look at a famous building and receive the corresponding Wikipedia information about that building
- A user can look at another person and receive his/her social media public profile information
- Smart glasses can be used as a navigation system that guides a driver through a city by showing the driver’s route in their field of view, and warns the driver about speed limits or dangers
- A user looks at a book written in a foreign language and the smart glasses translate the book into the user’s preferred language within their field of view

The first smart glasses have just recently been launched or announced, and many more will be launched soon. Famous examples are Google Glass (Project Aura) or Microsoft HoloLens. These two examples are visualized in the following two pictures.
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Abstract

People are using social media for many different purposes, more businesses have noticed the influence of social media to people’s daily life, and are trying to use social media as the mean to reach out to potential customers. Trust is important for any type of systems, and also to social media. This study used a large scaled survey to measure trust in social media, and the usefulness of social commerce. The research results showed that in general people do not trust others from the social media communities. However, survey respondents rated high for all the social commerce measurement, which can be interpreted the users believe social commerce is useful.
Social Commerce and Trust in Social Media

Introduction

Many people use social media one way or another. The usage of the social media has increased rapidly in the last few years. People are using social media for many different purposes, from networking, business to lifestyle and personal. More businesses have also noticed the influence of social media to people’s daily life, and are trying to use social media as the mean to reach out to potential customers. Nowadays if you use Internet applications for any purposes, you would see and experience some kind of e-commerce effort. Such as after you have searched for a particular type of electronic device online, the similar devices, and similar brands will show up on your browser’s ad section, while you are checking emails, or reading news. Whether you like it or not, they are there. Similarly, social commerce have been used by many companies to promote their products and services through the use of social media. Although some users might feel unhappy or uncomfortable being tracked and watched while they using Internet and social media, some others find it is convenient and useful. In general, there are some privacy and security concerns from the users of the Internet and social media. There is also trust issues in relation to the information people are getting from social media.

Background

Trust
Regardless what type of system or information, it is always difficult to earn trust from the users. Trust or loose of trust often comes with a big price tag. Trust is an important factor that could influence user’s perceptions of any systems, and further impact on their behavior, such as consumer’s trust of an e-commerce website could lead to intent to purchase. Through its focus on building relationships and fostering interaction, social media can serve as a channel to help users and consumers overcome their reluctance (Chaney, 2013). Users of social media often seek information from trusted sites and other trusted people (Xu, 2015). It would be interesting to study how much people trust recommendations and advice from other people online, whether it will impact on their behavior. In the management literature, trust is a set of specific beliefs with the integrity, benevolence and ability of another party (Gefen, Karahanna, & Straub, 2003; Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995). Trust can create and maintain exchange relationships, which may lead to sharing knowledge of good quality (Blau, 1964). Trust has been included in many management and information systems studies, such as organizational value creation (Tsai & Ghoshal, 1998), information systems group performance (Nelson & Cooprider, 1996), online transactions (Chang, Cheung, & Lai, 2005; Gefen et al., 2003; Gefen & Straub, 2004; Pavlou & Gefen, 2004), and knowledge sharing in virtual communities (Ridings, Gefen, & Arinze, 2002).
Social media benefits and barriers / social commerce

There are many benefits of social media. Social networking sites (SNS) can help in carrying out many tasks. It can help improve communication with other people inside of the organization, and with people outside of the organization. Social media has been used as a good marketing tool. Social media can also aid collaboration (sharing knowledge, views) with others.

There are several barriers related to using social networking, they include security issues, privacy, legal issues, confidentiality. Such as using SNS at work/school can impact on the security of important data (i.e. user details, other confidential information); it can interfere in the privacy of both the user and the organization. Originations may face legal consequences for activities carried out by students/employees on social networking sites (e.g. Posting comments, videos, pictures in Facebook, Twitter…).

When looking at the benefits of the social media, there is one particular perspective that needs individual attention which is from social commerce (also known as social business) perspective. Social commerce refers to the delivery of e-commerce activities and transactions via the social media environment, mostly in social networks and by using Web 2.0 software (Liang & Turban, 2012). It supports social interactions and user content contributions.

Google research divided the path to consumer purchase into different stages: awareness, consideration, intent and decision. Assisting channels build awareness, consideration, and intent earlier in the customer journey or “purchase funnel.” Last interaction channels act as the last point of contact prior to a purchase. Social media fall in the assist stages, and rarely directly linked to the last interaction which lead to consumer purchase decision (Google, 2012).

Despite not being a direct sales channel, social media can still support e-commerce. Benefits gleaned from social media (Chaney, 2013) are:

- **Promote brand awareness.** Due to its viral nature and ability to quickly and easily spread a message, brands that commit to regular posting of relevant content on social sites grow their base of fans and followers, and have ongoing interaction with them should, over time, expect to see an uptick in awareness.

- **Help overcome customer reluctance to purchase.** Customers reliance on word of mouth, especially when it comes from trusted sources such as family and friends.
- **Improve customer loyalty.** By building relationships with new customers and strengthening relationships with existing ones via social networks, it stands to reason both will increase.

- **Provide marketing insights.** Even retailers who choose not to pro-actively participate in social media can benefit by listening to the groundswell of opinion expressed by consumers on such sites.

### Methodology

Large scaled survey was used as method of data collection. People that have had experience of using any type of social media are the population of the study. The survey questionnaire were distributed through different social media network by open invitations. Control variables such as: education level, gender, and occupation were used in order to distinguish different respondent groups and test whether there are any differences of the responses among different groups. We used online survey as platform, as people using social media are highly likely use internet often and feel convenient to fill out the online survey. In total of 142 questionnaires were completed online. Since the survey link were sent through open invitations, and people were also encouraged to share the survey link to others, therefore, we do know how many people it reached, and do not know the response rate. However, we feel that total of 142 is good enough for the data analysis purposes.

### Results

This section includes the findings from the survey questionnaire. The respondents of the survey are from wide range of social media users. For gender, table 1 shows that 57% of respondents were female, 43% were male.

**Error! Not a valid link.** Table 1: Gender of the survey respondents

The education level of the survey respondents were also wide spread. Maybe because where the researcher chose to post the survey links at, there were large percentage 48% of respondents have post-graduate degree. We do recognize this high percentage is not the true representation of the population of the people that are using social media. Further study with more representation of other education levels might help to investigate whether the education level would have signification influence on users’ perceptions. There were 19% of survey respondents had some college / university education, and 25% have college / university degree.

**Error! Not a valid link.** Table 2: What is your highest level of education?

Table 3 shows the primary occupation of the survey respondents. More than half of the respondents were professional (54%). 16% were students, 8% for non-management employed and self-employed and 7% retired. The less represented groups were management 4% and un-employed 2%.

**Error! Not a valid link.** Table 3: What is your primary occupation?

Trust is a hard intangible thing to measure. We built our measurements of users’ trust based on some traditional fields trust literature and applied them to social
media’s special environment. Particularly we are interested in social media users’ trust for other people from the social media communities. The question was on a 5-likery scale, with 1 as strongly disagree, and 5 and strongly agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People in social media communities will not take advantage of others even when the opportunity arises</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in social media communities will always keep the promises they make to one another</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in social media communities behave in a consistent manner</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in social media communities are truthful in dealing with one another</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: trust in social media

It is quite interesting to see the results from Table 4 regarding trust. The Mean for all the trust measurements are all low, they are all lower than 2.5, which means that survey respondents in general do NOT trust other people in social media. Especially, there were two measures had mean close to only 2 very low, they are: ‘people in social media communities will not take advantage of others even when the opportunity arises,’ and ‘people in social media communities will always keep the promises they make to one another.’ This is kind of ‘bad news’ for the trust in social media. As much as people are using social media, they do not seem to trust each other on social media.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Commerce</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social commerce can help promote brand awareness</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social commerce can help overcome customer reluctance to purchase</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social commerce can help improve customer loyalty</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social commerce can help improve customer satisfaction</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social commerce can help provide marketing insights</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social commerce can help support search engine optimization</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Social commerce in social media

To the contrary, survey respondents rated all social commerce measurements high to very high, with mean of 3.43 to 4.11 on the 5-likery scale. The highest rated was ‘social commerce can help promote brand awareness,’ (4.11). A number of
other measurements also had high ratings. They are: ‘Social commerce can help provide marketing insights,’ (3.88), ‘Social commerce can help improve customer loyalty,’ (3.71), and ‘Social commerce can help support search engine optimization,’ (3.7). The survey results showed that the respondents believe social commerce can be very useful for companies.

Conclusion

Social media has become party of many people’s daily life. It is important to understand how people fell about using social media and whether people trust social media, and others on social media. As trust doesn’t come easy, the survey results confirmed that is true in social media as well. The respondents from our survey do not trust others from social media, the trust level in social media is quite low. Maybe because there is an un-known, un-sure of other’s true identities factor contribute to the low trust, also it seems more difficult to build trust in the virtual world. The encouraging finding from the study was that the survey respondents gave high ratings for all the social commerce measures. This encourages for companies that are doing social commerce to continue, and offer better services and to give some assurance for companies that are planning or considering doing social commerce. Social media is a field need many study both in theory and practice, as the research would benefit both the social media users and company that is interested in using social media to interact with its users.
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Abstract

The management literature reflects a growing interest in narcissism. Narcissists are more arrogant and greedy, and have lower empathy. However, their drive for attention and power, and façade of self-confidence allow narcissists to advance. Regarding decision making, our review finds that narcissists are less likely to recognize the moral content of decisions. Narcissists are also more likely to accept alternatives that are risky and that exploit others. We present a framework for narcissism’s influences on decision making in organizations. Implications for future research on top management team conflict, and on organizations that tend to attract and retain narcissists, are discussed.
NARCISSISM AND DECISION MAKING IN ORGANIZATIONS

Within the last few years, narcissism in organizations has become a growing and potentially important area of scholarly inquiry. For instance, narcissism has been linked to workplace deviance, job performance and contextual performance (Judge, LePine & Rich, 2006). Narcissism has also been linked to exploitative behavior in negotiations (Jonason, Slomski & Partyka, 2012). CEO narcissism appears to be associated with their companies’ erratic financial performance (Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007). The pervasiveness of destructively narcissistic managers poses a significant and costly problem (Lubit, 2002).

However, this growing body of research has not yet been integrated into a comprehensive model of organizational decision-making processes. A comprehensive model of organizational decision-making processes addresses factors such as needs assessment (problem recognition and definition), generation of alternatives, evaluation of alternatives, selection of an alternative, implementation, and post-implementation evaluation of the decision. In addition, a comprehensive model of organizational decision making addresses collaboration and moral values.

To fill this void, this literature review presents a model of narcissism’s influences on decision making in organizations. First, narcissism is defined and contrasted with related personality traits. The needs, values, information processing patterns and collaboration patterns associated with narcissism are reviewed. Second, decision making processes in organizations are framed. Decision making oriented toward utility maximization is compared and contrasted with ethical decision making. Third, research on narcissism is integrated with the decision-making framework to generate research propositions. The paper concludes with theoretical and practical implications.

Narcissistic Personality

Narcissism has been described in a variety of ways. For instance, Judge, LePine and Rich (2006) emphasize narcissists’ grandiosity and exaggeration of their talents and accomplishments. Resick and colleagues’ (2009) study of narcissism focused on arrogance, grandiosity, and self-promotion due to their centrality to the definition of narcissism and their observability. While narcissism in the business literature focuses on sub-clinical narcissism, we can draw useful insights from a clinical narcissistic personality inventory. The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 4th ed., Text Revision (2000) lists unrealistic self-perceptions, negative reactions to criticism, unrealistic expectations of success, lack of empathy, and excessive self-interest as characteristics of narcissists.

Narcissism is related to but distinct from traits such as psychopathy, Machiavellianism, extraversion, hostility and self-esteem. Judge and colleagues (2006) note that although narcissism has a positive relationship to self-esteem, the magnitude of the relationship is only moderate (Brown & Zeigler-Hill, 2004). Resick and colleagues (2009) point out that narcissism is distinct from true self-confidence and favorable self-evaluations, which
represent the “bright side” of leadership and promote leader effectiveness. Paulhus and Williams (2002) highlight the distinctiveness of three separate personality traits that all include a lack of empathy, namely Machiavellianism, psychopathy and narcissism. While narcissism is related to inflated self-esteem, Machiavellianism is characterized by disregard for morality and deceptive interactions with others; and psychopathy by antisocial behaviors, impulsivity and callousness.

Lubit’s (2002) treatise on destructive narcissism in managers explains how the condition is often the result of a traumatic childhood that robs the individual of a true sense of self-esteem. They have an inner void that leads them to seek excitement despite high risks. Destructive narcissists also lack commitment to any core values. They lack concern for the rights of others and drive away the most talented employees.

Measuring narcissism can be quite difficult due to the stigma of the term and the personality traits of the narcissist, which can make willing participants difficult to secure. The literature shows several methods of identifying and measuring narcissism. Paulhus and Williams (2002) used the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (Raskin & Hall, 1979) to measure narcissism in their participants, while Zhu and Chen (2014) used the prominence of CEOs in press releases and company publications to generate CEO’s narcissism scores using an ordinal scale. Brown and colleagues (2010) used the Phares and Erskine Selfishism Test to gather data from a sample of business students.

The measures used to analyze decision-making behaviors vary between studies as well, Chatterjee and Hambrick (2011) used an aggregate of three major forms of risky spending, research and development, acquisitions, and capital expenditures. They determined that since all three strategies contributed roughly equivalent amounts of spending that it was not necessary to differentiate them in their results. Brown and colleagues (2010) used ethical questions from Frank (2004), which address an ethical dilemma in a business and interpersonal setting.

Some of the methods used in previous studies have had difficulty removing confounding variables from their measures, Zhu and Chen’s (2014) method of measuring CEO prominence in company publications could involve more factors than narcissism, such as appealing to expectations of the company or shareholders, advice from image and marketing teams, and perception of similar behavior in peers.

**Needs, Values and Narcissism**

Needs and values determine which alternatives decision makers choose, and narcissism is associated with distinctive patterns in desires. Narcissists attempt to display their superiority by succeeding where others fail, by overcoming obstacles and taking risks. Chatterjee and Hambrick (2007) contend narcissistic CEOs are attracted to making bold and flashy business decisions, but not necessarily good ones. They found CEO narcissism was heavily correlated with erratic annual performance.
Narcissists have an overwhelming desire to outperform others, often disregarding difficulty and risk to achieve where others fail. Wallace and Baumeister (2002) found through a series of experiments that individuals high in narcissism tend to perform highly when they are told that a task is difficult and perform poorly when they perceive the task as simple. Low narcissism groups in the same study performed oppositely, with perceptions of difficulty predicting a more conventional performance. The authors concluded that this indicates narcissists’ desires to prove their superiority over others, particularly in the presence of an evaluative audience.

Narcissism is hallmarked by a deep-seated feeling of inferiority, which narcissists mask with grandiose behaviors and power seeking. Rosenthal and Pittinsky’s (2006) review found that narcissists use the credit and praise bestowed upon them for their accomplishments to bolster themselves, while simultaneously shifting responsibility for failures onto others. They authors state that, although narcissists consume praise and recognition excessively, a narcissist is never truly satisfied with accomplishments and will always seek more power and praise. Excessive need for praise and power can lead to the destruction of an organization, particularly when coupled with the blame-shifting behaviors that narcissistic leaders exhibit.

**Information Processing and Narcissism**

Patterns in information processing influence decisions, and narcissism influences perceptions, judgment and learning. For instance, ignorance to their condition is thought to be universal in narcissists. However a study performed by Carlson, Vazvire, & Oltmanns (2011) would seem to differ. Their study revealed that to a degree narcissists recognize their arrogance or narcissism. This begs the question of how they can maintain an excessively positive self-perception despite this knowledge. Carlson and colleagues (2011) suggest that the perception of these traits by the narcissist is different from others, for instance that a narcissist might view himself as having earned the right to be arrogant, while others interpret arrogance as being undeserved by definition. In other words, narcissists have high opinions of their abilities, and they believe those high opinions are justified.

Perception of success and interpreting cues of success are different for narcissists than the general population. According to Chatterjee and Hambrick (2011) narcissistic CEOs tend to be more dismissive of objective measures of performance than their peers. The authors also note that narcissists tend to respond more to social praise than their less narcissistic counterparts. This would indicate that objective feedback is not given appropriate weight in their risk appraisal process, which can lead to inappropriate risk taking.

Narcissists are overly confident in their abilities and maintain this confidence despite any contrary evidence, but are overly critical of others (Farwell & Wohlwend-Lloyd, 1998). Narcissists are generally optimistic toward personal performance, but not toward group or collaborative performance. The authors found a negative correlation between narcissism and appraisal of partners on tasks, potentially due to a feeling of envy or of being
competitive with their task partners. This would suggest an inability of narcissists to work with a team effectively due to their perception of their team members’ inadequacy.

**Collaboration and Narcissism**

Decision making in organizations often benefits from some degree of collaboration, and research shows that narcissism is associated with poor collaboration. Narcissists disregard authority figures and frequently ignore wisdom offered to them due to their high opinion of themselves and their degradation of others. According to Campbell and colleagues (2011), mentoring relationships involving narcissists can be detrimental to the protégé. Allen et al. (2009) support this with research that indicates narcissistic protégés can feel less fulfilled by mentoring, often do not perceive the benefits of mentoring, and disregard advice of their mentors. In response to the mentor-protégé study, Campbell and colleagues (2011) observed that there appears to be a change in leadership behaviors when dealing with narcissistic subordinates, which may be detrimental to their leader-member exchange.

Narcissistic CEOs are careful and biased when selecting advisors. In a study concerning narcissistic CEOs and selection criteria for board members Zhu and Chen (2015) found that, narcissistic CEOs were likely to select individuals that they perceived as being similar to them, had similar levels of narcissism, or had worked with other narcissistic CEOs. Zhu and Chen (2015) hypothesized that this was due to the perceived willingness of these three types of individuals to accept and support the risk taking behaviors of the CEO. Narcissistic CEOs’ tendency to surround themselves with individuals who enable risky behavior can be quite dangerous for an organization.

Psychological entitlement can interfere with the development of interpersonal relationships, and entitlement is considered a core component of narcissism (Pryor, Miller & Gaughan, 2008). Individuals scoring high on the entitlement subscale of the Narcissism Personality Inventory (NPI) were found to be more interpersonally antagonistic, less modest, more deceitful, more distrustful, less compliant, more resistant to authority, and to have colder and more detached views of others. Using a measure of psychological entitlement closely correlated with the entitlement subscale of NPI, Campbell et al. (2004) found that psychological entitlement was associated with higher levels of greed in decision making. Highly entitled individuals displayed more selfish and less cooperative responses to a commons dilemma involving harvesting trees from a forest.

Narcissists’ self-aggrandizing tendencies and naturally low opinions of others can make them unpopular, and they often fail to sustain personal relationships. Carroll and colleagues (1996) found that individuals who perceived someone as narcissistic were less interested in interacting with that person. Additionally, participants were likely to rate the perceived narcissist as being high in social dysfunction. This would indicate that the narcissistic personality is irksome to others, further impeding their social abilities.
Decision Making in Organizations
Utility-Maximizing Decision-Making Processes

Corporate executives are agents employed by the shareholders (the principals) with the expectation that the executives will make decisions that optimize returns on the shareholders’ assets (Jensen & Meckling, 1976). A premise of the economics of organizations is that people seek to maximize utilities (Freeman, 1999). Transaction cost economists acknowledge decision makers in organizations often operate in circumstances that place bounds on their ability to maximize utilities (Williamson, 1993). The assumptions of the classical decision-making model typically do not apply in practice. But while strict adherence to the prescriptions of the classical decision-making process is rare, systematic analytical decision making patterned after the classical model can lead to higher quality decisions than unstructured decision making (Bazerman, 2005).

In the simplest sense, any decision-making process entails a minimum of two parts: (a) recognition of the situation and (b) the evaluation-choice of a solution (Mintzberg, Raisinghani & Theoret, 1976). Systematic, analytical decision making is typically initiated with an explicit needs assessment (Bazerman, 2005; Page, Tootoonchi & Rahman, 2009). During needs assessment, the objective of the decision-making activity is identified (Abelson & Levi, 1985). Some information surrounding the decision is selected and classified as important and worthy of attention; other information is classified as less important or noise (Simon, 1957). However, as Page and colleagues (2009) note, needs assessment is often biased by a tendency to escalate commitments to past choices, the desire to defend past choices, a false sense of control over uncontrollable events, the discounting of unfavorable possibilities and exaggeration of the likelihood of favorable possibilities (Abelson & Levi, 1985; Bazerman, 2005). During needs assessment, a problem is defined and the criteria for identifying a good decision are specified. The situation as it is understood and diagnosed during needs assessment has a major effect on the decision that is ultimately selected (Mintzberg, et al., 1976).

With the need for decision making specified, the next step in classical decision making involves the search for alternatives. The organization and its external environment are scanned for information on courses of action that if selected might satisfy the criteria identified during needs assessment. However, searches are constrained by factors such as the cost of information and the perceived importance of the decision (Page, et al., 2009).

The next step entails evaluation of the alternatives that have been identified relative to the criteria. Expert advice and forecasts can be used to predict the adequacy of each alternative (Bazerman, 2005; Harrison, 1999). Evaluation proceeds iteratively as some alternatives are identified as inferior and others appear sufficiently promising to justify the cost of additional information and time to evaluate them. When decision making is formal and thorough, the information used and processing of information are more complete and less likely to be influenced by the biases of the decision makers. On the other hand, informal evaluation of alternatives is prone to distortion due to simplistic information processing, the preferences of the decision makers and political agendas (Bazerman, 2005; Harrison, 1999; Page, et al., 2009).
An alternative is chosen on the basis of its top ranking among alternatives with respect to the decision criteria and the alternative’s expected outcomes. Effective selection is a function of the decision makers’ competence and experience (Bazerman, 2005; Harrison, 1999; Page, et al., 2009).

The benefits of effective decision making are realized when the alternative selected is implemented (Harrison, 1999). Implementation of the selected alternative can be carried out by the party that made the decision, through collaboration of the decision makers with others, or delegated by the decision makers to be carried out by other parties. The results of implementation will reveal the accuracy of the predicted outcomes of the decision. Evaluation entails comparing the results of implementation of the alternative to the needs assessment. Needs are reassessed. Following implementation, needs might be fully satisfied, partially satisfied, unchanged or exacerbated. Needs that are not fully satisfied can be the impetus for another decision-making process (Harrison, 1999).

Some have advocated techniques and practices to overcome biasing factors in decision making in order to closely adhere to a process such as the one outlined above and thereby improve decision quality (e.g., Janis, 1982). To do so is to make decisions in a boundedly rational way inasmuch as the decision making is intentionally rational but with inevitable limitations (Williamson, 2010). Bounded rationality is due to inherent limitations in information availability and cognitive abilities (March & Simon, 1958).

Such contemplative, deliberate decision-making processes may not be optimal for “high velocity” environments in which rapid and discontinuous change result in information that is inaccurate, obsolete or unavailable (Bourgeois & Eisenhardt, 1988). Successful decision making in such environments requires carefulness and quickness; a decisive and powerful CEO and a powerful top management team; and, pursuit of innovation and incremental implementation. More deliberative decision making is not as well suited for high velocity environments.

Satisficing is another decision-making approach that can be quicker than contemplative, deliberate decision making. March and Simon (1958) posit that by necessity managers engage in satisficing in that they search for and select acceptable responses to needs they recognize, and they do so with limited and available information. The assessment of the need can be implicit or can be articulated in simplistic form. The search for alternatives is non-exhaustive and may emphasize alternatives selected in response to past needs. Evaluation of the alternatives can coincide with the search for them. When satisficing, the decision makers may discontinue search and evaluation of alternatives once an alternative is identified that is reasonably expected to satisfy the needs that triggered the decision-making process. While satisficing simplifies decision making, it uses incomplete analyses of needs, search for alternatives, and evaluation of alternatives. Decisions are expedient but likely to be inferior to those that would result from systematic, deliberative processes.
Ethical Decision-Making Processes

There is a long tradition of treating ethical decision-making processes in organizations as being different than utility-maximizing decision processes in the scholarly literature (Elm & Radin, 2012). However, it is not clear that doing so is necessary or useful. Messick and Bazerman (1996) contend that unethical decisions are merely a type of bad decision. Elm and Radin’s (2012) study of managerial decision making did not find that ethical decision-making processes differed from other types of decision making, and they suggest that progress in the field of ethical decision making may be hampered by not connecting it with the broader field of research on decision making.

This caution aside, not all decision-making situations involve moral content, and the decisions that do require moral self-regulation in order to achieve optimal decisions. Bandura (1986) posits that moral self-regulation requires an individual’s self-monitoring of their decisions and actions, self-judgment of the goodness or badness of alternatives relative to underlying values, and self-reactive mechanisms that censure or approve specific behaviors. These mechanisms, when engaged, prevent individuals from making and acting on choices that conflict with their values. In order to make decisions that conflict with one’s values without negative self-evaluation, moral self-regulation must be disengaged. Moral self-regulation and moral disengagement processes do not pertain to decisions that are unrelated to ethical values.

Baron and colleagues (2015) found that entrepreneurs’ motivation for financial gains contributed to their moral disengagement, which in turn increased their tendency to make unethical decisions. They suggested entrepreneurs’ desires for financial gains can “lubricate the downward slope toward unethical decisions and behaviors.” Although decisions that conflict with the decision maker’s values can be defined as failing to maximize utility, it might be instructive to frame ethical decision making as at least a special concern with utility maximization. As Baron, et al. (2015) note, decisions with moral implications may require an additional self-regulatory process of modulating desires for financial gains in order to avoid incurring contradictory moral costs.

Much attention in ethical decision making inquiry has been devoted to moral reasoning; reasoning within ethical situations. Rest’s (1986) model is perhaps the most popular. The four-stage model includes moral awareness, moral evaluation, moral intention and moral behavior. Further, much attention has been given to individual’s ethical sensitivity, which is the capacity to recognize that a decision-making situation has moral content. Relatedly, Kohlberg (1981) found that an individual’s moral reasoning was influenced by their level of moral development. At the most primitive level of moral development, the pre-conventional level, moral reasoning is egocentric and focuses on consequences for the decision maker rather than ethical values. For individuals maturing to the conventional level, moral reasoning incorporates consideration of the prevailing values of the social context. Among individuals who achieve the post-conventional level of moral development, moral reasoning involves the decision maker’s personal moral standards that can conflict with the prevailing values of the social context.
Trevino (1986) proposed a person-situation interactionist model of ethical decision making. The model proposed that decisions are determined by the moral reasoning level of the decision maker moderated by the situation and characteristics of the individual. Presented with an ethical dilemma, the decision maker’s cognitive processes are determined by their stage of moral development. Decisions made and acted upon are also influenced by the individual’s ego strength, field dependence, and locus of control. Choices are also shaped by pressures, reinforcement and norms unique to the job and organizational context.

Intuitive decision-making processes are also believed to pertain to ethical decision making (Haidt, 2001). This approach contends that ethical decisions are made primarily by rapid intuitions rather than by contemplative reasoning through to a solution. After moral intuitions have made a choice, reasoning about the choice then takes place. Moral intuition has been presented as an alternative to the more rational, conscious models favored by Kohlberg, Rest and Bandura.

Gunia, et al. (2012) elaborated on the role of social contemplation prior to making choices and on social accounts that decision makers provide for their choices. Their decision-making model included three parts; contemplation, conversation and explanation. Contemplation was defined as individually conducted moral reasoning. Conversation involved social contemplation; situation-relevant conversations between two or more parties. Explanation was the provision of social accounts of decisions. Contemplation and conversation help individuals construct explanations that are able to present decisions in socially accepted ways. Their experiment found evidence for both a priori contemplation, and for rapid decision-making processes like the use of moral intuition. In addition, their results suggest that contemplation was not merely used by subjects to construct explanations for unethical choices; contemplation amplified ethical action.

**Narcissistic Decision Making**

**Recognition of Problems**

One way in which narcissists differ from the average person is through their need for acknowledgement and praise. Consequently, they are more sensitive to and aware of opportunities to self-promote and gain praise from others. Chatterjee and Hambrick (2007) concluded that narcissists are prone to flashy and attention-grabbing decisions, leading to erratic annual performance. According to Wallace and Baumeister (2002), those high in narcissism may work to achieve a more difficult goal because of the prestige that difficult tasks entail. The perception that the task is more difficult or exclusive is enough to elicit this response according to Wallace and Baumeister (2002). Thus, the following is proposed:

Proposition 1: The higher a person’s narcissism, the more opportunities to get attention they perceive and the more frequently they initiate problem solving to exploit such opportunities.
Narcissistic CEOs can exhibit what Galvin and colleagues (Galvin, et al., 2015) refer to as Narcissistic Organizational Identification, a conflation of self and organization. Narcissistic leaders may envelope the organizations they lead within their own sense of identity, attributing successes of the organization to their selves and taking personal pride in achievements of their organization. The authors proposed that this is due to the narcissistic self-perception that they are the face of the company and that others can only see the organization in relation to themselves. This outlook can be detrimental to the organization if the narcissistic leadership begins to exploit the organization for their own benefit, which Galvin and colleagues conclude to be a natural behavior of the Narcissistic Organizational Identification relationship.

Proposition 2: The higher a person’s narcissism, the more opportunities to boost the image of their organization they perceive and the more frequently they initiate problem solving to exploit such opportunities.

Protecting one's self-esteem is a significant predictor of behavior. The narcissistic personality trait is positively associated with self-esteem (Nicholls & Stukas, 2011; Sedikides, Rudich, Gregg, Kumashiro & Rusbult, 2004). However, the self-esteem of a narcissist tends to be fragile and unstable, requiring constant defense and reinforcement (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001). The higher in narcissism a person is, the more likely they are to perceive a threat to their self-esteem. Accordingly, we propose the following:

Proposition 3: The higher a person’s narcissism, the more likely they are to perceive threats to their egos and initiate problem solving to address such threats.

Ethical decision making requires sensitivity to the moral rights of parties (Cavanagh, Moberg & Velasquez, 1981), and people high in narcissism are less sensitive to such concerns. Narcissists do not respect other’s rights (Lubit, 2002). Instead, they devalue and exploit others for support and esteem. Unconcerned with the rights of others, they are unlikely to notice a rights-related problem to be solved. Moreover, while evaluating alternatives during decision making, narcissists are less likely to reject an alternative on the basis of that alternative violating other’s rights. For these reasons, the following are proposed:

Proposition 4(a): The higher a person’s narcissism, the less likely they are to initiate problem solving to address violations of other’s rights.

Proposition 4(b): The higher a person’s narcissism, the less likely they are to consider other’s rights while considering alternative courses of action.

Being cold and detached, individuals high in narcissism are unlikely to notice others' unhappiness and respond by engaging in problem solving. In personality research, comparison of the entitlement subscale of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory to the NEO Personality Inventory (Costa & McCrae, 1992) found negative correlations of narcissism with warmth, tender-mindedness and altruism (Pryor, et al, 2008). Narcissists are somewhat oblivious to opportunities to be helpful. This gives rise to the following proposition:
Proposition 5: The higher a person’s narcissism, the less likely they are to recognize opportunities to improve the well-being of others through problem solving.

Narcissists are overly confident in their abilities and maintain this confidence despite any contrary evidence. According to Farwell and Wohlwend-Lloyd (1998) narcissists are generally optimistic toward personal performance. The authors report that they found a negative correlation between narcissism and appraisal of partners on tasks, potentially due to a feeling of envy or of being competitive with their task partners. This would display an inability of narcissists to work with a team effectively due to their perception of their own superiority.

Proposition 6: The higher a person’s narcissism, the less likely they are to recognize problems attributable to their own inadequacies

Moral self-regulation in decision making is unlikely to be a strong suit of narcissists. Moral self-regulation involves evaluation of the goodness or badness of alternatives relative to underlying values (Bandura, 1986). Without a strong set of personal values, narcissists are not prepared to make such assessments. Consequently, narcissists are expected to be less effective at noticing the moral content of decisions, which gives rise to the following proposition:

Proposition 7: The higher a person’s narcissism, the less effective they are at moral self-regulation, and the less likely they are to recognize the moral content of decision-making situations.

Identification, Evaluation and Selection of Alternatives

Narcissists are less likely to consider and use input from others while evaluating alternative courses of action. Kausel and colleagues (2015) studied how narcissists responded to advice and found that narcissists perceive the advice of others as being useless and inaccurate. They also found that while accountability can increase advice taking in those with lower narcissism, this same effect does not significantly impact those with high narcissism. Additionally, Allen and colleagues (Allen, Johnson, Xu, Biga, Rodopman & Ottinot, 2008) found that narcissistic protégés frequently disregard the advice of their mentors and perceive fewer benefits from mentoring as a result.

Proposition 8: The higher a person’s narcissism, the less likely they are to consider and use input from others while evaluating alternatives.

Narcissism is associated with grandiose self-confidence (Lubit, 2002). Narcissists are overly optimistic about their performance and sustain their confidence despite evidence of their limitations (Farwell & Wohlwend-Lloyd, 1998). This gives rise to the following proposition:

Proposition 9: The higher a person’s narcissism, the higher their propensity to overestimate their abilities to implement solutions and to favor overly ambitious alternatives.
Narcissism has been associated with exploitative behavior in negotiations (Crossley, Woodworth, Black & Hare, 2016). Organizations may inadvertently reward exploitative attitudes toward others, as exploitation can provide advantages in negotiations (Jonason, Slomski & Partyka, 2012). Accordingly, the following is proposed:

Proposition 10: The higher a person’s narcissism, the more likely they are to consider an alternative that exploits others to be an acceptable alternative.

A lack of commitment to a set of personal values and an inner emptiness push narcissists toward risky alternatives. Lubit (2002) described stories of executive decision making in which due diligence was not conducted. The excitement of high risk shapes narcissists’ choices. Thus, we propose the following:

Proposition 11: The higher a person’s narcissism, the more they favor overly risky alternatives.

Feeling entitled, people higher in narcissism are especially inclined to favor alternatives that are beneficial to them. Their decision making is biased by their selfishness and greed (Campbell, et al., 2004).

Proposition 12: The higher a person’s narcissism, the more heavily they weight their own personal gains or losses in the evaluation of alternatives.

Narcissists can be hard to get along with, their self-aggrandizing tendencies and naturally low opinions of others can make them unpopular, and they often do not maintain personal relationships for very long. Carroll et al. (1996) performed a study that found individuals who perceived someone as narcissistic were less interested in interacting with that person. Additionally participants were likely to rate the perceived narcissist as being high in social dysfunction. This would indicate that the narcissistic personality is irksome to others, further impeding their social abilities.

Proposition 13: The higher a person’s narcissism, the fewer confidants and associates they have who provide uncensored input during contemplation of alternatives.

According to Zhu and Chen (2015), narcissistic CEOs are biased when selecting collaborators. They found that narcissistic CEOs were likely to appoint and select board members that had similar levels of narcissism, or who had worked with other narcissistic CEOs. The authors hypothesized that this was due to the perceived willingness of these individuals to accept and support the risk-taking behaviors of the CEO. This can be negative for the organization due to the lack of diverse opinions and viewpoints appraising the risk in high-level decision making. The potential for amoral and unethical behaviors is also heightened in this situation, as the narcissist’s biases and lack of empathy are unchallenged.

Proposition 14: The higher a person’s narcissism, the more likely they are to have associates who are similar to them and reinforce rather than correct their biases in alternative evaluation.
Decision Implementation and Post-Implementation Evaluation

Narcissists have a drive to prove their superiority and this leads to extra effort and higher achievement. Wallace and Baumeister (2002) found through a series of experiments that individuals high in narcissism tend to perform highly when they are told that a task is difficult or hard to achieve and perform poorly when they perceive the task as simple. Low narcissism groups in the same study performed differently; perceptions of difficulty led to a more conventional performance level. The authors conclude that this indicates a narcissistic desire to prove superiority over others.

Proposition 15: When narcissists perceive decision implementation to be an opportunity to prove their superiority, narcissism will be positively associated with high levels of effort and higher achievement.

Overestimating their own capabilities and underestimating those of others (Farwell & Wohlwend-Lloyd, 1998), people high in narcissism are less likely to use help when implementing decisions. They are self-aggrandizing and have naturally low opinions of others (Carroll, et al, 1996; Lubit, 2002). For these reasons, we prose the following:

Proposition 16: The higher a person’s narcissism, the less likely they are to ask for help when implementing decisions.

According to a literature review by Rosenthal and Pittinsky (2006) narcissists use the credit and praise bestowed upon them for their accomplishments to bolster themselves, while simultaneously shifting responsibility for failures onto others. The authors state that, though narcissists consume praise and recognition excessively, a narcissist is never truly satisfied with accomplishments and will always seek more power and praise. Excessive need for praise and power can lead to the destruction of an organization, particularly when coupled with the blame-shifting behaviors that narcissistic leaders exhibit.

Proposition 17: The higher a person’s narcissism, the more likely they are to shift blame for poor results.

Social praise and attention may have a greater impact on narcissists than do objective measures of success. According to Chatterjee and Hambrick (2011), narcissistic CEOs tend to be more dismissive of objective measures of performance than their peers. The authors also note that narcissists tend to be bolstered significantly more by social praise than their less narcissistic counterparts. In addition, Chatterjee and Hambrick conclude that narcissistic CEOs who receive praise for their achievements tend to take bold risks more than their less narcissistic counterparts.

Proposition 18: The higher a person’s narcissism, the more social praise for decisions matters to them in evaluating the outcomes of decisions, and the less objective measures of success matter.

Summary and Implications

This literature review provides a framework for advancing inquiry into the effects of narcissism on decision making in organizations. Furthermore, we answer the call for
additional examination of the linkages between narcissism and ethical leadership (e.g., Campbell, et al., 2011) by addressing ethical decision-making processes. Our framework suggests important directions for future research.

The extensive influences of narcissism on decision making have important implications for strategic decision making by CEOs and their top management teams. Eisenhardt, Kahwajy and Bourgeois (1997) detailed the importance of effective conflict management by top management teams in shaping strategic choice. Cohesive and effective top management teams are critical to the success of firms. Top management team members shape, articulate and execute the vision of the corporation through ongoing group interactions and decisions. Discord is natural in such situations as reasonable people are likely to view an organization's ambiguous and uncertain situation in different ways. Moreover, top management team members are likely to be passionate about their beliefs. Furthermore, conflict should be valuable. Issue-oriented conflict leads to the consideration of more alternatives, better understanding of the alternatives, and better results. To manage conflict effectively, Eisenhardt and colleagues (1997) recommend the use of heterogeneous teams, frequent team interactions, the use of distinct roles (e.g., devil's advocate, futurist and counselor), and multiple decision-making heuristics. From the review above of narcissistic decision making in organizations, it would appear that future research will find that CEO narcissism affects strategic performance of their firms by ineffectively managing top management team conflict.

One of the first decisions a narcissist makes with regard to their organization is to become a member of the organization. Future research should also examine what types of organizations attract, develop and promote narcissism. "The people make the place," inasmuch as organizational cultures are substantially shaped by the types of people they attract, select and retain (Schneider, 1987). Narcissists’ outward self-confidence can help them gain the confidence of others (Lubit, 2002), which can help them secure job offers from organizations. Once they are members of an organization, narcissists tend to select subservient lieutenants. Their drive for power and attention pushes them to attain high status positions. Additionally, their lack of attachment to values and lack of empathy give them the guile to aggressively use politics and exploitation to advance. Future research should determine which organizational cultures narcissists are more attracted to, which are more likely to select narcissists, which are more likely to promote them, and which are more likely to halt or expel them.
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Abstract

For quantitative scheduling techniques found in journals their wider use in applications has been declining by a variety of obstacles. This article will first list a number of these obstacles and then suggest ways to overcome them. Parks and Police departments are government agencies that both have limited and competing resources. In these circumstances, it is an ideal situation to share the resources as much as possible. In this paper I will show examples of where the limited resources may occur in both agencies, and how the manager may overcome these problems by sharing the resources. Examples of affective and just sharing of resources are given for both parks and police departments. In Parks Management, affective trade-offs are shown among trim mowing, tractor mowing, garbage collection and ball-field dragging. In Police departments affective trade-offs are shown among foot patrol, car patrol, detective analysis and office work.
Applying Decision Utility to Solve Problems with Limited Resources in Parks and Police Management

Introduction

Let us begin with a situation encountered in 1972 by a researcher in devising a computerized quantitative production scheduling system for a tire production plant. The schedule produced by the system was constrained by the machines available, the sequencing of the machines for each type of job, the flow of materials, the demand of make to order jobs, the demand of make to stock jobs, the job due dates, and the personnel available. The corporate MIS department commissioned the system which was designed to be updated on their mainframe computer once a week. After the system was completed, the MIS department said the system was a success because it demonstrated to the company that the computer could be used to schedule production which was the entire purpose of the project. However, the system would not be used to actually schedule production which was a shock to the author. After much thought, there were many reasons for the non-implementation. (1) Job control: the production schedulers did not want the MIS department to take control. Basically, they did not want someone else doing even part of their job. (2) Efficient schedule: the production schedulers felt that a computer program could never produce a schedule as efficient as their own and the company had the potential to lose money. (3) Short term priority changes: the computer schedule could not respond to short term changes in the priorities such as marketing or corporate headquarters requesting that a particular customer receive top priority today. (4) Tradeoffs: Production schedulers did not agree with the suggested schedule and more importantly did not know how the computer schedule that made the myriad of tradeoffs necessary to produce a schedule. For example, a production schedule must tradeoff decreasing total setup time versus increasing the chance that some due dates will not be met. In addition, if all due dates cannot be met, the computer schedule internally chooses which jobs are late and the production schedulers may not agree with the tradeoffs used to make that choice. (5) Preference and knowledge input: the computer schedule did not reflect the preferences and knowledge of the production schedulers or any other department such as marketing. (6) Using the computer schedule as a tool: most production schedulers don’t understand or even want to understand how the quantitative scheduling algorithm determines the computer schedule. Therefore, any real or perceived problem with the computer schedule is cited as proof that the quantitative scheduling algorithm should be scrapped as it is clearly inferior to a schedule produced by a production scheduler. In other words, a production scheduler is not trained to use the computer schedule as tools to help them do their job but instead view it as a competitor. (7) Incomplete information: the data used to produce the computer schedule did not completely mirror the real world situation and by necessity left out some information including political nuances. Thus, any computer schedule will usually be seen by someone as having serious shortcomings.
Priority Class Scheduling

Most of the problems listed above are present in all applications of quantitative scheduling techniques but there has been very little work in literature to try and solve these problems. One study by (Brown and Ozgur, 1997) suggested using priority class scheduling to reduce due date conflicts between marketing and the production schedulers by replacing due dates with production periods and priority classes. The priority classes are used by the production scheduler as constraints on what can be scheduled in a production period. If any job in priority class i is started in the production period, then all jobs in priority class i-1 must be completed within the production period. This is the only constraint on the production scheduler and allows the scheduler to concentrate on optimizing manufacturing efficiency within the production period. The constraint is so simple that its consequences are easily understood by those who assign jobs to priority classes but at the same time allows manufacturing some flexibility in scheduling. Indeed, the production scheduler can schedule a priority three job to be completed early in the production period as long as all priority one and priority two jobs are completed within the production period. In addition, if only some priority three jobs can be completed in the production period, the selection of which jobs to produce is made entirely on the basis of production efficiency. This gives some flexibility to manufacturing to optimize production efficiency. Indeed, the production scheduler only considers the priority classes when scheduling and does not even need to know the due dates of the jobs. This means that marketing alone without any help from the production schedulers could determine the priority class for each job and let the production schedulers concentrate on increasing production efficiency. Theoretically, priority class scheduling would greatly reduce the conflict between marketing and manufacturing. However, getting the production schedulers to agree to even try priority class scheduling would be very difficult because of some of the problems listed above. The production schedulers would perceive a loss of job control because they would feel that marketing would be dictating their jobs to them. With marketing in control of the “due dates,” manufacturing would think that getting an efficient schedule would be impossible and the company would lose money. Short term physical changes could cause the violation of the priority class scheduling rules. For example, suppose a priority class 3 job was lumped together with a priority class 1 job early in the production period to reduce setup time and cost. If later in the production period a machine broke down and caused a priority class 2 job not to be run, then at the end of the production period, a priority class 3 job was completed while a priority class 2 job was not completed. This is a clear violation of the idea of priority classes. The production schedulers would be blamed for the violation and marketing would be furious.

Scheduling Parks Maintenance

Although many quantitative scheduling techniques are designed for production scheduling, other types of scheduling problems have been studied but they have some of the same obstacles listed above for production scheduling. For example, consider the problem of scheduling jobs in a governmental agency where the amount of work to be done almost always exceeds the resources available. In this case, the scheduling problem
is deciding how much of each job to do and not do given the amount of resources on hand. Anderson and Brown (1978) devised the Parks Maintenance Management System (PMMS), a quantitative parks maintenance scheduling system that avoided some but not all of the obstacles listed above. Using the resources available (mainly personnel and machines), parks maintenance must determine how much of each job to do to keep the parks in as good condition as possible. For example, in the summer, a parks maintenance district must tradeoff how the number of times jobs like tractor mowing (mowing large open areas), trim mowing (mowing small areas around trees, sidewalks, buildings, etc.), litter removal, and ball field dragging are done in each park. The main problem is to determine the correct balance between the jobs given the resources available. This is clearly a case where a balance is necessary because doing a lot of litter removal and ball field dragging while doing no mowing would not be acceptable to the tax payers. For each parks district and scheduling period, the PMMS used as data a list of the parks, estimates of the time for a parks maintenance crew to complete each job in each park, the personnel and equipment available, and what personnel and equipment that constituted a parks maintenance crew for each job. In addition, the model was driven by a maximin value function collected from the parks maintenance management that showed what they considered the best balance of the jobs at various levels of resources. For example, they might feel that for a low level of resources, relatively more mowing should be done while for a higher level of resources, the amount of litter removal and ball field dragging relative to mowing should be increased. A computer schedule was run every two weeks and gave a district maintenance supervisor an amount of each job the district could accomplish in the next two weeks with the resources predicted to be available. This computer schedule represented the best balance between the jobs as it maximized the maximin value function given the resource constraints. A very simple example will be used to illustrate PMMS. Suppose a parks manager (PM) is trying to decide how many times the jobs trim mowing, tractor mowing, litter removal, and ball field dragging should be completed this summer for the parks in his district. First, the PM’s perfect complements preference structure is determined by having him complete a table. Table 1 contains a completed table where initially the Desirable Quantity column as well as columns 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 are empty except for the Totals and UTILITY rows. The PM is asked to give how many times each job should be done to keep the parks in good condition (these amounts should represent the upper end of the PM’s range of interest). The PM’s response is shown in the Desirable Quantity column of Table 1. Next the PM is asked to complete column 1 with percentages of the corresponding desirable quantity that sum to 80. The response of 10 for trim mowing corresponds to 10 percent of the desirable quantity of 20 or 2 trim mowings. These percentages reflect the PM’s tradeoffs between the four attributes and contain what he considers the best balance between them given the percentages can only sum to 80. The attribute values corresponding to the percentages in column 1 are 2 trim mowings, 10 tractor mowings, 2 litter removals, and 0 ball field draggings over the summer. These attribute values are then entered in column 1 of Table 2. In a similar manner, the PM then fills in columns 2, 3, 4, and 6 so the percentages for each column sum to the amount listed in the Totals row. Finally, the attribute values corresponding to the percentages are entered in the appropriate columns in Table 2. This collects data on what the PM thinks is the best balance between the
attributes over a range from doing nothing (column 0) to the desirable quantities (column 5) and beyond (column 6).

Table 4: Constrained Choice Table for Parks Maintenance Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>DESIRABLE QUANTITY</th>
<th>PERCENT OF DESIRABLE QUANTITY</th>
<th>UTILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trim Mowing</td>
<td>20 Mowings</td>
<td>0 10 40 50 80 100 100</td>
<td>0 80 160 240 320 400 480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractor Mowing</td>
<td>20 Mowings</td>
<td>0 50 70 90 100 100 100</td>
<td>0 20 40 60 80 100 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter Removal</td>
<td>10 Removals</td>
<td>0 20 50 80 90 100 120</td>
<td>0 0 0 20 50 100 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballfield Dragging</td>
<td>100 Draggings</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 8 16 20</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 8 16 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>0 80 160 240 320 400 480</td>
<td>0 20 40 60 80 100 120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since each column in Table 2 is a point in the attribute value space, a linear line between these points approximate what the PM considers the best balance over the entire attribute value space. To keep it simple, suppose the only limiting resource needed to accomplish the jobs is labor measured in hours. The PM estimates that one trim mowing requires 50 labor hours, one tractor mowing requires 40 labor hours, one litter removal requires 150 labor hours, and one ball field dragging requires 10 labor hours. These estimates are entered in the LABOR HOURS column of Table 2. The labor hours needed to accomplish the attribute values in columns 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 are computed and entered in the TOTAL LABOR HOURS row. Suppose the PM has 2074 labor hours available this summer. Then the amounts of each attribute that provides the best balance while using no more than 2074 labor hours can be found by linear interpolation in Table 2. From Table 2, the best balance is 8.8 trim mowings, 15.6 tractor mowings, 6.2 litter removals, and 8 ball field draggings for a utility of 48. Note that a non-integer amount such as 8.8 trim mowings is acceptable because that means every park would be trim mowed 8 times and get 80 percent of the way through the ninth trim mowing.
This system has many advantages. The PM’s preferences are inputted to the model and are used to determine the best amounts of each attribute to accomplish given the resources available. The PM can easily understand how the quantitative scheduling algorithm determines the schedule. In addition, “what if” questions can now be answered. Suppose city council asked the Parks Department what it could accomplish if the labor hours were increased from 2074 to 2438. Using linear interpolation, Table 2 shows that 2438 labor hours would increase the trim mowing from 8.8 to 9.6, increase tractor mowing from 15.6 to 17.2, increase litter removal from 6.2 to 7.4, and increase ball field dragging from 8 to 16. PMMS also collected data on how much of each job was accomplished in the preceding two week period. Although this actual job performance data was compared to what the computer schedule predicted could be done, it was not used in a punitive fashion but rather as a starting point for discussion of what changes would enable the parks department to do a better job of serving the public. The objective was to instill pride in the parks maintenance personnel and to motivate them into making continual improvements. By design and by enlightened management, PMMS avoided many of the obstacles listed above. PMMS avoided the job control obstacle as parks maintenance management viewed the computer schedule as simply a starting point and was free to change it as conditions warranted. In addition, the computer schedule only gave the amounts of each job that could be accomplished and did not tell a manager what personnel should be assigned to which crew or, like priority class scheduling, when the jobs should be done within the period. The managers were free to devise their own work schedule within the computer schedule framework so they were motivated to design an efficient schedule and could not blame any inefficiencies on the computer schedule. The managers were also free to respond to both short term physical changes and priority changes as they saw fit. The preference and knowledge input obstacle and the tradeoffs obstacle were, for the most part, avoided by using the maximin value function supplied by the parks maintenance management to drive the determination of the computer schedule. For the obstacle regarding using the computer schedule as a tool, every effort was made to enable parks management to accomplish this but was limited by the fact that the computer schedule was only produced once every two weeks and the parks maintenance managers could not use it to ask “what if” questions. In addition, although there was some minimal training on how the quantitative scheduling algorithm worked, hindsight says that more effort should have been directed into training. Finally, as with all applications of quantitative scheduling techniques, the incomplete information obstacle was present. As it was applied to parks management, another example was given by the author in a separate journal article regarding the scheduling of police work by using maximin value function, an article written by Ozgur and Brown (2012).

Maximizing Efficiency and Balancing Work Load for Police Station

Although many quantitative scheduling techniques are designed for production scheduling, other types of scheduling problems have been studied but have some of the same obstacles listed above for production scheduling. For example, consider the problem of scheduling police officers in a police department where the amount of work to be done almost always exceeds the resources available in a given time period such as summer months. In this case, the scheduling problem is deciding how much of each type
of job to do and still protect the public and ensure public safety given the amount of resources on hand for the entire summer months. For each police scheduling period, the police chief used as data a list of the police officers, estimates of the time for a police officer or police car to complete each job in the city, and what additional personnel and equipment was available by the police department for each police activity. In addition, the model was driven by a maximin value function collected from the police department that showed what the police chief considered the best balance of the jobs at various levels of resources. For example, they might feel that for a low level of resources, relatively more patrol, either foot or car patrol should be done while for a higher level of resources, the amount of detective analysis and office work should be preferred over foot patrol or car patrol. A computer schedule was run every two weeks and gave the police chief or the police supervisor an amount of each job the city could accomplish in the next two weeks with the resources predicted to be available. This computer schedule represented the best balance between the jobs as it maximized the maximin value function given the resource constraints. A very simple example will be used to illustrate police scheduling. Suppose the police chief or the police supervisor is trying to decide how many times the detective analysis or the office work will be done in lieu of foot patrol or car patrol. The decision should be how much foot or car patrol should be completed in lieu of office work or detective analysis in a period in his district. First, the police chief’s perfect complements preference structure is determined by having him or her complete a table. Table 3 contains a completed table where initially the Desirable Quantity columns, as well as columns 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 are empty except for the Totals and UTILITY rows. The police chief is asked to give how many times each job should be done to keep the city, and its streets or roads safe in good condition (these amounts should represent the upper end of the police chief’s range of interest). The police chief’s response is shown in the Desirable Quantity column of Table 3. Next the police chief is asked to complete column 1 with percentages of the corresponding desirable quantity that sum to 80. The response of 10 for foot patrol corresponds to 10 percent of the desirable quantity of 20, or 2 foot patrols. These percentages reflect the police chief’s tradeoffs between the four attributes and contain what he/she considers the best balance between them given the percentages can only sum to 80. The attribute values corresponding to the percentages in column 1 are 2 foot patrols, 10 car patrols, 2 detective analyses, and 0 office work over the entire summer. These attribute values are then entered in column 1 of Table 4. In a similar manner, the police chief then fills in columns 2, 3, 4, and 6 so the percentages for each column sum to the amount listed in the Totals row. Finally, the attribute values corresponding to the percentages are entered in the appropriate columns in Table 4. This collects data on what the police chief thinks is the best balance between the attributes over a range from doing nothing (column 0) to the desirable quantities (column 5) and beyond (column 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>DESIRABLE QUANTITY</th>
<th>PERCENT OF DESIRABLE QUANTITY</th>
<th>TABLE 3: Constrained Choice Table for City Police Departments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.Foot Patrol</td>
<td>20 Officers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Car Patrol</td>
<td>20 Cars</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since each column in Table 4 is a point in the attribute value space, a linear line between these points approximate what the police chief considers the best balance over the entire attribute value space. To keep it simple, the only limiting resource needed to accomplish the jobs is labor measured in hours. The police chief estimates that one foot patrol requires 80 labor hours, one car patrol requires 40 labor hours, one detective analysis requires 100 hours, and one office work requires 40 labor hours. These estimates are entered in the LABOR HOURS column of Table 4. The labor hours needed to accomplish the attribute values in columns 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 are computed and entered in the TOTAL LABOR HOURS row. Suppose the police chief has 2074 labor hours available this summer. Then the amount of each attribute that provides the best balance while using no more than 2074 labor hours can be found by linear interpolation in Table 4. From Table 4, the best balance is 8.53 foot patrol, 15.05 car patrol, 5.79 detective analysis, and 5.27 office work for a utility of 46. Note that a non-integer amount such as 8.53 foot patrol is acceptable because that means every officer would foot patrol 8 times and 1 officer would get only 53% percent of the way through the ninth patrol walk.

This system has many advantages. The police chief preferences are inputted to the model and are used to determine the best amounts of each attribute to accomplish given the resources available. The police chief can easily understand how the quantitative scheduling algorithm determines the schedule. In addition, “what if” questions can be answered in the quantitative algorithm. Suppose the city asked the Police Department what it could accomplish if the labor hours were increased from 2074 to 2438. Using linear interpolation, Table 4 shows that 2438 labor hours would increase the detective analysis from 5.79 to 6.56, increase office work from 5.27 to 10.39, increase foot patrol from 8.53 to 9.04, and increase car patrol from approximately 15 to 16. The police chief also collected data on how much of each job was accomplished in the preceding two week period. Although this actual job performance data could be compared to what the computer schedule predicted could be done, it was not used in a punitive fashion but rather as a starting point for discussion of what changes would enable the police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTRIBUTE</th>
<th>LABOR HOURS</th>
<th>ATTRIBUTE VALUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.Foot Patrol</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0 2 8 8.53 9.04 10 16 20 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Car Patrol</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0 10 14 15.05 16.08 18 20 20 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.Detective analysis</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0 2 5 5.79 6.56 8 9 10 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.Office Work</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0 0 0 5.27 10.39 20 50 100 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LABOR HOURS</td>
<td>0 800 1700 2074 2438 3120 4980 7400 10000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITY</td>
<td>0 20 40 46 50 60 80 100 120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
department to do a better job of serving the public. The objective was to instill pride in the police department personnel and to motivate them into making continual improvements. By design and enlightened management, the police chief avoided many of the obstacles listed above. The police chief avoided the job control obstacle as the police department viewed the computer schedule as simply a starting point and was free to change it as conditions warranted. In addition, the computer schedule only gave the amounts of each job that could be accomplished and did not tell the chief what personnel should be assigned to which job or, like priority class scheduling, when the jobs should be done within the period. The chief was free to devise his/her own work schedule within the computer schedule framework so he/she was motivated to design an efficient schedule and could not blame any inefficiencies on the computer schedule. The chief was also free to respond to both short term physical changes and priority changes as he/she saw fit.

The preference and knowledge input obstacle and the tradeoffs obstacle were for the most part avoided by using the maximin value function supplied by the police department to drive the determination of the computer schedule. For the obstacle of using the computer schedule as a tool, every effort was made to enable the police department to use the computer schedule as a tool. This was limited by the fact that the computer schedule was only produced once every two weeks and the police department chief could not use it to ask any “what if” questions. In addition, although there was some minimal training on how the quantitative scheduling algorithm worked, hindsight says that more effort should have been directed into training. Finally, as with all applications of quantitative scheduling techniques, the incomplete information obstacle was present. Another model that was used successfully in scheduling is for sequence-dependent set-up products.

Sequence-Dependent Set-up Scheduling of Production

The setups in a facility or a plant are done for similar products in a sequence. Sequence-dependent set-up can be symmetric or changing from product A to product B or from B to product A (Ozgur and Brown, 1995). Sequence dependent set-up times done for similar products in a sequence can also be made for asymmetric or changing from product A to product B is different than changing from product B to product A (Ozgur and Bai, 2010). In the asymmetric sequence-dependent setup case with different setup from product A to product B than product B to product A is more complicated than if the sequence-dependent setups were symmetric because even though the set-up time from switching from product A to product B is different than switching from product B to product A. The switchover times for asymmetric matrices should be similar to switchover times had the sequence-dependent set-up times had been symmetric, since we are dealing with the same products. However even though, the sequence dependent set-ups from product A to product B will be slightly different than changing from product B to product A if the sequence-dependent setups are asymmetric. However, it won’t be too different from each other if the sequence-dependent setups were symmetric, because product A and product B are going to be similar whether the set-up times are symmetric or asymmetric, because it is the same product A and same product B. Even though there might be small difference changing over from product A to product B vs. changing over
changing over from product B to product A. Since they are the same product A and product B, we can expect the differences to be small.

Sometimes to be able to group similar items to groups cluster analysis is used so that we sequence the products within each group. Once all the groups are sequenced, we have another procedure that finally sequences all the groups together to come-up with one final sequence. However the sequence dependent set-up sequencing is a special case of Traveling Salesmen Problem (TSP). The TSP is non-polynomial (NP) bounded or it is also referred to as NP- complete. NP- complete problems are well known in the literature that takes an inordinately long time to complete. As a matter of fact if the problem is too big, it is unsolvable. That is why we approached the sequence dependent set-up problem heuristically, using a common sense rules of thumb.

**Overcoming Obstacles**

Using the discussion above, some strategies and ideas on how to overcome obstacles to the application of quantitative scheduling techniques can now be stated. Probably the most important idea is to make the quantitative scheduling technique accessible to the managers as an integral tool in their day-to-day work. This requires three important changes in the way quantitative scheduling techniques are designed and implemented. Managers must understand how the scheduling algorithm works so they know not only its strengths but its weaknesses. Much more time must be spent in educating the managers so they view the scheduling algorithm as an important tool that they can use. Managers must have constant access to the scheduling algorithm so they can run “what if” analyses. This access was not possible in the 1972 tire production system because only mainframe computers were available. However, today the power of laptop computers and the internet make this access possible, but the designers and programmers of the scheduling system must make this access the top priority in the design and implementation of the computerized quantitative scheduling system. Ways to measure a manager’s value function and integrate that value function into their model must be invented. If this is done, the manager will feel a sense of ownership of the model and will not be afraid to use its results.
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Abstract

Lean practitioners use a variety of metrics to continually assess and control system performance. Some of these metrics possess a cost accounting nature. Inherent characteristics of these cost accounting metrics, including their predefined time horizon, cost allocation approach, and the potential lack of a customer perspective can confound process improvement efforts. This recognition has led to the recent emergence of *lean accounting*. Lean accounting has emerged in recognition of the potential short comings of traditional cost accounting methods as a means of promoting continuous improvement efforts. This paper focuses on the impetus for the emergence of lean accounting.
The Emergence of Lean Accounting

Introduction

Transformation system performance metrics are collected and used for three primary purposes. First, they enable a better understanding or monitoring of the current system state. Second, they promote control activities, or corrective actions which guide improvement efforts towards the ideal state. Third, they are used for both internal and external stakeholder reporting purposes.

Numerous metrics have been devised to assist the lean practitioner over the past three decades. These metrics capture system performance data to better focus monitoring and controlling efforts to better assist the attainment of improvements in system objectives. These metrics are commonly focused on a specific aspect of system performance such as time (e.g., set up, takt, pitch, or throughput times), costs (e.g., inventory investments and turnover rates), quality (e.g., number of defects), flexibility (e.g., set up times or the variety of items produced), sustainability (e.g., reclamation or recycling achievements), or worker safety and morale (e.g., number of accidents).

This paper focuses on the emergence of lean accounting. Lean accounting does not refer to an alternative means of accounting. Namely, lean accounting is not well defined to date. Rather, the emergence of the term lean accounting has occurred in large part due to limitations of current cost accounting practices which form the basis of numerous performance metrics used for monitoring and controlling purposes within transformation systems. This subject is beginning to garner attention as metrics impact operating practices as well as internal and external reporting practices. This paper identifies and explains the limitations of current cost accounting practices which have served as the impetus for the emergence of lean accounting. The contribution of this paper is not to suggest a better means of accounting, but rather to identify potential shortcomings of current accounting practices from a lean perspective, which may promote future improvement efforts. Along these lines, this paper provides guidance relevant towards the creation of metrics for the lean practitioner.

Lean Performance Metrics

Lean performance metrics, or key performance indicators (KPIs), may be categorized by the objective they recognize, including time, cost, quality, flexibility, sustainability, or employee safety and morale. Alternatively, a KPI may be categorized by the portion of the system it monitors, ranging from a KPI captured for a resource as small as machine, to a larger process, or to the entire organization itself. Although not meant to be an exhaustive list, frequently encountered lean metrics categorized by objective are identified in Table 1.

Table 1: Example Lean Performance Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric Nature</th>
<th>Lean Performance Metric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Time based

- Total order throughput time
- Average system order throughput time
- Process velocity = throughput time/value-added time
- Net operating time available = total operating time available – production and maintenance downtime
- Plant availability = total operating time available/net operating time available
- Number of process steps; machine setups; material touches

Cost based

- Number of process or system employees
- Inventory turnover = cost of goods sold/average inventory
- Days of inventory outstanding = 365 days/inventory turnover
- Efficiency = actual output/standard output
- Utilization = total resource time usage/total resource time availability
- Yield = (units produced–defective units)/units produced
- Process step efficiency = (order batch size × takt time)/total process step operating time
- Labor productivity = units of output/units of labor

Quality based

- Number of defects (defect rates)
- Scrap rates
- First time through = (order batch size – number of defects in order)/order batch size

Flexibility based

- Setup times (possibly as a portion of pitch times)
- Range of worker task capabilities
- Range of machine task capabilities
- Routing alternatives

Sustainability based

- Extent of energy requirements supplied by renewable/alternative energy sources
- Waste to landfill (indexed to net sales)
- Volatile air emissions (indexed to net sales)
- Environmental protection agency toxic release inventory (indexed to net sales)

Safety and Morale based

- Number of job accidents
- Employee satisfaction
- Staff retention

The vast majority of research demonstrates that firms commonly rely on numerous KPIs when employing lean (Kennedy and Widener, 2008). Lean practitioners find it desirable to rely upon metrics possessing a variety of characteristics. For instance, metrics that are visual enhance communication and comprehension capabilities. Visual management techniques have the ability to convey a lot of information quickly. Furthermore, people seemingly retain information better when it is represented both verbally and visually. Nonfinancial metrics that relate back to specific products or processes enable system monitoring and proactive measures to be taken. For example, capturing hourly outputs
may promote system adjustment efforts in as much of a real time manner as is possible. Alternatively, financial metrics that are often well understood as people easily understand the value of a dollar.

In addition to differing characteristics, the time and location metrics are captured differs to some extent upon the transformation environment. For example, in low-volume, batch environments, the examination of connections and flows between resources is critical for waste reductions. This is true given the impacts varied upstream batch process times have on downstream arrival times and delays. Therefore, it is important for the system drumbeat (takt times and pitch times) to be consistent between connecting process resources. Alternatively, in high-volume, repetitive, line flow processes, it is assumed that processes are initially designed with a common takt time across system resources. Therefore, a greater focus on the productivity of the resources themselves is often pursued. In particular, a measure such as overall equipment effectiveness and the six big losses of equipment utilization, which focus on equipment availability (equipment failure, setup, and adjustment), equipment speed loss (idling, minor stoppages, and reduced speeds), and output loss due to lower quality (defects and reduced yields) is useful (Nakajima (1988). The point is, not all lean metrics or KPIs are useful for all types of transformation processes. Given their varied nature, lean practitioners often rely upon a variety of metrics, both financial and nonfinancial.

Many of the metrics noted in Table 1 lack a direct financial nature. For example, the days of inventory outstanding expresses the expected time required for demand to consume the existing inventory. However, a critical element of many business choices relates to the financial bottom line. Financial implications of strategic choices, tactical, as well as operational decisions can materially affect lean practices. Simply put, many common lean performance metrics may be converted into financial terms; however, they are not directly financially focused.

**Lean Accounting**

Financial accounting is commonly thought of as having an external reporting focus. As an integral business function though, accounting serves both internal and external cost-reporting purposes. Financial accounting measures and records transactions and contributes to various documents, primarily financial in nature, based upon generally accepted accounting principles (GAAPs).

Anecdotal evidence suggests financial accounting performance metrics do not always serve lean practitioners well for several reasons. First, financial accounting performance metrics provide late information. In particular, measures calculated at the end of a period, such as a month, may delay or prevent proactive actions. Second, financial accounting performance metrics may be vague. For example, the allocation of indirect overhead costs to a line of products does not represent accurate system performance. Third, measures, which are primarily financial in nature (e.g., standard costs) do not relate to the customer’s perspective of value-added tasks for specific products. This confounds
process improvement activities. Consequently, the term *lean accounting* has recently emerged.

The emergence of lean accounting recognizes the potential deficiencies of current financial accounting practices when attempting to assess system performance. Lean accounting attempts to rationalize the necessity to track, allocate, and monitor financial metrics at numerous, pinpoint locations within operation processes. Lean accounting recognizes that voluminous transaction processing attributable to standard costing and overhead allocation practices does not add value to well-understood, stable processes. Rather, some of the financial metrics and processed transactions which focus on tracking, allocating, and monitoring system performance may be unnecessary and eliminated.

A sound understanding of financial accounting practices and financial metrics is important for lean practitioners’ comprehension of lean accounting and for choices both in the boardroom and on the factory floor. These practices and metrics may reflect data that are financial in nature or they may reflect data that concern defects due to unmet specifications including length, width, height, weight, or volume. Alternatively, the data may reflect flow interruptions due to late materials, poor machine reliability, missing tools, unavailable operators, and so on. The point is lean practitioners benefit from the knowledge of a broad set of performance assessment tools with the frequency of data collection being determined by the value of the data itself. Highly stable operations require less data collection and transaction processing.

Ideally, lean practitioners will rely upon a broad set of performance measures possessing numerous characteristics. These characteristics can include (1) financial metrics, (2) current, or real-time system performance, (3) a depiction of the current state of the process relative to the planned or expected state, (4) engaging the individual(s) close to the process and those individuals who are responsible for maintaining and correcting the process, (5) if possible, simultaneously relying upon multiple sensory functions (e.g., coupling audio signals with visual signals), (6) utilization of smaller time increments between data capture points enabling issues being brought to light sooner and more easily, highlighting the introduction of assignable sources of variation, (7) use for accountability regarding investigative results, and (8) utilization of various colors in order to depict multiple-state conditions. Some of the more significant accounting practices and financial metric topics impacting lean practitioners’ choices both in the boardroom and on the factory floor are identified in the following sections.

**Cost Accounting**

Cost accounting provides much of the information used for financial accounting reporting purposes. Cost accounting typically collects, analyzes, and disseminates financial and nonfinancial information related to the costs of resource acquisition and consumption supporting transformation processes for both internal and external decision making.

*Cost allocation* is used to describe the assignment of *indirect costs* (e.g., lease, overhead, insurance, taxes, and quality assurance, and quality control) to particular cost objects
(e.g., individual jobs, orders, a product, department, machine, or material). The objective of allocating indirect costs to an object is to measure the underlying usage of indirect resources by objects. Cost accounting relies upon individuals within responsibility centers to provide estimates of resource usage for cost allocation purposes. Resource usage often cuts across multiple departments making accurate estimates difficult at best. Indirect costs, which are assumed to be related to an object such as a part, machine, or an order, cannot be directly or easily traced to an object. Indirect costs are nonetheless attributed to the object despite the difficulty tracing costs.

Indirect costs can comprise a significant portion of overall costs assigned to objects. The historical practice of allocating indirect costs in this manner has been done for several reasons. First, it assumes this information is necessary for economic decision making, such as determining a selling price for a product. However, in a product’s inception, the selling price may not sufficiently cover production costs, as production volumes are commonly low relative to later periods. Leaders should always examine decisions from a systematic point of view; otherwise, some products assessed as being successful in later life cycle stages may never initially go into production. Second, full cost disclosure, even though one may be relying upon inaccurate cost estimates, can be used to motivate employees to alter designs. Various strategies, including simplicity from fewer parts, the use of standardized components, or possibly alternative materials or technologies can be followed to alter designs. Third, estimates for reasonable reimbursement rates may be required. Fourth, external information reporting is often necessary.

Unfortunately, indirect cost estimates can be wrong to a great extent, leading to poor decision making. This sometimes occurs because indirect costs are often accounted for with definitive time periods (e.g., a week or month). However, indirect costs may be incurred beyond these discreet time periods. Furthermore, indirect costs are often assumed to be incurred at a linear rate such as the incurrence of monthly rent. Yet not all months have the same number of working days. And, there may be variable (seasonal) aspects to some indirect costs, further reducing the effectiveness of estimates.

An additional cost allocation issue is whether indirect costs are controllable, minimally influenced, or uncontrollable. This issue is similar to non-value-adding activities. Most would agree that non-value-adding activities should be eliminated, as they are wasteful. Unfortunately, not all non-value-adding activities can be eliminated, as they may not be avoidable. Some costs that are allocated to objects are uncontrollable. Examples of uncontrollable costs include depreciation, workspace charges, general and administrative overhead allocations, and even direct labor during periods of low demands as the labor may not be transferred or eliminated. Uncontrollable costs should be recognized so managers do not pursue matters beyond their immediate, direct control.

Choices about: (1) the degree of detailed estimation, collection, analysis, and reporting of information, (2) product-costing (service-costing) methods (e.g., variable, absorption, or throughput costing), (3) product-costing methods using traditional sequential tracking or backflush tracking, and (4) process costing methods (e.g., weighted average and first in, first out) can each have profound impacts on costs of goods sold and therefore financial
reporting implications. These are but a few of the accounting issues confronting the lean practitioner. These ideas are discussed in the following four sections.

**Activity-Based Accounting Systems**

Emerging lean accounting practices seek to reduce non-value-adding transaction processing, eliminate standard costs in favor of actual costs, and eliminate cost allocations. Activity-based costing (ABC) represents a step in this direction. ABC attempts to improve upon traditional estimating approaches of indirect costs by focusing on less aggregated or more detailed transformation activities, such as actual machine setup times, design activities, or inspection activities for each specific product in order to allocate indirect costs to objects on the basis of specific activities undertaken for each product.

ABC activities may rely upon process flowcharts to more accurately trace and estimate indirect costs. Process flowcharts may provide a more finely structured mapping of transformative activities allowing a more accurate cost tracing and subsequent allocation.

ABC systems commonly use utilize a four-part cost hierarchy (Horngren, Foster and Datar, 2000). The hierarchies are based upon different types of cost drivers or differing degrees of difficulty in determining cause-and-effect relationships for cost allocations, which may be estimated based upon a process flowcharting investigation. Four-part hierarchies, which determine how indirect costs are allocated are typically related to (1) output unit-level cost measures, (2) order- or batch-level cost measures, (3) product- or service-sustaining cost measures, and (4) facility-sustaining cost measures. Each of these hierarchies is defined in the following text.

**Output unit-level cost measures** assess indirect costs against resources consumed producing specific products or services. Examples of these activities include electrical consumption and machine maintenance. Costs associated with these activities are assumed to be directly proportionate with the output levels for a product or service. Indirect costs deemed related to unit output levels are allocated directly using a measure such as unit outputs. For example, assume the monthly electric bill for an organization producing 500 units of product A and 250 units of product B is $1,000. In this example, monthly electric costs allocated to product A would be $666.67 (500/750 × $1,000), while $333.33 (250/750 × $1,000) would be allocated to product B.

**Order- or batch-level cost measures** assess indirect costs against resources consumed producing an order or a batch of a product or a service rather than against unit output levels. Examples of these activities would include item procurement or setup activities. Costs associated with these activities are assumed to be incurred once per order or batch for a product or service. Assume the setup costs associated to produce a batch of product A are estimated to be $250. If five setups are done for product A during the month, the costs allocated for product A setups would be $1,250 (5 × $250).
Product- or service-sustaining cost measures assess indirect costs against resources consumed producing a specific product or service. This assessment does not occur on the basis of units or batches, but rather for the product or service itself. Examples of this would include vendor identification, product design, product engineering, and tooling costs. Each of these activities incurs costs, which cannot be directly traced to unit or batch volumes.

Facility-sustaining cost measures assess indirect costs against resources consumed producing all of the organization’s products and services. Examples of these costs include lease, custodial, security, information technology, and other costs. Determining cause-and-effect relationships for these cost allocations are most difficult. Therefore, some organizations deduct these costs from operating income rather than pursuing a product cost allocation approach.

Cost hierarchies used within ABC systems promote identification of cost cause-and-effect relationships. The idea of ABC systems is to promote more accurately tracing and estimating of indirect costs, which may promote efficiency improvements. The cost cause-and-effect relationships promote more accurate indirect cost tracing and estimating, which may allow for waste elimination and efficiency improvements. However, it is important to understand the effort involved in determining detailed identification of cost drivers and cost categories. Detailed ABC systems can be costly to initiate, understand, operate, and maintain. In effect, the lean practitioner must question the value added of this detailed information.

Product (Job) Costing: Variable, Absorption, and Throughput Costing

Reported income is a key metric in the performance evaluation of all managers. It is important to understand that the incurrence and reporting or the expensing of costs can significantly impact short-term performance perceptions. Lower-volume, batch processes typically rely upon one of three alternative methods of product (job) costing. These methods recognize that work flows in low volume systems focus upon specific customer orders often possessing distinctly identifiable (customized) characteristics. These historical product costing approaches differ largely in their treatment of inventoriable costs, which refers to the timing of when costs of a product (job) are expensed as cost of goods sold.

The three alternative lower-volume batch process product-costing methods are variable, absorption, and throughput costing. These methods differ in the timing in which they expense “variable” and fixed manufacturing costs. The difference is attributable to the expensing of these costs to either the period in which the product is made or in which it is sold. If any costs are expensed in a later period than the product is made, those costs are inventoried in the earlier period(s) and consequently inflate the earlier period’s operating income.

Variable costing is an inventory costing method that reports variable manufacturing costs (both direct and indirect) in the period in which the product is sold, not necessarily in the
period in which the product is produced. Variable costing reports both direct and indirect variable manufacturing costs in the form of stored inventory, allowing for delayed reporting of these manufacturing costs until the period in which the product is sold. While the reporting of variable manufacturing costs may be inventoried under variable costing, fixed manufacturing costs (both direct and indirect) are excluded from inventoriable costs and therefore are treated as an expense in the period in which they are incurred.

Absorption costing is a product costing method that treats all manufacturing costs of a particular product, both variable and fixed manufacturing costs, as inventoriable costs. Absorption costing uses the total direct costs and indirect overhead costs associated with manufacturing a product as the cost base. Relative to the variable costing method, use of absorption costing can encourage managers to produce more inventory than necessary in order to inflate operating income in the period because absorption-costing inventories not just variable manufacturing costs but also fixed manufacturing costs. In general, if inventories increase during an accounting period, more operating income will be reported under absorption costing than variable costing. All nonmanufacturing costs are expensed in the period in which they are incurred under both variable- and absorption-costing approaches.

Contrary to variable and absorption costing, throughput costing treats all costs except those related to variable direct materials, as expenses of the period in which the product is made. Namely, only variable direct costs are inventoriable costs. Throughput costing results in a lesser incentive to increase production in order to artificially inflate operating income in a specific period. Table 2 compares the cost expensing differences among the three alternative product-costing methods.

**Table 2: Comparison of Product Costing Method Expensing Manner**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventoriable Costs</th>
<th>Throughput Costing</th>
<th>Variable Costing</th>
<th>Absorption Costing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Variable Direct Material Costs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Variable Direct Conversion Costs*</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Variable Indirect Manufacturing Costs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fixed Direct Manufacturing Costs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fixed Indirect Manufacturing Costs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Variable direct conversion costs refer to all direct manufacturing transformation costs less direct material costs.
It should be clear that the three alternative product-costing methods impact reported income differently. Variable and absorption costing can promote the unnecessary buildup of inventories which leads to inflated current period performance because they treat some costs as inventoriable thereby avoiding their immediate incurrence. It should be noted that among the three product-costing methods, GAAP requires U.S. firms utilize absorption costing for external financial reporting and is therefore the most commonly used product costing method.

Although absorption costing is the product costing method most commonly used, there is disagreement as to the favored inventory costing approach. Lean practitioners might consider throughput costing to encourage greater efficiencies. However, throughput costing is not allowed for external reporting if its use results in materially different numbers than those reported by absorption costing. As previously noted, GAAP does not allow throughput costing to be used for external financial reporting for U.S. firms. However, GAAP is not followed globally. Furthermore, there is disagreement among accountants as to a favored product-costing approach. Some accountants suggest variable costing be used for external reporting because the fixed portion of manufacturing costs is more closely related to manufacturing capacity than to the actual production of specific units. Other accountants suggest absorption costing be used for external reporting because inventories should carry both variable and fixed cost components as both are necessary for production.

**Traditional Product Costing and Backflush Inventory Costing Choices**

The product (job) costing methods for lower volume batch process transformation systems noted above traditionally assume a sequential approach. Specifically, accounting journal entries occur at sequential process stages such as procurement (raw materials inventory), fabrication (work-in-process inventory), final assembly (finished goods inventory), and distribution. Each one of these process stages requires recording journal entries.

An alternative to traditional product costing is backflush inventory costing. It is sometimes used in systems with short throughput times that maintain little in-process inventories or highly stable periodic inventory levels. Although it still reflects a linear process flow, backflush inventory costing often omits capturing one or more in-process accounting journal entries, effectively delaying the costing process until final assembly is completed. Costs are then “flushed” back at the end of the production run and assigned to the goods. This eliminates some of the detailed tracking of costs at intermediate production process steps, a feature common to traditional sequential costing systems. The detailed tracking of traditional sequential costing systems may simply not provide the value-added information for monitoring and control purposes.

By eliminating work-in-process accounts and journal entries, backflush costing simplifies the accounting process. However, this simplification and other deviations from traditional costing systems mean that backflush costing may not always conform to GAAP. For example, work-in-process inventories may exist but would not be recognized in financial
statements. This system also complicates a potential audit trail, as the ability to identify resource consumption at sequential process stages may be eliminated.

Process Costing: Weighted Average and First In, First Out

Accounting in higher-volume, repetitive, line flow processes often uses a costing approach which recognizes the higher-volume nature of the process for financial reporting. Although there may be minor differences, it is often assumed each item is largely identical, consuming similar production resources. Consequently direct material costs, direct labor costs, and indirect manufacturing costs are largely indistinguishable among the mass-produced items. As a result of this uniformity, a process-costing approach treats all units produced as equivalent through the adoption of an average production cost per unit to calculate unit costs of products or services.

Given of the wide variety of items produced in lower volume, batch processes, product costing methods record separate journal entries for each product at each production process stage (e.g., procurement, fabrication, or assembly stages). As a result of equivalent products, rather than having separate journal entries at each stage of the high volume production process for different products, process-costing methods result in a single journal for each process stage. Process costing relies on two alternative inventory cost flow assumptions, a weighted average or a first in, first out (FIFO) assumption. Each of these methods results in different work-in-process and work-completed costs.

The *weighted average* process-costing method calculates an equivalent unit cost of work done to date, regardless of the actual period or timing in which the work was completed. It assigns this cost to both the number of equivalent units completed and transferred downstream as well as to the equivalent units transferred to work-in-process inventory at the end of the period. The *weighted average cost* is the total of all costs entering the work-in-process journal account (regardless of timing) divided by total equivalent units of the work done to date.

The *FIFO* process-costing method may be best explained as a four-step process. First, it assigns the cost of the previous period’s equivalent unit ending inventory (current period’s equivalent unit work-in-process beginning inventory) to the first units completed and transferred downstream during the current period. Second, it assigns the costs of equivalent units worked on but not finished during the period to the remaining equivalent unit work-in-process beginning inventory. Third, cost assignment proceeds to equivalent units arriving, completed, and transferred downstream during the period. Fourth, cost assignment proceeds to equivalent units arriving and remaining in work-in-process inventory.

The principal differences between these two process-costing procedures include the following observations. First, the weighted average process-costing method aggregates inherited units and costs (work done in prior periods and accounted for as current period beginning inventory) with units and costs of work done during the current period. As a result, the weighted average process-costing method tends to smooth (average) equivalent
unit costs. Second, the weighted average process-costing method is computationally simpler than the four-step FIFO process. Third, the FIFO process-costing method for equivalent unit costs is performed solely for work done during the current period. Therefore the FIFO method is more transparent with information concerning periodic cost changes, which may enhance one’s performance-monitoring ability. Fourth, costs of completed units and therefore, operating income can be materially different under the two approaches when the direct material or transformation process costs vary greatly from period to period or when there is a dramatic change in periodic work-in-process inventory levels relative to work transferred downstream. This can influence one’s understanding of financial reports. Regardless of the method, process-costing approaches are typically used exclusively in high-volume process industries that produce similar items, given their need to determine equivalent units. Otherwise, the average production cost per unit is too broad.

Conclusions

Beyond specific cost-based accounting metrics, there are additional financial controls and KPIs that lean practitioners should be aware of as well. For example, in any investment decision, various financial considerations should be assessed. Among these are example metrics such as the payback period, return on capital, discounted or net present value, as well as operating profit.

Needless to say, there is a wide array of important performance metrics. Some focus on various system objectives (e.g., cost or time), others examine specific system elements (e.g., machine utilization), some are not directly financial in nature (e.g., inventory turns), and others are directly financial (e.g., payback period). Emerging lean transformation system monitoring and control procedures are attempting to focus on recent system or current state performance, social controls (e.g., encouraging worker cross-training), and visualization approaches. Technology is facilitating and will continue to facilitate the identification of more costs as direct rather than as indirect costs. For example, bar code technology can identify consumption of specific parts within an exact stage of a transformation process.

Some common performance metrics possess a cost accounting nature. Inherent characteristics of these cost accounting metrics, including their predefined time horizon, cost allocation approach, and the potential lack of a customer perspective can confound process improvement efforts. This recognition has led to the recent emergence of lean accounting. Although not well defined to date, lean accounting has emerged in recognition of the potential shortcomings of traditional cost accounting methods as a means of promoting continuous improvement efforts. This paper serves to highlight the reasons for the emergence of lean accounting.

The emergence of lean accounting refers largely to the need to develop metrics that address system assessment that possess the following desirable characteristics: (1) financial, (2) current, or real-time relative to the planned or expected state, (3) engaging the individual(s) close to the process and those individuals who are responsible for
maintaining and correcting the process, (5) if possible, simultaneously relying upon multiple sensory functions (e.g., coupling audio signals with visual signals including various colors in order to depict multiple-state conditions), (6) utilization of smaller time increments between data capture points enabling issues being brought to light sooner and more easily, highlighting the introduction of assignable sources of variation, and (7) accountability regarding investigative results.

It is important to understand that many variables impact lean performance metrics. The data characteristics noted above reflect desirable characteristics which expand upon financial accounting KPI’s. Monitoring, controlling, and improving transformation processes are data driven. The focus, nature, and limitations of each metric should be understood. Lean practitioners benefit from the knowledge of a broad set of performance assessment tools.
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Abstract
Prior research has shown that supply chain disruptions cause decline in stockholder wealth. This paper explores the factors that affect the stock impact of supply chain disruptions. We use Event Study Methodology and analyze supply chain disruptions data from the US, India, and Japan to reveal the stockholder wealth impact. The rich multinational data allows comparison of stock impact between countries considered. We find that disruptions cause stock decline, however, the magnitude of decline varies between countries. We also study contagion across competitors. Along with companies reporting a supply chain disruption, unaffected competitors in the same industry segment also experience a stock decline following the disruption. We also reveal that stock decline is significantly higher in recessionary market period. Companies show statistically insignificant stock decline from disruptions in bear market cycle. Outside the US, we observe significant stock decline prior to public announcement of disruption. This may indicate possibility of insider trading. Our results are of importance for supply chain managers who make decision regarding investments in disruption mitigation. Investor who take short positions on stocks could use our results to make better investment decisions.  
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Introduction

Supply chain management has been considered as the next big source of creating competitive advantage. Operationally and financially, companies benefit from adopting and improving supply chain management practices. These benefits are, however, difficult to quantify. Anecdotal and case study based evidence may not be enough to justify investment in supply chain management. Effective supply chain practices are expected to make operations reliable and responsive to unexpected events such as supply chain disruptions. Therefore, one approach to estimating the value of effective supply chain management is to estimate the value lost when disruptions happen. For publically traded companies, the diminished value could be estimated with stockholder wealth changes.

Past research has linked supply chain disruptions with the stock performance of affected companies (Kumar, Liu, and Scutella, 2015; Filbeck, Kumar, Liu, and Zhao, 2015; Filbeck, Kumar, and Zhao, 2014; Schmitt & Raman, 2012; Hendricks & Singhal, 2003, 2005a, 2005b). The supply chain performance, during disruptions and otherwise, affects financial performance of a company often measured in terms of cash flow, earnings, return on assets (ROA), and credit ratings. Disruptions could influence these metrics and thus the financial outlook of a company. The consequence is expected to be reflected in stock market outcomes which are efficient to any new information.

A significant amount of research has been devoted to addressing various aspects of disruptions. The issues addressed include strategic, tactical, and operational. See Ellis et al. (2011) for a thorough literature review. However, the extant quantitative literature on disruptions management is almost entirely focused on supply chains in the US. Supply chains differ between countries (Sahay, Gupta, and Mohan, 2006; Zhao, Flynn, and Roth, 2006, 2007). They may also vary in their disruption mitigation abilities, which are affected by culture and country (Kumar, Liu, and Caliskan-Demirag, 2015). The suitability of a disruption management practice or strategy may depend on supply chain characteristics, which could vary based on economic and other country specific factors. Therefore, research efforts directed towards managing disruptions in countries other than the US could be valuable. Besides, in today’s global marketplace, supply chains and markets span across countries, and the effects of disruptions could cascade between countries and continents. For example, the Japanese Tsunami of 2011 disrupted supply chains across the world. Efficient operations require understanding and managing all echelons of a supply chain, some of which could be located in other countries. Therefore, we consider data from the US, India, and Japan.

Efficiency inducing practice of decentralization in modern supply chains has resulted in focused production and operations. Companies and their competitors may share operating resources. They may also compete for markets and operating resources. Performance of companies in supply chains is affected by decisions and policies of supply chain partners.
Sharing common operating resources may imply that competitors’ performance is interrelated. The literature in accounting and finance has explored the impact of ‘event announcements’ by competitors. Some of these events include new major orders, large dividend announcements, bankruptcy announcements, litigation, acquisitions, leveraged buyouts, new product introductions, stock repurchases, and international cross-listings on competitor stock performance.

Supply chain disruptions may benefit a company’s unaffected competitors. However, market conditions may affect companies within an industry in a similar way. Many industry competitors share suppliers, transporters, and manufacturers, indicating that disruptions at one company may have negative consequences for the competitors.

This research builds on Hendricks and Singhal’s (2003) and other work on understanding the impact of supply chain ‘glitches’ on stock market performance. They underlined the importance of effective supply chain management by revealing the financial impact that follows a ‘glitch’ in supply chain operations. Their analysis was entirely based on supply chain disruptions in companies that are traded in the US stock markets. We, however, focus on companies in three countries. The underpinning of our work is that learning and theories applicable to supply chains in the US may not be directly applicable to supply chains in other parts of the world (Zhao et al., 2006). Also considering countries from different parts of the world could help understand cultural differences in stock consequences from supply chain disruptions.

This research aims to answer the following questions: 1) How does stock consequences from disruptions vary between countries? 2) Do competitors of disrupted companies experience stock impact? 3) Do market cycles affect the consequences of supply chain disruptions? To address these issues, we study the share price impact on the affected companies form three countries in different market conditions. We also study affected companies’ competitors. Furthermore, we also explore other factors such as firm size, growth prospects, and framework of an industry on a competitor’s stock price reaction to a company’s supply chain disruption. Part of this paper motivated by the following studies Kumar, Liu, and Scutella (2015), Filbeck, Kumar, Liu, and Zhao (2015), and Filbeck, Kumar, Zhao (2014). Other results are new for literature.

Our analysis indicates that supply chain disruptions cause stock decline in all three countries considered. However, the magnitude of decline varies. Markets in Japan and India show a significant decline as early as 3 days prior to the disruption announcement day. The US markets did not register a decline until the announcement day. We find that along with the companies announcing disruption, competitors in the same industrial sector register significant stock decline. Moreover, Bear and Bull market cycles affect the stock decline. Companies experience stock decline only in Bear market cycle. Parametric as well as non-parametric tests support our findings.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents relevant literature. In Section 3 discuss event study methodology as applied to supply chain disruptions data. Section 4 reports the findings. Finally, Section 5 concludes the paper.
Literature Review

There is a rich stream of literature dealing with management of supply chain disruptions. Both analytical and empirical studies have focused on planning, preventing and mitigating supply chain disruptions. The literature permeates to several academic research areas. See Ellis, Shockley, and Henry (2011) and Craighead, Blackhurst, Rungtusanatham, and Handfield (2007) for comprehensive literature reviews. Our research is in the domain of estimating the value of effective supply chain management by observing the financial consequences when supply chains experience disruptions. Within this domain, we focus on exploring country, culture, market cycle, and competitive differences.

Quantitative indicators to measure the effectiveness of supply chain management strategies are rare. Extant research relies on a conceptual framework or case studies, which focuses on establishing a correlation between the effectiveness of supply chain management and shareholder value (Mentzer, 2001; Chopra & Meindl, 2012). Some research has shown that supply chain management could lead to enhanced shareholder wealth. Filbeck, Gorman, Greenlee, and Speh (2005) demonstrate that companies that announced adoption of supply chain management-enhancement tools experience positive share price reaction with the magnitude of the reaction positively related to the degree of certainty regarding the publication date. Other specific supply chain practices such as just-in-time inventory (Fullerton, McWatters, & Fawson, 2003), responsive inventory management (Roumiantsev & Netessine, 2007), and inventory turnover (Thomas & Zhang, 2002; Chen, Frank, & Wu, 2005) have been shown to improve stock performance of a company.

Another stream of research has taken an indirect approach to demonstrate the financial benefits of effective supply chain management. This research stream studies the impact of supply chain disruptions on stockholder value. Our research falls in this category. The underlying argument is that by estimating the stockholder value diminished because of a disruption, one could assess the value of effective supply chain management. Using event study methodology similar to the one applied in this paper, Hendricks and Singhal (2003) analyze the effect of supply chain glitches on shareholder wealth. Their results show a marked decrease in shareholder value following announcement of a supply chain glitches. They also reveal insights such as larger firms experience less negative impact, and firms with higher growth prospects experience a more negative stock price impact.

Hendricks and Singhal’s (2005a) research shows that in the long term (two years, one year pre- and post-glitches period) the stock reaction to disruptions is nearly -40%. For the companies announcing a supply chain disruption the equity risk was higher by 13.5% in the year following the disruption. Hendricks and Singhal (2005b) compare the performance of companies that announced disruptions to other companies (who did not announce a disruption in the event period) and make inferences about operating income, return on assets (ROA), return on sales, inventory growth, and sales growth. Companies announcing disruptions experience decreased performance on all these measures.
Filbeck, Kumar, Liu, and Zhao (2015) explore the impact of market cycle and company domicile on stock performance. Using a dataset of automobile companies in the US they show that stock impact from disruptions is dependent on the market cycles, with bear cycles resulting in a more negative outcome as compared to bull market cycles. Japanese companies (that are traded in the US stock market) demonstrate a more robust performance as compared to American automobile companies. Filbeck, Kumar, and Zhao (2014) explore contagion across competitors in the event of a supply chain disruption. Competitors are found to experience negative stock reactions indicating that negative stock consequences of disruptions are not limited to the companies affected but also cause losses for competitors. Kumar, Liu, and Scutella (2015) extend the results to Indian stock market and contrast them with the US market.

All papers discussed until now in this literature review focus exclusively on companies in the US. However, economic and market conditions affect the applicability of supply chain practices. Owing to economic and cultural factors, business management practices and policies deemed effective in one country may not be applicable in supply chains of other countries. Zhao et al. (2006, 2007) call for research efforts to be directed specifically towards supply chains in developing countries. They use China as an example and cite economic, governmental, and cultural differences as motivations for research specifically focused on China. They also outline the differences in supply chain in China and that in western countries. Similarly, Sahay and Mohan (2003) and Sahay et al. (2006) outline supply chain characteristics in India. Jayaram and Avittathur (2012) outline the challenges that western companies may face in operating under supply chain structures prevalent in India. They also motivate the need for research specifically focused on these countries.

Our research has some support from accounting and finance literature. Literature in these areas have extensively documented the effect of various events on company as well as competitor stock performance. Some of these events include new major orders (Galy & Germain, 2007), large dividend announcements (Laux, Starks, & Yoon, 1998), bankruptcy announcements (Helwege & Zhang, 2013), litigation (Hadlock & Sonti, 2012), acquisitions (Stillman, 1983), leveraged buyouts (Chevalier, 1995), new product introductions (Chen, et al., 2002), stock repurchases (Hertzel, 1991), and international cross-listings (Melvin & Valero-Tonone, 2003).

Research in international management is rich in identifying the correlation between national culture and business practices. Many of these studies use the quantitative measures of national culture developed by Hofstede. The dimensions developed by Hofstede (2013) are derived using a factor analysis of a large scale data from 72 countries. The five dimensions thus developed measure the similarities and differences between national cultures. Subsequent research has reaffirmed the validity of these measures (Merritt, 2000). Other measures of national culture were developed by GLOBE project (Javidan and House, 2001), Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998), and Schwartz (1994). However, despite limitations, Hofstede’s measures are widely accepted to be valid for business applications (Magnusson et al., 2008). See Wiengarten et al. (2011) for a description of other measures and applicability of Hofstede’s measures.
Studies have shown that national culture impacts business decisions. For example, decisions in Western companies are sometimes focused on short-term returns, while in many Asian companies decisions are motivated by long-term effects. Other important differences include short-term employment and individual responsibility and decision-making in American companies. Many Asian companies have lifetime employment, consensual decision-making, and collective responsibility (de Koster and Shinohara, 2006). Literature on national culture demonstrates differences between countries and offers explanations to account for differences in business strategies, such as international expansion, low cost versus differentiation, compensation schemes, and choice of financial structure (Pagell et al., 2005). Dunning and Pearce (1982) and Porter (1990) argue that home country of the company and physical location of facilities and personnel affect business decisions. So as to understand the business impact of national culture, Katz et al. (1999) and Nakata and Sivakumar (1996) call for studying the association of national culture and functional decisions such as in the area of operations management.

Roh et al. (2008) attribute cultural orientations for difference in productivity gap between American and Japanese companies. Studying manufacturing data from six countries, Naor et al. (2008) conclude that difference in manufacturing performance across countries could be explained by the organizational culture. Wiengarten et al. (2011) study the moderating influence of Hofstede’s national cultural dimensions on investment in manufacturing facilities and quality practices. They found that Individualism moderates both facilities and quality investment; while Masculinity and Uncertainty Avoidance moderate only the quality practices. McGinnis and Spillan (2012) attribute culture for differences in logistics strategies between the US and Guatemala. Other research has shown the association between national culture and total quality management (Katz et al. 1998), innovation (Panida et al., 2011), supplier selection (Carter et al., 2010), product characteristics (Desislava, 2010), and product development (Nakata and Sivakumar, 1996). Kaasa and Vadi (2010) conclude that innovativeness is higher in companies located in countries with high Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Collectivism, and low Masculinity.

Cultural orientation is particularly important when making supply chain disruptions decisions (Dowty and Wallace, 2010). They use cultural biases to characterize interactions among organizations during humanitarian supply chain disasters. The four cultural biases identified by Dowty and Wallace (2010) are hierarchist, individualist, fatalist, and egalitarian. Management effectiveness and interactions between companies are found to be influenced by these cultural biases. Jia and Rutherford (2010) address the issue of supply chain relational risk associated with cultural differences between companies from China and the West. They suggest that companies must adapt according to local culture to be successful.

Data and Event Study Methodology Applied to Supply Chain Disruptions

Sample Data
The US, India, and Japan are open market and democratic countries and allow freedom of press and media. Therefore, we expect the media outlets to report on important events
including company related news that are of public interest. Our disruptions data is derived from Dow Jones News Service (US), Wall Street Journal (US), The Economic Times (India), The Japan Times (Japan), and Nikkei (Japan).

To compile disruptions data, full text articles were searched in The Economic Times for a 10 year period from January 1, 2003 to December 31, 2012. The keywords searched include supplier breakdown, design issues, production delays, inventory shortfall, poor planning, inaccurate forecast, strike, transportation delay, accidents, data breach, fire, earthquake, and ethical complaints. They keywords were selected to cover disruptions in operations, supply, demand, production, inventory, distribution, or transportation at one or more stages of a supply chain. We read the complete text of the articles to identify a supply chain disruption.

Our initial data included a large number of disruption points. In compiling the final data, we dropped companies that are not publically traded. We also removed the disruption data if the company did not have stock information surrounding the date of disruption. The resulting data is 313 (the US), 301 (India), and 216 (Japan). Stock market data is obtained for respective countries through Yahoo finance and CRSP database.

**Event Study Methodology**

Standard event study methodology is applied on disruptions data to estimate its financial impact on stockholder wealth. The methodology is extensively used in finance and accounting applications. The method is designed to investigate the impact of an *event* on *metrics*. In our application, the event is announcement of a supply chain disruption while the abnormal stock returns are used as the metric to assess the impact of the event. Event study methodology is one of the most frequently used tools in the financial research area and has been traditionally effective in estimating stock price reaction to events such as the announcements of earnings, dividends, or mergers. The content in this section has been adapted from Kumar, Liu, and Scutella (2015). In a common application, standard event study methodology is designed to examine the stock returns for a set of companies experiencing a similar event (e.g., a supply chain disruption in our case). The event may occur at different point in time for a set of companies. However, having a large number of data points would statistically eliminate the effect of factors other than the disruptions on stock outcomes. The stock returns are statistically tested for any abnormal or unexpected returns.

The purpose of most event studies applied in finance and accounting is to assess the stock reactions from a value-relevant event announcement. Supply chain disruptions are value-relevant events that could affect the operations and thus the profit potential of a company. Moreover, efficient market theory suggests that stock markets are efficient and reflect all value relevant information. At any instant, stock price of a company is affected by the company specific as well as environmental (business) factors. Stock price also reflect expectations about future earning prospects of a firm. Therefore, information about a value relevant event such as a supply chain disruption is expected to affect stock returns of a company.
In analyzing disruptions, from 10 days prior and post disruption announcement, the actual daily stock returns are compared with expected returns. “Conceptually, event study helps differentiate between the stock returns that would have been expected if the supply chain disruption would not have happened (normal returns) and the returns that were observed (abnormal returns)” (Kumar, Liu, Scutella, 2015). Event study methodology is made rigorous and relevant by calculating expected returns using historical data while adjusting for market wide influence and trends. For more details on event studies refer Dodd and Warner (1983), Cowan (1992).

The announcement/publication day of a disruption is considered the event day (t=0). To cover for possibilities of insider information we analyze data and abnormal returns from 5 days prior to announcement date. Overall, an 11-day window is considered. For robustness of results both mean and market models are considered. See Brown and Warner (1985) for details of the models. The parameters needed to estimate the abnormal returns were calculated using past 255 trading days (about one year) stock price. The estimation period is (-300, -46). We follow Dodd and Warner (1983) and use standard event-study methodology.

In market model an estimation period starting from -300 to -46 prior days to disruption announcement is used.

\[ R_{jt} = \alpha_j + \beta_j R_{mt} + u_{jt}, j = 1, \ldots, N; \ t = -300, \ldots, -46, \]

where \( N \) is the number of disruption points in the sample, \( R_{jt} \) is the return on stock \( j \) for day \( t \), \( R_{mt} \) is the return on market proxy \( m \) for day \( t \), \( u_{jt} \) is the random error for stock \( j \) for day \( t \) and is normally distributed with \( E[u_{jt}] = 0 \), \( \alpha_j \) is the estimated intercept term for stock \( j \), and \( \beta_j \) is the estimated risk coefficient for stock \( j \). The market model is estimated using the equally-weighted market returns from SP500, SENSEX, and NIKKEI. Hendricks and Singhal (2003) use an estimation window of 200 days. Our longer estimation window of 255 days (-300 to -46) is expected to yield more robust parameter estimates.

We calculate the abnormal returns for each day in the test period. The market model abnormal returns (AR) for stock \( j \) for day \( t \) is defined as

\[ AR_{jt} = R_{jt} - (\alpha_j + \beta_j R_{mt}), j = 1, \ldots, N; \ t = T_1, T_1 + 1, \ldots, T_2, \]

The mean model abnormal returns for stock \( j \) for day \( t \) is defined as

\[ AR_{jt} = R_{jt} - \bar{R}_j, \]

where \( \bar{R}_j \) is stock \( j \)'s mean return for the estimation period.

For both models, \( E[AR_j] = 0 \), i.e., no abnormal return is expected in an efficient market in equilibrium. If \( E[AR_j] \neq 0 \), i.e., abnormal returns are observed, we infer that disruptions cause a change in shareholder wealth. The cumulative abnormal returns for stock \( j \) (CAR) over the event window is \( CAR_j = \sum_{k=T_1}^{T_2} AR_{jk} \). We follow Patell (1976) to test the statistical significance of abnormal returns, which are based on standardized normal distribution. The standardized abnormal returns (SAR) for stock \( j \) in day \( t \), is calculated as
\[
SAR_{j,t} = \frac{AR_{j,t}}{S_{j,t}}.
\]
The abnormal return is divided by the standard error from the market model estimation for stock \(j\). The average standardized abnormal return (ASAR) for day \(t\) is \(ASAR_t = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} SAR_{j,t}\). Finally for each day, the \(Z\)-statistic is calculated as:

\[
Z_t = \sqrt{N} \cdot ASAR_t.
\]
The limiting distribution of \(Z_t\) is the unit normal, under the null hypothesis that the mean normalized, standardized abnormal return equals zero. Over the testing period, which begins with \(T_1\) and ends with \(T_2\), the cumulative normalized, average standardized abnormal return (CASAR) is

\[
CASAR_{T_1,T_2} = \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=T_1}^{T_2} \sum_{j=1}^{N} SAR_{j,t} \right).
\]

Then, the \(Z\)-statistic is \(Z_{T_1,T_2} = \sqrt{N} \cdot CASAR_{T_1,T_2}\), and has a unit normal limiting distribution under the null hypothesis that the cumulative normalized, average standardized prediction error over the period from \(T_1\) through \(T_2\) equals zero. For robustness we also perform a non-parametric sign test to make inference about the sign (positive or negative) of abnormal returns in the estimation period.

**Empirical Results**

We now present the empirical findings of event study methodology applied to the supply chain disruption data from the US, India, and Japan. Since Hendricks and Singhal (2003) focused on the data from the US, we refrain from providing extensive results from the US market but instead use the US stock impact results to contrast the India and Japan results. As indicated earlier, our study builds on seminal paper by Hendricks and Singhal (2003) and enriches the literature by focused on multiple countries, competitors, and market cycles. Some of the results presented here appeared in Filbeck, Kumar, Liu, Zhao (2015), Kumar, Liu, and Scutella (2015), and Filbeck, Kumar, Zhao (2014). Some other results are new to the literature.

Table 1 reports event study results for disruptions in Indian companies. The three panels in the table outline the CAR around, prior, and post disruption announcement day. The results are obtained using a market model. It is clear that most significant returns are observed prior or around the announcement day. No significant returns are seen in the post disruption announcement windows. This may indicate a possibility of prevalence of insider trading. In an 11-day window of (-5,+5) Indian companies could experience a statistically significant average stock decline of -2.88%. The sign test support the results and indicate that statistically higher number of companies face stock decline (negative stock returns) following a disruption. A mean model for event studies show a similar significance in the results.

**Table 1**: Market Model Event Study Results: Cumulative Abnormal Returns for Disruptions in Indian Companies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Statistics</th>
<th>Sign Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 reports the event study results for Japanese companies. Similar to companies in India, Japanese stock markets show decline in the windows prior to the disruption announcement day. However, we also observe declines in the post disruptions window. Insider trading may be prevalent but not to the extent of Indian markets. Overall, in a 11-day window Japanese companies register a statistically significant stock decline of -0.61%. The stock decline is smaller than the Indian market. When compared to Indian companies, Japanese companies fare better in stock decline following a disruption. Mean model when applied to Japanese companies support our results.

Table 2: Market Model Event Study Results: Cumulative Abnormal Returns for Disruptions in Japanese Companies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Windows</th>
<th>Mean Abnormal Returns (%)</th>
<th>Patell Z Statistics</th>
<th>Positive: Negative Returns</th>
<th>Generalized Sign Z Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panel A: CAR around the disruption announcement date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-1,+1)</td>
<td>-1.17%</td>
<td>-2.509**</td>
<td>118:167</td>
<td>-1.696*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-2,+2)</td>
<td>-1.47%</td>
<td>-2.465**</td>
<td>122:163</td>
<td>-1.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-3,+3)</td>
<td>-2.25%</td>
<td>-4.038***</td>
<td>106:179</td>
<td>-3.121***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-4,+4)</td>
<td>-2.78%</td>
<td>-4.407***</td>
<td>119:166</td>
<td>-1.577***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-5,+5)</td>
<td>-2.88%</td>
<td>-3.993***</td>
<td>112:174</td>
<td>-2.459**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel B: CAR pre disruption announcement date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-5,0)</td>
<td>-2.24%</td>
<td>-4.982***</td>
<td>103:182</td>
<td>-3.477***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-4,0)</td>
<td>-2.37%</td>
<td>-5.589***</td>
<td>106:179</td>
<td>-3.121***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-3,0)</td>
<td>-2.11%</td>
<td>-5.652***</td>
<td>99:186</td>
<td>-3.952***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-2,0)</td>
<td>-1.62%</td>
<td>-4.185***</td>
<td>112:172</td>
<td>-2.357**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-1,0)</td>
<td>-1.24%</td>
<td>-4.008***</td>
<td>114:170</td>
<td>-2.119*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel C: CAR post disruption announcement date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0,+1)</td>
<td>-0.51%</td>
<td>-0.594</td>
<td>120:164</td>
<td>-1.406$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0,+2)</td>
<td>-0.43%</td>
<td>-0.244</td>
<td>125:159</td>
<td>-0.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0,+3)</td>
<td>-0.72%</td>
<td>-0.778</td>
<td>129:155</td>
<td>-0.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0,+4)</td>
<td>-0.99%</td>
<td>-1.296$</td>
<td>119:165</td>
<td>-1.525$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0,+5)</td>
<td>-1.23%</td>
<td>-1.310$</td>
<td>123:162</td>
<td>-1.102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of disruptions=301. $, *, **, and *** represent the significance at 0.10, 0.05, 0.01, 0.001 levels, respectively.
Panel B: CAR pre disruption announcement date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Window</th>
<th>Number of valid disruptions</th>
<th>Mean Abnormal Return (%)</th>
<th>Patell Z Statistics</th>
<th>Generalized Sign Z Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(-5,0)</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>-0.46%</td>
<td>-3.389***</td>
<td>103:112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-4,0)</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>-0.29%</td>
<td>-2.938**</td>
<td>115:100&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-3,0)</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>-0.43%</td>
<td>-3.271***</td>
<td>113:102)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-2,0)</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>-0.47%</td>
<td>-3.316***</td>
<td>100:115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-1,0)</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>-0.21%</td>
<td>-2.261*</td>
<td>108:107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Panel C: CAR post disruption announcement date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Window</th>
<th>Number of valid disruptions</th>
<th>Mean Abnormal Return (%)</th>
<th>Patell Z Statistics</th>
<th>Generalized Sign Z Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0,+1)</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>-0.22%</td>
<td>-2.433**</td>
<td>96:120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0,+2)</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>-0.20%</td>
<td>-2.579**</td>
<td>97:119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0,+3)</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>-0.23%</td>
<td>-2.753**</td>
<td>102:114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0,+4)</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>-1.999*</td>
<td>107:109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0,+5)</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>-0.15%</td>
<td>-1.994*</td>
<td>101:115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We now present the results for the data from the US. Table 3 reports the event study results for US companies in a short format. Unlike India and Japan, we did not observe any significant stock decline in the pre announcement period. We observe that the US companies suffer a stock decline of -1.13% in an 11-day window covering pre and post announcement day. The stock decline is higher than Japan but lesser than that for India. A t-test for difference in stock decline shows a statistically more negative decline for India when compared to the US. Although qualitatively the decline for the US is higher than that for Japan, the difference is not statistically significant.

Table 3: Market Model Event Study Results: Cumulative Abnormal Returns for Disruptions in the US Companies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Window</th>
<th>Number of valid disruptions</th>
<th>Mean Abnormal Return (%)</th>
<th>Patell Z Statistics</th>
<th>Generalized Sign Z Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(-5,+5)</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>-2.922**</td>
<td>130:180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-1,0)</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>-3.167***</td>
<td>131:179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$, *, **, and *** represent the significance at 0.10, 0.05, 0.01, 0.001 levels, respectively.

We now present results for competitors of companies announcing disruptions. The results presented in Table 4 show that along with companies announcing disruptions, competitors also register stock declines. Perhaps, with the interconnectedness of business and supply chains, companies in the same industry share consequences of disruptions. The table shows that competitors on an average register a stock decline of -1.38% when a competitor in the same industrial segment announces a disruption. The results are obtained using the data and companies in the US.

Table 4: Event study results for competitors in the event sample surrounding the announcement date in the US.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event window</th>
<th>Mean Abnormal Return (%)</th>
<th>Patell Z Statistics</th>
<th>Generalized Sign Z Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(-5,+5)</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>-2.922**</td>
<td>130:180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-1,0)</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>-3.167***</td>
<td>131:179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Panel A. Cumulative abnormal returns for whole event sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(-5, -2)</th>
<th>(-1, 0)</th>
<th>(1, 5)</th>
<th>(-5, +5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole event sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARs Mean (%)</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARs Median (%)</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-stat on Mean</td>
<td>(-2.02**)</td>
<td>(-4.84***)</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>(-3.65***)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon signed-rank test Z-stat</td>
<td>(-31.55***)</td>
<td>(-33.95***)</td>
<td>(-30.59)</td>
<td>(-33.55***)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$, *, **, and *** represent the significance at 0.10, 0.05, 0.01, 0.001 levels, respectively.

Finally, we present results for Bear and Bull market. Using the US data we divide the disruption announcement based on the prevalent market cycle. The underlying idea is that market movements and investor response to supply chain disruptions may depend on the market cycle. Table 5 present the findings. We find that investors react negatively to disruption announcements but only in Bear markets. In Bull market the stock impact from disruptions announcements is insignificant.

**Table 5:** Event Study Results for Event Sample surrounding Disruptions Announcements Considering the Market Cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval</th>
<th>Whole Sample (n=408)</th>
<th>Bear Market (n=83)</th>
<th>Bull Market (n=325)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAR</td>
<td>Z-stat</td>
<td>CAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-5, -2)</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-1, 0)</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-1.70*</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1, 1)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-1, 1)</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2, 5)</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>-2.11**</td>
<td>-1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-5, 5)</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>-2.61***</td>
<td>-4.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***indicates significant at 1% level; **indicates significant at 5% level; *indicates significant at 10% level.

**Conclusions**

In this paper we studied supply chain disruptions and their financial impact on stockholder wealth. Data from three countries was analyzed. Our findings suggest that companies in all three countries suffer stock decline in the event of a disruption. The decline is significantly higher for India when compared to Japan and the US. There is no significant difference in stock outcome for the US and Japan. Companies in India and Japan register decline prior to the public announcement of disruptions, indicating a possibility of insider trading. Strong trade and stock market regulations may factor in the US market as companies do not register a stock decline prior to the announcement date.
We also show that competitors of disruptions announcing companies suffer a negative stock impact following the disruptions. This indicates that companies in same industrial sector share fortunes when a disruption affect one of them. We also found that the markets react negatively to disruptions only in Bear market cycle. Investor sentiments and market direction affect stock impact from supply chain disruptions
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