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The purpose of this study was to explore employee-organization identification in the apparel retail store setting. This study was guided by the following questions: (1) What is the nature of employee-organization identification in apparel retail stores? (2) In what ways, if any, is salesperson appearance related to employee-organization identification in an apparel retail store setting? (3) To what extent are employees’ perceptions of store image, person-organization fit, and attractiveness of the organization directly and indirectly related to level of employee-organization identification among salespeople in an apparel retail store? (4) To what extent is level of employee-organization identification related to level of job involvement and job performance among salespeople in an apparel retail store? To address these questions, data was collected in two phases. In the first phase, interviews were conducted with nine apparel retail store employees. Interviewees’ responses suggested that the apparel products they wore both during and outside of work seemed to serve as an indication of their level of identification with the apparel retail store for which they worked. In the second phase of the study, a questionnaire was completed by 251 apparel retail store salespeople. An analysis of the data using a structural equation modeling technique revealed that employees’ beliefs concerning other individuals’ perceptions of the store’s image (i.e., construed external image) were directly and positively related to employee-organization identification. In the best-fitting model, neither person-organization fit nor attractiveness of the organization to the employee were shown to be significantly related to employee-organization identification. Employee-organization identification was directly and positively related to both job involvement and job performance, but job involvement and job performance were not significantly related to each other. Although the first phase of the study suggested a possible relationship between salesperson appearance and employee-organization identification, this finding was not replicated in the second phase of the study. However, post-hoc analyses revealed that salespeople who were required to wear the store’s apparel while working displayed a higher level of person-organization fit, attraction to the
store, job satisfaction, employee-organization identification, and job involvement than salespeople who were not required to wear the store’s apparel while working.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Chapter Overview

This chapter introduces readers to the dissertation. Key variables and the relationships that exist among those variables are briefly discussed in the background section. The purpose of the study is presented, along with a justification for the methods used in the study and the significance of the study. Following a listing of the definitions of the variables used in the study, information concerning the organization of the dissertation is presented.

Background

It is a commonly held belief among marketing researchers and practitioners that apparel retail stores, like people, have identities (Gioia, Schultz, & Corley, 2000; Stern, Zinkhan, & Jaju, 2001). An apparel retail store’s identity can be conceptualized as “the degree to which [that store] presents a distinct and coherent image” to individuals (Schmitt, Simonson, & Marcus, 1995, p. 85). Individuals develop an image of an apparel retail store based on beliefs they have concerning the functional (e.g., physical attributes of the store and the products) and psychological (e.g., personality attributes of the store) characteristics that store possesses (d’Astous & Levesque, 2003; Martineau, 1958; Keaveney & Hunt, 1992; Zimmer & Golden, 1988). Thus, store image is “the summation of all the attributes of a store” (Samli, Kelly, & Hunt, 1998, p. 165) that results in the formation of an “overall impression of a store” (Keaveney & Hunt, 1992, p. 165). This overall impression can be formed in the mind of anyone who is a member of any of the various categories of “retail publics” (Samli, Kelly, & Hunt, 1998, p. 31). The categories of retail publics include, but are not limited to, “customers, former customers, competitors’ customers, those community members who never patronize the store, vendors, shareholders, and the store’s employees and management” (Samli, Kelly, & Hunt, 1998, p. 31).

Members of the various retail publics evaluate an apparel retail store’s image by observing cues that are presented throughout the store. One such cue is salesperson appearance, particularly in terms of the apparel products worn by salespeople (Baker,
Grewal, & Parasuraman, 1994; DeNora & Belcher, 2000; Gardner & Siomkos, 1986; Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988; Schmitt, Simonson, & Marcus, 1995). Apparel products are imbued with meaning as a result of societal-level activities, including advertising (McCracken, 1988). The meanings that are originally associated with the apparel products are transferred from the product to the wearer. Consequently, information concerning the demographic and psychographic characteristics of the wearer may be transmitted from the wearer to the perceiver via the meanings that are associated with the apparel products being displayed by the wearer (Damhorst, 1984-85; Douty, 1963; Kapferer & Laurent, 1985/86; Kwon & Farber, 1992; Rosencranz, 1962). When individuals perform the social role, to use Goffman’s (1959) terminology, of retail salesperson for a particular apparel retail store, they may be required by the store management team to follow a dress code. Although a specific uniform may not be required, the salespeople may be instructed to wear apparel items which are associated with particular characteristics that are consistent with the store’s image (e.g., sexy, conservative). When individuals in an apparel retail store see salespeople, who are representatives of the store, wearing particular apparel items that are associated with particular meanings, these individuals may transfer the meanings associated with the salespeople’s appearance to the store (Klassen, Clayson, & Jasper, 1996).

While members of the various retail publics could use any salesperson’s appearance to assess the store’s image, some salespeople’s appearance may be more representative of the store’s image than other salespeople’s appearance. When individuals are committed to particular social roles such that they place a great deal of importance on adequately performing these social roles, they tend to surround themselves with more of the symbols associated with that role than those individuals who are not as committed to that role (Arthur, 1997). Thus, salespeople who are more committed to their role as employees of an apparel retail store would most likely surround themselves with more symbols from the store, including apparel items from that store, as a reflection of their level of commitment to their role as salespeople of that store.
Furthermore, when individuals are committed to a particular social role, they tend to use the characteristics associated with this social role to define themselves as people (Goffman, 1959; Michelman, 1998; Sandstrom, Martin, & Fine, 2003). When an individual is committed to an employment role, he or she may use the characteristics associated with his or her employment organization to describe him- or herself. When a salesperson "defines him- or herself by the same attributes that he or she believes define the organization" for which he or she works (Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994, p. 239), he or she is said to have identified with the apparel retail store. Employees have been shown to exhibit identification with employment organizations which possess identities that the employees find attractive (Dukerich, Golden, & Shortell, 2002). For employees of an apparel retail store, the awareness of the store's image seems to be based, at least initially, on their experiences with the store as consumers (Goldsberry, Gehrt, Sun, & Shim, 1999). Employees assess the level of attractiveness of an organization's identity based upon the level of similarity the employees believe exists between their own identity and the organization's identity (Dineen, Ash, & Noe, 2002; Judge & Cable, 1997). In other words, employees find employment organizations attractive when there is a high degree of "person-organization fit" between aspects of the employee's identity and the employment organization's identity (Kristof, 1996, p.1).

Employment organizations benefit from employee-organization identification because identification has been positively linked to employees' level of job involvement (Gould & Werbel, 1983; Schneider, Hall, & Nygren, 1971; van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000) and job performance (Bartel, 2001; Benkhoff, 1997; Efraty & Wolfe, 1988). While employee-organization identification has been shown to exist in many settings (Bell & Menguc, 2002; Creighton, 1995; Pratt, 2000), employee-organization identification has not been explicitly examined in any of the bricks-and-mortar retail stores in the United States that primarily sell apparel products. Furthermore, in previous studies of employee-organization identification, visible, behavioral manifestations of an employee's level of
identification with his or her employment organization have not been explicitly investigated. Appearance may be one of the behaviors indicative of employee-organization identification.

**Purpose**

The purpose of the present study is to explore employee-organization identification in the apparel retail store setting. This study is guided by the following questions: (1) What is the nature of employee-organization identification in apparel retail stores? (2) In what ways, if any, is salesperson appearance related to employee-organization identification in an apparel retail store setting? (3) To what extent are employees' perceptions of store image, person-organization fit, and attractiveness of the organization directly and indirectly related to level of employee-organization identification among salespeople in an apparel retail store? (4) To what extent is level of employee-organization identification related to level of job involvement and job performance among salespeople in an apparel retail store?

**Methodology**

Both qualitative and quantitative approaches to data collection are employed in the present study as a means of investigating employee-organization identification and the role that apparel may play in the expression of apparel retail salespeople’s identification with their employment organizations. Although the existence of a relationship between employee-organization identification and an employee’s appearance in terms of the apparel he or she wears to work has been suggested by previous researchers (Benkoff, 1997; Pratt & Rafaeli, 1997; Rafaeli, Dutton, Harquail, & Mackie-Lewis, 1997), the relationship between employee appearance and employee-organization identification has not been explicitly, empirically examined. Thus, qualitative methods (i.e., interviews) are used to gain an understanding of the relationship between apparel and employee-organization identification from the salespeople’s perspective (Arnould & Price, 1991; Seidman, 1998).

In addition to the qualitative methods, quantitative methods (i.e., survey) are also employed in the present study. The purpose of the survey is two-fold. One purpose is to validate the findings obtained via the qualitative interviews by generating items based on the interview data (Lastovicka, Bettencourt, Hughner, & Kuntze, 1999), adding these items to
the pre-existing scales of identification (i.e., Mael, 1988) on the survey, and comparing the findings from the survey to the findings obtained from the interviews. The second purpose of the survey is to extend the applicability of the concept of employee-organization identification from other contexts to apparel retail stores by examining relationships shown to exist between employee-organization identification and other variables (e.g., attractiveness of the organization to the employee, job involvement, job performance) in the context of apparel retail stores. While previous research has been conducted on employee-organization identification in many industries, such as the insurance industry (Bell & Menguc, 2002), the transportation industry (Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994), and the health care industry (Dukerich, Golden, & Shortell, 2002), the concept has not been studied in the apparel retail industry. The survey for the present study is used in an attempt to replicate the findings of previous research in the apparel retail store context and demonstrate that the findings from previous studies on employee-organization identification can be generalized across employees from a variety of industries (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003).

**Significance**

Investigating employee-organization identification in an apparel retail store, in general, and exploring the ways in which a salesperson’s level of identification with an apparel retail organization might be visibly demonstrated via appearance, in particular, have both practical and theoretical importance. Due to the fact that employee-organization identification has not yet been investigated in a bricks-and-mortar apparel retail store setting in the United States, studying identification in such a context would extend the applicability of the concept of employee-organization identification into a new industry. If the process is shown to occur in apparel retail stores, retail practitioners could attempt to increase salespeople’s level of identification with their apparel retail stores in order to increase level of job involvement and performance. Furthermore, by exploring the relationship between appearance and identification, another one of the ways in which employee-organization identification might be displayed could be identified. If it were shown that a relationship between salesperson appearance and employee-organization identification existed,
academicians could add items concerning the appearance dimension of employee-organization identification to existing scales of identification (e.g., Mael, 1988) in an effort to increase the effectiveness of such scales. Thus, understanding the relationships that exist between salesperson appearance, store image, and employee-organization identification would be of both practical and theoretical interest.

Definitions

*Attractiveness*: Individuals’ “valence perceptions” of an employment organization (Turban & Dougherty, 1992, p. 740).

*Commitment to a social role*: The level of importance an individual places on adequately performing a particular social role and using his or her performance of this social role as a means of defining him- or herself as a person (Goffman, 1959; Michelman, 1998; Sandstrom, Martin, & Fine, 2003).

*Construed external image*: An individual’s “beliefs about outsiders’ perceptions” (Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994, p. 248) regarding the “distinctive, central, and enduring attributes of the organization” (Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994, p. 244).

*Employee-organization identification*: The degree to which an employee “defines him- or herself by the same attributes that he or she believes define the organization for which he or she works” (Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994, p. 239).

*Identity*: The “cognitive and affective understanding of who or what” one is (Schouten, 1991, p. 413).

*Job involvement*: The “degree to which one is cognitively preoccupied with, engaged in, and concerned with one’s present job” (Paullay, Alliger, & Stone-Romero, 1994, p. 224).

*Job performance*: An employee’s “behavior that has been evaluated in terms of its contributions to the goals of the organization” (Bush, Bush, Ortinau, & Hair, 1990, p. 119).

*Perceived organizational identity*: An individual’s “beliefs about the distinctive, central, and enduring attributes of the organization” (Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994, p. 244).

*Person-organization fit*: The “compatibility between people and organizations that occurs when…they share similar fundamental characteristics” (Kristof, 1996, p.1).
Personal identity: The part of one’s identity that “consists of idiosyncratic characteristics, such as abilities and interests” (Bhattacharya, Rao, & Glynn, 1995, p. 47).

Salesperson appearance: The apparel items worn to work by salespeople in an apparel retail store.

Social identity: The part of one’s identity “which derives from his or her knowledge of his or her membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership” (Tajfel, 1978, p. 63).

Social role: “A set of related meanings that directs the individual’s behavior in a social setting” (e.g., an employment role such as a salesperson for an apparel retail store) (Solomon, 1983, p. 321).

Social role performance: Includes “all the activity of an individual which occurs during a period marked by his continuous presence before a particular set of observers and which has some influence on the observers” (Goffman, 1959, p. 22).

Store identity: The “degree to which [a store] presents a distinct and coherent image” to individuals (Schmitt, Simonson, & Marcus, 1995, p. 85).

Store image: The “summation of all the attributes of a store” (Samli, Kelly, & Hunt, 1998, p. 165) that results in the formation of an “overall impression of a store” (Keaveney & Hunt, 1992, p. 165).

Organization of Dissertation

Following the introduction, Chapter 2 includes an overview of employee-organization identification research and a presentation of information concerning employees and their appearance at work. Previous research findings related to both the relationship between employees’ identities and their appearance at work as well as the antecedents and consequences of employee-organization identification are discussed. The theoretical framework is presented along with the objectives, research hypotheses, and the proposed model. Chapter 3 presents the methodology for the study. Chapters 4 and 5 present the procedures used to recruit participants, the methods used to collect and analyze the data, and
the findings from the two different phases (i.e., the qualitative and the quantitative phase) of the study. Conclusions and suggestions for future research are presented in Chapter 6.
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Chapter Overview

This chapter contains both a review of studies conducted on employee-organization identification and a review of studies conducted on employees’ appearance at work. Using symbolic interaction theory, justification for the potential existence of a relationship between employee-organization identification and apparel retail salesperson appearance in terms of dress is provided. In addition to salesperson appearance, studies that have identified both antecedents and consequences of employee-organization identification are also discussed. The objectives, research question, hypotheses, and proposed model for the study are presented at the end of the chapter.

Employee-Organization Identification and Perceived Organizational Identity

The concept of employee-organization identification that is based on the tenets of social identity theory may help explain employee behavior in an apparel retail store. Social identity theory was developed by Tajfel and Turner in the late 1970s as a means to “describe and understand the psychological basis of intergroup behavior and outgroup discrimination” (van Dick, 2001, p. 269). That is to say, social identity theory attempts to explain why individuals show a preference for social groups of which they are a part.

According to the theory, one’s self-concept is composed of two parts: a personal identity and a social identity. One’s personal identity “consists of idiosyncratic characteristics, such as abilities and interests” (Bhattacharya, Rao, & Glynn, 1995, p. 47). One’s social identity, on the other hand, is “that part of an individual’s self-concept which derives from his or her knowledge of his or her membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership” (Tajfel, 1978, p. 63). In other words, part of who one thinks one is as a person is based on the characteristics of the groups into which one can categorize him- or herself. Some of the social categories individuals use in the formation of their social identities include ethnic groups, gender groups, familial groups, and socioeconomic groups (Herriot, 2004).
An individual’s social group affiliations help to guide his or her behavior in social situations. In this way, an individual’s social group affiliations are related to the social roles he or she performs. A social role is “a set of related meanings that directs the individual’s behavior in a social setting” (Solomon, 1983, p. 321). That is to say, a role is a person’s position within any given social encounter. Using terminology from Goffman’s (1959) dramaturgical perspective, roles can be thought of as the various parts that individuals perform during the human drama known as life. When individuals are cognitively aware of the social roles they play, they can use this information to guide their behavior and act appropriately for the specific role they assume in any given social situation. Because social roles tell us how to act by indicating “what obligations and expectations apply to our behavior,” they are normative in nature (Sandstrom, Martin, & Fine, 2003, p. 130).

When individuals are forming their social identities, they do not use the characteristics of every social category to which they can be assigned or of every social role which they perform to form their own identities. Instead, they select the social groups and social roles which are most important to them (Goffman, 1959; Michelman, 1998; Sandstrom, Martin, & Fine, 2003; van Knippenberg, 2000). An important social group to most people is their work group. In fact, as van Dick, Wagner, Stellmacher, and Christ (2004) note, “some of the most important group affiliations a person has, probably more important than any other group membership,” are their memberships in occupational groups (p. 172). Associated with these work groups are particular social roles. It stands to reason that, if work group membership is important to individuals, then the social roles associated with these work groups would also be important to these individuals. When a particular social role is important to an individual, he or she is said to be committed to that social role (Sandstrom, Martin, & Fine, 2003). When an individual is committed to a particular social role, he or she uses the characteristics associated with that social role to define himself or herself as a person (Goffman, 1959; Michelman, 1998; Sandstrom, Martin, & Fine, 2003). Thus, in situations in which an employee’s social role as a salesperson for a particular
apparel retail store is an important one for him or her, this employee may use his or her association with this particular store to form part of his or her social identity.

According to Dutton, Dukerich, and Harquail (1994), organizations possess identities that are composed of particular attributes that are “distinctive, central, and enduring” (p. 243). When people use the same attributes that contribute to the organization’s identity to describe their own identity, these people are said to have identified with that organization. Individuals have been shown to exhibit identification with many different types of organizations, including universities (Mael & Ashforth, 1992), museums (Bhattacharya, Rao, & Glynn, 1995), and employers (Bell & Menguc, 2002; Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994; Pratt, 2000).

In Dutton, Dukerich, and Harquail’s (1994) model of organizational identification, identification with an organization requires that similarities exist between an organization’s identity and an individual’s identity, or more specifically, an individual’s social identity. While researchers in the area of organizational identification have proceeded with the assumption that organizations, like individuals, possess identities and that the identities possessed by both individuals and organizations could be similar in both structure and content (Gioia, Schultz, & Corley, 2000), an organization’s identity is not exactly the same as an individual’s identity. While an individual’s personal and social identities can collectively be defined as “the cognitive and affective understanding of who and what” one is (Schouten, 1991, p. 413), an organization’s identity has to be described differently because an organization, as a non-living, non-breathing entity, cannot have beliefs about itself. However, individuals associated with an organization can have perceptions of that organization’s identity, and this is what is referred to as a “perceived organizational identity” (Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994; Dukerich, Golden, & Shortell, 2002; Mael & Ashforth, 1995).

A perceived organizational identity is composed of both an internal component and an external component. The internal component is an individual’s “beliefs about the distinctive, central, and enduring attributes of the organization” (Dutton, Dukerich, &
The external component of a perceived organizational identity is an individual’s “beliefs about outsiders’ perceptions” (Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994, p. 248) of those “distinctive, central, and enduring attributes” (Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994, p. 244). Thus, this definition takes into account both the individual’s perceptions of the organization as well as the individual’s perceptions of what others think about the organization.

As a means of making the internal/external distinction very clear, Dutton, Dukerich, and Harquail (1994) included two distinct components of perceived organizational identity in their model of organizational identification. The internal component retained the name “perceived organizational identity,” and the external component of perceived organizational identity was called “construed external image.” While this arrangement makes the distinction explicit, some disagreement exists in the field concerning the complete separation of these two forms of perceived organizational identity. Some researchers (Hatch & Schultz, 2002; Scott & Lane, 2000a) argue that organizational identity is an overarching term for the combination of both individuals’ beliefs about their organization and individuals’ beliefs about what others think of that organization. In other words, the two components of organizational identity may actually be related to one another. This possibility was not tested in either Dutton, Dukerich, and Harquail’s (1994) original model or an abbreviated model that was empirically tested by Dukerich, Golden, and Shortell (2002). Hence, it remains unknown whether, and to what extent, the internal and external components of perceived organizational identity interact in any employment context.

Another problem with the original Dutton, Dukerich, and Harquail (1994) conceptualization of perceived organizational identity is that no attempt is made to address the dynamic nature of organizational identity. If perceived organizational identity is similar to an individual’s identity, then an appropriate definition for perceived organizational identity would allow for variations in identity over time because, as contemporary scholars (Baudrillard, 1988; Firat, 1994; Morgado, 1996; Turkle, 1995) have noted, individual identity is fluid and dynamic. Yet, the definition provided by Dutton, Dukerich, and
Harquail (1994) implies, with words like “enduring,” that perceived organizational identity is static.

While many researchers, particularly those in the area of employee-organization identification (Gioia, Schultz, & Corley, 2000; Pratt & Foreman, 2000; Scott & Lane, 2000b), have acknowledged that organizational identities, like individuals’ identities, are dynamic, very few researchers have attempted to empirically test this assumption. In an effort to address this issue, Dukerich, Golden, and Shortell (2002) empirically examined whether individuals’ perceptions of their employment organization varied over time. The results of their longitudinal study indicated that employees’ perceptions of the health care organizations for which they worked were relatively stable over one year, with assessments of only three out of 37 attributes varying significantly from the first assessment period to the second assessment period. Thus, while employees’ assessments of the organization’s identity were not completely identical over time, these assessments did not fluctuate wildly from one assessment period to the next. In this way, perceived organizational identities seem to be similar to personal values, which may also vary slightly from time to time but generally do remain relatively stable over an individual’s lifetime (Rokeach, 1973). In any case, the results from the Dukerich, Golden, and Shortell (2002) study indicate that, while it would be appropriate, as suggested by Pratt and Foreman (2000), to acknowledge whether a past, present, or future identity is being discussed or investigated, organizational identities do not seem to be unstable, as suggested by Gioia, Schultz, and Corley (2000), but rather seem to be relatively stable or “sticky” (Scott & Lane, 2000b, p. 143).

Although the dynamic nature of organizational identity can be easily accounted for by specifying whether one is referring to a past, present, or future perceived organizational identity, a more troublesome aspect of the Dutton, Dukerich, and Harquail (1994) definition of perceived organizational identity is that it is not known exactly what these “distinctive, central, and enduring attributes” that contribute to the organization’s identity are (p. 244). Unfortunately, a global list of characteristics or categories of characteristics that individuals typically use in order to form impressions of organizations may never become available as a
result of individual idiosyncrasies across different types of organizations. Albert and Whetton (1985) conceded that a scientific taxonomy of the characteristics that are generally associated with an organizational identity may be “impossible” because of the “complexity” of each organization and its corresponding identity (p. 268).

However, similar to the ways in which personality assessments (e.g., California Psychological Inventory, Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, Myers-Briggs Type Indicator) have been created for use in understanding individuals’ identities (Funder, 2001), research has revealed the characteristics that are most likely to be used by individuals for the purposes of organizational identity assessment when considering employment organizations within the same industry. Through focus group interviews, Dukerich, Golden, and Shortell (2002) demonstrated that, at least within the same industry, there was some similarity among employees concerning the attributes on which they based their assessments of the organizations for which they worked. In their study, a total of 37 of the same attributes were mentioned by focus group participants from three different health care organizations (Dukerich, Golden, & Shortell, 2002). Thus, there is some evidence to suggest that, within the same industry, perceived organizational identities may be based on assessments of similar characteristics.

Within the retail industry, reliable and valid scales have been created to assess retail stores’ identities. Due to the fact that a store’s identity is “the degree to which [that store] presents a distinct and coherent image” to individuals (Schmitt, Simonson, & Marcus, 1995, p. 85), a retail store’s identity is often referred to, instead, as its “store image.” Store image has been defined as “the summation of all the attributes of a store” (Samli, Kelly, & Hunt, 1998, p. 165) that results in the formation of an “overall impression of a store” (Keaveney & Hunt, 1992, p. 165). Some of the aspects of a store that contribute to that store’s image include the store’s physical characteristics (e.g., size, layout, color scheme), the products sold in the store and their price ranges, the psychological characteristics that store possesses (e.g., the personality attributes of the store), the appearance of the store’s salespeople, and the type and amount of services offered at the store (d’Astous & Levesque, 2003; Keaveney...
The scales used to quantify the construct of store image, such as the scale created by Chowdhury, Reardon, and Srivastava (1998), contain items to assess each of these aspects of the store (e.g., employee service, product quality, product selection, atmosphere, convenience, price/value). These types of store image scales are often used by the store owners or managers to assess their consumers’ impressions of the store, and these scales have also been effectively used by researchers to investigate employees’ perceptions of their employment store’s image (Samli, Kelly, & Hunt, 1998). While employees’ impressions of a store are not always exactly the same as consumers’ impressions of the same store, the fact that employees of a store can have impressions of a store indicates that they could potentially identify with that store’s image in the same way that individuals in other employment contexts have been shown to identify with their employment organizations (Bell & Menguc, 2002; Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994; Pratt, 2000). Although employee-organization identification has not been studied among the salespeople in bricks-and-mortar apparel retail stores in the United States, there is some evidence from previous research to suggest that organizational identification could happen in this context.

Evidence of Employee-Organization Identification within Retail Contexts

Employee-organization identification has been shown to occur in many different employment contexts. For example, the existence of employee-organization identification has been demonstrated among Amway distributors (Pratt, 2000), employees in a large insurance agency (Bell & Menguc, 2002), and employees of the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey (Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994).

The phenomenon of identification has also been studied in a bricks-and-mortar retail store setting by Creighton (1995), who examined the development of collective identity among employees of a Japanese department store. While Creighton’s (1995) work was insightful because it demonstrated that a type of employee-organization identification does
occur in bricks-and-mortar retail store settings, her work focused on the development of collective identity, as opposed to individual identity. Due to the fact that Americans tend to be more individualistic than collectivistic, the type of identification Creighton uncovered in Japan, a collectivist nation, may or may not be similar to the one that occurs in U.S. stores (Hofstede, 1980).

Some evidence does exist, though, that seems to support the proposition that identification can occur for employees working in retail establishments in the United States. Although not studies of employee-organization identification, per se, the notion of identification did arise in both McGrath’s (1989) and Sherry and McGrath’s (1989) ethnographies of gift retailers. The employees of both gift retail establishments examined seemed to personify the attributes associated with the retail establishments and to exhibit a sense of oneness with the retail establishments to the extent that, at one point in the text, McGrath (1989) described both the employees and the products sold in the store as “baubles” that appeared to be beautiful, fanciful, and highly adorned and embellished (p. 448). In this particular instance, it is difficult to tell where the employees’ identities end and the retailers’ identities begin. Thus, although McGrath (1989) and Sherry and McGrath (1989) were not explicitly investigating employee-organization identification, their findings suggest that identification can occur in the retail store context. Additionally, their findings suggest that this identification could be articulated, at least to some degree, by the appearance of the employees.

Employees’ Appearance at Work

Several researchers have investigated the ways in which employees use apparel items to express aspects of their social identity to others and perform their social role in the workplace. Although not specifically a study of employment and dress, appearance emerged as a factor in Kanter’s (1977) analysis of the gender differences that existed within a U.S. corporation in the 1970s. Kanter found that women, who were almost exclusively employed in secretarial positions, dressed more casually and in more varied ways than men, who were almost exclusively employed in managerial and professional positions. In this
simple example it is evident that apparel can be used by individuals within organizations to express their gender identity and their social role as secretaries or as members of the managerial or professional staff within organizations. In another exploration of the relationship between appearance and the expression of social identity, Rafaeli, Dutton, Harquail, and Mackie-Lewis (1997) interviewed female members of a university administrative staff. The authors found that these employees purposefully wore particular apparel items (e.g., formal business suits) to express the fact that they believed they possessed traits (e.g., conservatism, professionalism) they knew to be associated not only with these apparel items but also with the social role of administrative staff member. A similar use of formal business suits to convey information about their level of professionalism and authority was mentioned by female university professors and administrators in interviews conducted by Green (2003) and Kaiser, Chandler, and Hammidi (2003). As is evident from the studies conducted by Kaiser, Chandler, and Hammidi (2003), Green (2003), and Rafaeli et al. (1997), individual employees do wear particular apparel items in an effort indicate to both fellow employees and clients of the organization that they possess the characteristics associated with the apparel items and the social role they are performing.

While all of the participants in the studies conducted by Kaiser, Chandler, and Hammidi (2003), Green (2003), and Rafaeli et al. (1997) were women, researchers have shown that men also use their appearance at work to express characteristics associated with the social roles they are performing. In her study of African-American males employed in managerial roles, McLeod (1998) found that the men she interviewed felt a need to dress in a particular way in an effort to express certain characteristics of their identity and to feel socially accepted at work. As a result of the fact that the social role of manager was important to the men in McLeod’s (1998) study, these men felt that they had to wear traditional, conservative, and formal business attire to their places of employment to demonstrate their commitment to their managerial roles. Similarly, Form and Stone (1955) also found that businessmen controlled their appearance at work in an effort “to make
satisfactory impressions on others” (p. 13). The businessmen were aware of the fact that they needed to appear a certain way (e.g., wearing a business suit) while they were performing their social role as businessmen in order to be accepted by both other employees within the organization as well as clients of the organization.

In addition to aspects of their own social identity, employees' appearance can also serve as an indication of the employment organization’s identity to both employees and customers. Pratt and Rafaeli (1997) interviewed employees (e.g., doctors, nurses, psychologists, social workers, occupational therapists) and customers (e.g., patients and their family members) of the rehabilitation unit of a university hospital to investigate the differences that existed in their perceptions of the organization when the rehabilitation nurses wore street clothes to work and when the rehabilitation nurses wore scrubs to work. They found that the rehabilitation unit actually had two different, but simultaneously existing, identities (i.e., care-giving facility and teaching facility) as a result of the various types of patients they served. Some of the patients required acute care, and, in these instances, nurses who appeared in scrubs transmitted the unit’s identity as a care-giving facility more effectively than those nurses who appeared in street clothes. On the other hand, the nurses who appeared in street clothes transmitted the unit’s identity as a teaching facility that prepared patients and their family members for at-home care more effectively than did those nurses who appeared in scrubs. Thus, it is clear that, in the minds of consumers, the appearance of an organization’s employees is related to the organization’s identity.

Although not a study of apparel products, Klassen, Clayson, and Jasper (1996) demonstrated that, just as in the hospital setting, consumers in a retail store setting may also use the appearance of employees to glean information about the store’s image. After reading descriptions of a salesperson’s height and weight, participants were asked to respond to questions concerning the impression they had of the store in which this salesperson worked. The results demonstrated that, when the salesperson was described as being obese, the participants were more likely to indicate that the store for which that salesperson worked
was less successful and had a poorer image than when the salesperson was not described as being obese. Hence, Klassen, Clayson, and Jasper's (1998) study provides further evidence that a salesperson’s appearance can be used by consumers as a conduit of information concerning a store’s image.

In fact, employees seem to be more satisfied with their employment roles when the aspects of the employment organization’s identity that they are trying to convey with their appearance is consistent with aspects of their own social identity. The female business executives that were interviewed in Kimle and Damhorst’s (1997) study indicated they preferred to work for business firms that possessed organizational identities that were similar to their own social identities. Those participants who had to wear apparel items that conveyed information about their employment organizations that was inconsistent with their “personal image priorities” (Kimle & Damhorst, 1997, p. 62) were less satisfied with their employment roles than were participants whose apparel items conveyed the similarities that existed between their social identity and their organization’s identity.

Kimle and Damhorst’s (1997) research suggests that a relationship may exist between an employee’s appearance and his or her level of identification with his or her employment organization. This relationship, however, has not been explicitly, empirically examined in previous research. While researchers (Benkhoff, 1997; Pratt & Rafaeli, 1997; Rafaeli et al., 1997) have suggested that the apparel items an employee chooses to wear could be visible manifestations of his or her level of identification with the employment organization, the specific relationship between employee appearance in terms of apparel items and employee-organization identification remains unexplored. However, the possibility that an employee’s appearance could be related to his or her level of identification with an employment organization is certainly supported by previous research on employee appearance at work (Kimle & Damhorst, 1997; Pratt & Rafaeli, 1997; Rafaeli et al., 1997) and is also proffered by various social-psychological theories of appearance, such as symbolic interaction theory.
Symbolic Interaction Theory

The theoretical foundations for symbolic interactionism were based on the work of James, Cooley, and Mead in the late 1800s and early 1900s (Farr, 1996; Sandstrom, Martin, & Fine, 2003). The theory of symbolic interaction focuses on “the meanings that people give to actions and events” and on “understanding how these meanings are constructed and negotiated” (Sandstrom et al., 2003, p. 3). According to the theory, human beings assign meanings to things that exist (e.g., people, products, stores) or occur (e.g., actions) in the world (Blumer, 1969; Solomon, 1983). These meanings are not inherent within the things, themselves. Instead, the meanings for these things are created by individuals through the process of social interaction (Blumer, 1969; Sandstrom et al., 2003). While interacting, each individual witnesses each other individual’s response to a thing. Over time, each person learns what that thing means based on both his or her own reaction as well as other people’s reactions to that particular thing (Farr, 1996). In this way, meanings for things become shared among people, and these things then become symbols that cue cognitive, emotional, and behavioral responses in both oneself and in others.

Like the meanings assigned to other things that exist in the world, the meanings assigned to an individual’s self are also negotiated within society. According to the theory, the self is composed of two “interdependent and inseparable dimensions” (Fisher, 1978, p. 167). One of these dimensions is called the “I.” The “I” is the part of the self that makes each person within society an individual with a unique composition of biological and psychological traits (Schellenberg, 1978). In addition to the “I,” the self is also composed of the “me.” The “me” “consists of the attitudes of others” about what the things that exist or occur in the world mean (Schellenberg, 1978, p. 51). One of these things that exists in the world is, of course, an individual person. Over time, this individual person witnesses the reactions that other people in society have towards him or her as a thing in the world. This individual person reflects upon the reactions of others and uses his or her interpretations of these reactions to learn about who he or she is as a person and to direct his or her future
action. In this way, the self is a social construction because each person's self is not given, but rather "emerges" through interactions with others in society (Farr, 1996, p. 67).

The meanings that other people assign to an individual through social interactions with that individual are often directed by certain cues. One of these cues is the appearance of the individual, in part the apparel products worn by that individual (Stone, 1965). Apparel products, like individuals, exist in the world and have meanings attached to them through either direct social interaction or observations of social interaction with individuals who wear them (Solomon, 1983). In this way, apparel products become symbols such that when a particular person wears a particular apparel item (e.g., a Ralph Lauren shirt), other people make assumptions about what type of person he or she is (e.g., conservative) and respond to that person accordingly. Thus, a relationship is established between an individual's appearance and his or her sense of self (i.e., identity) if an individual's sense of self is based on his or her interpretations of the reactions that he or she receives from other members of society.

Hence, the theory of symbolic interaction clearly allows for a connection to exist between one's appearance and one's identity in terms of both his or her personal and social identities and could, therefore, be useful for addressing questions concerning the relationship between appearance and employee-organization identification in the context of an apparel retail store. A salesperson's appearance could be used to assess the degree of consistency between his or her sense of self, particularly in terms of his or her social identity, and the store's image because, as the theory of symbolic interaction suggests, the apparel products that a salesperson wears serve as symbols of his or her personality traits, which may or may not be similar to the store's traits. Furthermore, the theory also provides a framework for understanding the ways in which consumers make the cognitive leap from salesperson appearance to store image. When consumers are in a store environment, they look for symbols they recognize to help them understand what type of store they are in. One of the symbols they might recognize is salesperson appearance. Because the apparel products a salesperson is wearing are symbolic representations for the type of person he or she is and
because the salesperson is an integral component of the store, consumers most likely assume that the apparel products the salesperson is wearing are also symbolic representations for the type of store they are in. To the consumer, the characteristics he or she believes that this salesperson possesses are likely to be the ones that the store itself possesses. Thus, in the consumer’s mind, there is most likely some degree of consistency between this salesperson’s social identity, as expressed via his or her appearance, and the store’s image.

When a great deal of consistency exists between a salesperson’s appearance and the image of the apparel retail store for which he or she works, it is most likely the case that the employee is committed to his or her social role as a salesperson for that particular apparel retail store. When individuals are committed to particular roles, they tend to surround themselves with more of the symbols associated with that role than those individuals who are not as committed to that role. This pattern was revealed by the work of Arthur (1997). She found that young women whose membership in a sorority was the most salient role for them in terms of their self-definitions tended to use their sorority’s Greek letters in more of their dress and appearance-related items than those sorority members who were not as committed to that role. This same pattern is likely to also be revealed among salespeople who are committed to their role as employees of a particular apparel retail store. These salespeople would most likely surround themselves with symbols of the store, including apparel items from that store, as a reflection of their level of commitment to the role of employee of that store.

Individuals who are committed to their role as employees of an apparel retail store would most likely also display a high degree of identification with that apparel retail store because the roles they use to define themselves as people are the ones to which they are the most committed (Michelman, 1998; Sandstrom, Martin, & Fine, 2003). Hence, if a salesperson were committed to the role of employee of an apparel retail store, he or she would also identify with that apparel retail store because, based on the definition of employee-organization identification (Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994), he or she would use the characteristics associated with the store to define, at least in part, his or her own
social identity. Thus, a relationship seems to exist between commitment to the role of salesperson in an apparel retail store and identification with that apparel retail store. If this is the case, then it is fair to say that salespeople who identify with the apparel retail store for which they work will be more likely to assume the characteristics of the store and display these characteristics through their appearance than salespeople who are not committed to that social role and do not identify with that store.

Although the relationship between employee social identity and store image has not been previously investigated, the existence of such a relationship is not altogether improbable, especially in light of literature concerning employee recruitment. When individuals are actively seeking employment, they often consider applying at those employment organizations that are attractive in some way to them. One of the things that makes an employment organization, such as an apparel retail store, attractive to a potential employee is the level of congruency he or she believes exists between the employment organization’s identity and aspects of his or her own identity (Dineen, Ash, & Noe, 2002; Judge & Cable, 1997). This is referred to as “person-organization fit” (Kristof, 1996). Although person-organization fit has not been previously investigated in relation to employee-organization identification, both attractiveness of the employment organization and perceived organization identity have been shown to be antecedents of organizational identification in various employment contexts.

**Antecedents of Employee-Organization Identification**

**Attractiveness, person-organization fit, and perceived organizational identity.** Although the term “attractiveness” is not specifically defined in their conceptual model, Dutton, Dukerich, and Harquail (1994) suggested that individuals are aware of organizations’ identities and are attracted to some organizations more than other organizations based upon their knowledge of those organizations’ identities. This relationship between the level of attractiveness of the perceived organizational identity and the level of employee-organization identification was empirically tested by Dukerich, Golden, and Shortell (2002). Using a structural equation model, Dukerich, Golden, and
Shortell (2002) found that a higher assessment of the attractiveness of both the internal and external components of perceived organizational identity led to a higher strength of employee-organization identification. Although their model did not allow for any interaction between the internal and external aspects of perceived organizational identity, their findings demonstrated that attractiveness was an antecedent of employee-organization identification, albeit without an explicit definition of attractiveness.

Although not in a study of employee-organization identification, the term “attractiveness” was defined by Turban and Dougherty (1992) in their study of college students’ perceptions of employment organizations during on-campus recruiting activities. Turban and Dougherty (1992) defined attractiveness as the students’ “valence perceptions” of the employment organization (p. 740). In other words, attractiveness is an indication of how much an individual is drawn to an employment organization. Like a magnet being drawn to steel, an employee is pulled towards the organization based on his or her perceptions of that organization’s identity. However, unlike magnetic attraction, which is based on attraction between dissimilar items, the attraction between an employee and an organization is presumably based on similarities between aspects of an employee’s identity and the organization’s identity, which is referred to as “person-organization fit” (Kristof, 1996).

Person-organization fit has been defined as “the compatibility between people and organizations that occurs when...they share similar fundamental characteristics” (Kristof, 1996, p. 1). Person-organization fit has been shown to be related to the level of attraction an employee feels towards a potential employment organization. Judge and Cable (1997) found that perceived person-organization fit was positively related to the attractiveness of an employment organization among 182 college students in engineering, business, and labor relations programs who were applying for their first professional job after graduation. Similarly, Dineen, Ash, and Noe (2002) found that, among 206 business students, perceived person-organization fit was positively related to the attractiveness of an employment organization in a web-based employment recruitment context.
Although the studies conducted by Dineen, Ash, and Noe (2002) and Judge and Cable (1997) did not deal explicitly with employee-organization identification, it is evident from studies such as these that potential employees were aware of an employment organization's identity before actual employment with that organization began. Perceptions of a potential employment organization's identity may come from corporate recruitment activities and materials (e.g., career fairs, websites, brochures), corporate advertising (e.g., television, print), and word-of-mouth sources (e.g., talking to professors, friends, other employees) (Cable, Aiman-Smith, Mulvey, & Edwards, 2000; Dineen, Ash, & Noe, 2002; Herriot, 2004; Turban, 2001). In the case of a retail apparel store's image, the awareness of the image most likely comes from previous experience as a consumer of the store or from a desire to be a consumer of that store. On the one hand, Goldsberry, Gehrt, Sun, and Shim (1999) found that individuals indicated a preference for working in retail stores where they liked to shop. This finding seems to indicate that potential employees of an apparel retail store may initially be attracted to that apparel retail store for employment purposes based on the experiences they have had with the apparel retail store through past purchases. Through these consumption-related experiences, the potential employees most likely have an awareness of the level of fit they believe exists between their own individual identities and the apparel retail store's image. On the other hand, actual purchase behavior may not be required for potential employees to become aware of an apparel retail store's image. Chaudhuri and Holbrook (2001) demonstrated that individuals can have an emotional attachment to the products that a store sells without actually purchasing these products. In some cases, the products may be too expensive for a person to actually purchase and use. Yet, despite the individual's inability to purchase the actual product, he or she could still share common characteristics or have a desire to share common characteristics (e.g., fantasy relationships) with the store and the products it sells. His or her awareness, in this case, of the similarities that he or she perceives to exist between himself or herself and the store's image would be based on his or her experiences with the store and its products through window shopping activities or exposure to the marketing activities of the apparel retail store.
Thus, actual purchase may not be required for a potential employee to become aware of a store's image and to assess the amount of person-organization fit that exists between the store's image and his or her social identity.

Regardless of the way in which they become aware of the level of person-organization fit that exists between themselves and the store, these potential employees most likely become more familiar with the store's image and begin to perceive either more or less similarity between themselves and their employment organization as they begin working for the apparel retail store. When these individuals perceive a greater level of fit due to a greater amount of similarities between their own identities and the apparel retail store's image, then these employees most likely continue to perceive the apparel retail store as an attractive organization for which to work. When they perceive the apparel retail store as an attractive organization for which to work, past research (Dukerich, Golden, & Shortell, 2002) suggests that they will tend to exhibit a high degree of employee-organization identification with that apparel retail store. When the salespeople exhibit a high degree of identification with the apparel retail store for which they work, they will also most likely exhibit a high degree of job involvement and job performance, which are two consequences of employee-organization identification.

**Consequences of Employee-Organization Identification**

**Job involvement.** Job involvement is "the degree to which one is cognitively preoccupied with, engaged in, and concerned with one’s present job" (Paullay, Alliger, & Stone-Romero, 1994, p. 224). In other words, job involvement is the level of importance that an individual places on his or her current employment situation as an aspect of his or her life. Researchers have found that employee-organization identification is positively related to job involvement. In their study of 163 faculty members in a Dutch university, van Knippenberg and van Schie (2000) found that job involvement was positively and significantly related to organizational identification. Similar results were found by Gould and Werbel (1983) in their study of 453 clerical, technical, professional, and administrative personnel and by Schneider, Hall, and Nygren (1971) in their study of 141 U.S. Forest
Service Professionals. Although none of these studies was conducted within the context of an apparel retail store, it seems likely that similar results would also be found within that employment context.

**Job performance.** In addition to job involvement, job performance has also been shown to be related to employee-organization identification. Job performance is “behavior that has been evaluated in terms of its contributions to the goals of the organization” (Bush, Bush, Ortinau, & Hair, 1990, p. 119). According to Bhattacharya and Sen (2003), organizational identification “causes people to become psychologically attached to and care about the organization, which motivates them to commit to the achievement of its goals” (p. 83). That is to say, job performance should increase as the level of employee-organization identification increases. In fact, job performance has been shown to be positively related to organizational identification. Efraty and Wolfe (1988) found that, among 215 employees from eight elder care facilities, a positive relationship existed between organizational identification and three different performance responses (i.e., task involvement, investment of effort, and performance effectiveness). Similar results were obtained by Benkhooff (1997) in her study of 182 bank employees in 37 branches of a bank in Germany. She found that identification was a positive, significant predictor of individual employees’ sales behavior. Thus, individuals who identify with their employers seem to work towards the organization’s goals.

While Benkoff’s (1997) and Efraty and Wolfe’s (1988) studies demonstrated, via regression and correlation analysis, respectively, that job performance was positively related to employee-organizational identification, job performance has also been shown to be a consequence of employee-organization identification using other methods and statistical techniques. Bartel (2001) surveyed 310 employees of the Pillsbury Company who participated in a work-sponsored community outreach program. Pre-participation and post-participation surveys revealed that the employees who participated in the work-sponsored community outreach program displayed a greater degree of identification with Pillsbury after they participated in the program than prior to their participation. Furthermore, the
participants' job performance, as measured by their supervisors' evaluations of the participants' level of work effort, increased following their participation in the outreach program. Bartel (2001) concluded that the increase noted in the participants' work effort was a direct result of the increase in the level of identification with the organization that occurred following their participation in the community outreach program. Thus, it seems to be the case that job performance is not only positively related to but also a consequence, as opposed to an antecedent, of employee-organization identification.

**Relationship between employee-organization identification, job involvement, and job performance.** While previous research findings (Bartel, 2001) demonstrate that job performance is a consequence of employee-organization identification, it is unclear from previous research whether job involvement is also a consequence of employee-organization identification, and, if so, how job involvement and job performance are related. In his meta-analysis of the relationship between job involvement and job performance, Brown (1996) did not find a significant relationship between job involvement and job performance. However, several researchers (Brown, 1996; Diefendorff, Brown, Kamin, & Lord, 2002; Paullay, Alliger, & Stone-Romero, 1994) have argued that this non-significant finding is the result of the way in which job involvement has been measured in the past. These researchers argue that job involvement is often measured as work centrality, which is an entirely different construct from job involvement. Work centrality is an indication of how important work, in general, is to a person's sense of self, while job involvement is an indication of how important one's current employment situation, in particular, is to a person's life. In this way, work centrality is a broader construct that job involvement, and this may be part of the reason for the non-significant findings in Brown's (1996) meta-analysis.

Another reason for the non-significant findings in Brown's (1996) meta-analysis may be a result of the way in which the job performance construct was measured. Researchers (Hollenbeck & Williams, 1986) who have measured job performance solely in terms of actual sales over a period of time have not found job involvement to be
significantly related to job performance. On the other hand, researchers (Lee & Mowday, 1987; Shore, Newton, Thornton, 1990) who assessed employees’ job performance in a more global fashion and incorporated more dimensions of the job performance concept than strictly sales performance into their studies have found job involvement to be positively and significantly related to job performance. Although sales performance is, of course, an important aspect of apparel retail salespeople’s job performance, additional job performance behaviors (e.g., showing up on time and as scheduled for shifts, quickly and accurately ringing up sales, maintaining a positive, customer-centered attitude) are equally as important to the financial success of an apparel retail store and often appear as items on annual salesperson performance evaluations. Therefore, it seems more appropriate to use global measures of job performance (i.e., Bush, Bush, Ortinau, & Hair’s (1990) scale) in an apparel retail store setting. Consequently, it seems likely that job involvement and job performance will be positively and significantly related in an apparel retail store setting.

The existence of a positive and significant relationship between job involvement and job performance has been demonstrated in previous research. Farris (1969) conducted a longitudinal study of 151 engineers working in an electronics corporation regarding their perceptions of their employment organization and their job performance. Farris (1969) found that, across measurement times, self-reported job involvement was significantly related to self-reported performance, as measured by the number of patents received or applied for. Lawler and Hall (1970) also found that job involvement was positively related to job performance, as measured by self-reports of their effort while at work, among 291 scientists working in research and development laboratories. Diefendorff, Brown, Kamin, & Lord (2002) surveyed 130 employed, undergraduate students and their supervisors and found that self-reported job involvement was a predictor of supervisor-reported job performance using regression analysis.

From studies such as the ones conducted by Diefendorff, Brown, Kamin, and Lord (2002), Lawler and Hall (1970), Farris (1969), it seems to be the case that job involvement is positively related to job performance. Additionally, both job involvement and job
performance seem to be positively related to employee-organization identification. Since employee-organization identification leads to increased job performance and job performance is positively related to job involvement, it seems logical to assume that employee-organization identification would also lead to job involvement. Although neither job involvement nor job performance have been investigated in relation to employee-organization identification in an apparel retail store, it seems likely that these variables would both be consequences of identification in this context. Furthermore, it seems logical to assume that the more involved an employee is with his or her job, the more he or she will be concerned about his or her performance in that job. Consequently, he or she will perform better in that job than an employee who is not as highly involved with his or her job. Therefore, it seems likely that job performance should be a consequence of not only employee-organization identification but also job involvement. In other words, employee-organization identification should be directly related to both job involvement and job performance as well as indirectly related to job performance through job involvement in a structural equation model.

Objectives

The objectives of this research project are: (1) To explore the relationship that exists, if any, between salesperson appearance and employee-organization identification through interviews with salespeople in apparel retail stores. (2) If a relationship is found to exist, to develop items about appearance that can be added to existing scales of identification (e.g., Mael, 1988) in order to explain additional variance in participants' responses. (3) To test the following hypotheses and proposed model using a survey method to determine if the relationships specified in the model are upheld in the apparel retail store context.

Research Question, Hypotheses, and Proposed Model

To address the first and second objective, a qualitative research question was written as follows: To what extent is employee-organization identification expressed through an apparel retail salesperson's appearance? To address the third objective, previous research was used to develop a proposed model (Figure 1) and the following hypotheses:
H₁: Employees’ perceptions of their employment organization’s perceived organizational identity (i.e., internal component of store image) will be positively related to their perceptions of person-organization fit with their employment organization (i.e., the apparel retail store).

H₂: Employees’ perceptions of their employment organization’s construed external image (i.e., external component of store image) will be positively related to their perceptions of person-organization fit with their employment organization (i.e., the apparel retail store).

H₃: Employees’ perceptions of their employment organization’s perceived organizational identity and their perceptions of their employment organization’s construed external image will be positively related.

H₄: Employees’ perceptions of person-organization fit with their employment organization (i.e., the apparel retail store) will be positively related to their perceptions of the attractiveness of their employment organization (i.e., the apparel retail store).

H₅: Employees’ perceptions of the attractiveness of their employment organization (i.e., the apparel retail store) will be positively related to their organizational identification with their employment organization (i.e., the apparel retail store).

H₆: Employees’ organizational identification with their employment organization (i.e., the apparel retail store) will be positively related to their perceptions of their job involvement.

H₇: Employees’ organizational identification with their employment organization (i.e., the apparel retail store) will be positively related to their perceptions of their job performance.

H₈: Employees’ perceptions of their job involvement will be positively related to their perceptions of their job performance.

H₉: The model containing items concerning the appearance dimension of employee-organization identification will fit the data better than the model that does not include items concerning the appearance dimension of employee-organization identification.
Figure 1. The proposed model to be tested in the second phase of the study.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

The overarching goals of the present study are (1) to explore and validate the relationship, if one exists, between salesperson appearance in terms of apparel worn and employee-organization identification in apparel retail stores and (2) to extend the findings from previous research on employee-organization identification among employees in several different industries to employees specifically in the apparel retail industry. To accomplish these goals, a mixed-method, two-phase design is employed (Creswell, 1998; Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003).

In the first phase of the study, a qualitative approach to data collection is taken as a means of both exploring the potential relationship between employee-organization identification and salesperson appearance as well as developing questionnaire items for the second phase of the study. Although previous research findings suggest that a relationship may exist between employee-organization identification and an employee’s appearance in terms of the apparel he or she wears to work (Benkoff, 1997; Pratt & Rafaeli, 1997; Rafaeli, Dutton, Harquail, & Mackie-Lewis, 1997), no research has been conducted which specifically investigates the possibility that an employee’s appearance could be a visible manifestation of his or her level of identification with his or her employment organization. Since this relationship has not been previously investigated in any industry, let alone the apparel retail industry, an understanding of the behavior and beliefs of apparel retail salespeople with respect to the role of apparel in relation to identification is lacking.

To gain insight concerning the relationship between employee appearance and employee-organization identification from the apparel retail salesperson’s perspective and to identify categories of meanings for salespeople about apparel and employee-organization identification, qualitative methods (i.e., interviews) are used in the first phase of the present study. Qualitative research methods, such as interviews, are particularly useful for exploring complex social phenomena with individual actors in an effort to gain an understanding of the phenomena from each individual actor’s perspective (Moore & Lutz, 2000; Narvaez, 2000). Because interview participants are afforded the opportunity to describe their
attitudes, feelings, and behaviors, the meanings the participants attribute to their attitudes and actions are allowed to emerge. The researcher acquires an understanding of the phenomenon under investigation through the careful interpretation of the interview data.

In the process of interviewing, specific words and phrases that are meaningful to the participants are expressed. Using inductive reasoning, the words and phrases that are meaningful to the interview participants should also be meaningful to other individuals experiencing the phenomenon under investigation (Babbie, 2004). To test this assumption, interviews could be conducted with every individual experiencing the phenomenon. However, a more time- and cost-effective means of validating a researcher’s interpretations of interview data would be the development and validation of scale items (Babbie, 2004). The “ideas and insights” (Churchill, 1979, p. 67) offered by interview participants can be used to generate scale items, and these scale items can be validated among a larger sample of individuals using quantitative methods, such as surveys (Lastovicka, Bettencourt, Hughner, & Kuntze, 1999).

The process of validating the interpretations of qualitative data using quantitative methods is referred to as a “triangulation of methods” (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003; Moore & Lutz, 2000). This validation approach is used in the present study. In the second phase of the study, the information gleaned from the interviews in the first phase of the study is used to generate scale items that can be used to quantitatively assess participants’ beliefs concerning any apparel-related behaviors associated with employee-organization identification. The results obtained by surveying a large sample of apparel retail salespeople are compared to the results obtained by interviewing a small sample of apparel retail salespeople in an effort to validate the findings from both phases of the present study.

In addition to validating the findings from the first phase of the present study, a second purpose of the second phase of the study is to extend the applicability of the concept of employee-organization identification by examining in the context of apparel retail stores the relationships between employee-organization identification and other variables, as depicted in Figure 1, that have been shown to exist in a variety of other employment
contexts. Previous research has been conducted on employee-organization identification in many industries, such as the insurance industry (Bell & Menguc, 2002), the transportation industry (Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994), and the health care industry (Dukerich, Golden, & Shortell, 2002). However, the concept has not been studied in the apparel retail industry. The survey for the present study is used in an attempt to replicate the findings of previous research in the apparel retail store context and demonstrate that the findings from previous studies on employee-organization identification can be generalized across employees from a variety of industries (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). Replication is an important part of the scientific process because comparing the results of studies across space and time is useful in theory generation (Babbie, 2004). If theories contain, by definition, law-like generalizations, then the relationships specified between the variables in a theory should not be context-specific (Kerlinger, 1986). In order to demonstrate that the relationships found between variables in one context also are applicable in another context, researchers often replicate previous studies and attempt to validate and extend the findings from one study in a new study. The second phase of the present study is an example of one of these types of replication studies. The second phase of the present study is not only used to validate the findings from the first phase of the study but is also used to extend the findings from previous research on employee-organization identification into a new industry, the apparel retail industry. The findings from the second phase of this study add to the body of knowledge concerning employee-organization identification and aid in the development process of a theory of employee-organization identification.

The "marriage" of qualitative and quantitative approaches in the two phases of the present study, therefore, allows for the clarification of meanings of variables to the participants, the development of more valid items that make sense to and are grounded in the experiences of participants in the social contexts under study, and a complementary compensation for the limitations of both types of approaches to research.
CHAPTER 4:
METHOD AND FINDINGS FOR PHASE 1: INTERVIEWS FOR ITEM GENERATION

Chapter Overview

In this chapter, information concerning the data collection procedures used, characteristics of the participants, and data analysis procedures used for the first phase of the study is presented. The principal emergent themes from the qualitative interviews are discussed. The chapter also contains discussions of the new scale items that were written concerning the relationship between employee appearance and organizational identification and the two new hypotheses that were written based on the interview data. At the end of the chapter, a modified model to be tested in the second phase of the study is presented.

Method

Data collection. Because this phase of the study was used to gain a deeper understanding of the complex relationship that may exist between salesperson appearance, store image, and employee-organization identification, face-to-face interviews were used for data collection. This technique allowed participants to more freely express themselves and to explain their actions (Holloway & Jefferson, 2000; Schouten, 1991; Seidman, 1998). Participants were purposively recruited through networking with professors and graduate students at two different Midwestern universities. These professors and graduate students provided the contact information for individuals they knew who were currently employed in apparel retail stores. These potential participants were then contacted either through e-mail or in person while they were at work and were asked if they would be willing to be interviewed. All potential participants who were contacted agreed to be interviewed. Appointments were scheduled during the initial contact.

Face-to-face interviews were conducted at a location specified by the participant. The interviews followed a semi-structured format. Specific questions were asked in an effort to direct the interview and obtain imperative pieces of information. The questions focused on participants’ perceptions of the stores for which they worked and how these perceptions of the stores were related to perceptions of themselves and their appearance.
Many of the questions were based on those asked in previous qualitative research on appearance and identity among group members (Hunt & Miller, 1997) and appearance and identity in employment contexts (McLeod, 1998; Rafaeli, Dutton, Harquail, & Mackie-Lewis, 1997). Examples of these questions are provided in Appendix B. As data collection proceeded, some of these questions were altered or omitted and other questions were added because an emergent intuitive design was used that allowed the data collected during each interview to guide subsequent interviews (Marshall & Rossman, 1999).

**Participant characteristics.** The number of participants in this phase of the study totaled nine adults (pseudonyms and demographic data are provided in Table 1). Eight of the participants were currently employed as either part-time sales associates (working between 8 and 20 hours per week) or full-time sales floor managers (working at least 40 hours per week) in an apparel store. The types of apparel stores represented were national chain specialty stores, department stores, and local boutiques. All of the eight participants worked in stores which sold apparel products that they could potentially wear both inside and outside of the store because the apparel products sold were gender-appropriate (i.e., the males worked in stores which sold apparel products for men exclusively or for men and women and the females worked in stores which sold apparel products for women exclusively or for women and men). The length of time in which participants were employed in their current positions ranged from two months to twelve years. The number of participants, eight, was sufficient to reflect variations in participants’ experiences based on the length of time they had been employed in their current positions, the number of hours they work each week, the type of apparel sold in each store (e.g., high-end vs. low-end, formal vs. casual), and the overall store image of each store. Additionally, no new information came out during the eighth interview.

In addition to interviewing the eight individuals who were currently employed in positions which involved selling apparel products directly to the final consumer in a store setting, one individual who was currently employed as a buyer for a national retailer was also interviewed. This interview was conducted for the purpose of comparing and
Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Participants in Phase 1 of the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Current position</th>
<th>Time in position</th>
<th>Type of store</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sabrina</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Sales floor manager</td>
<td>12 years</td>
<td>Specialty/ national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sales associate</td>
<td>11 years</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Sales associate</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Boutique/ local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Sales floor manager</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Specialty/ national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Buyer</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Corporate office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Sales floor manager</td>
<td>1.5 year</td>
<td>Specialty/ national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Sales floor manager</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>Specialty/ national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sales associate</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>Boutique/ local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sales associate</td>
<td>1.5 year</td>
<td>Boutique/ local</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All names used in this table are pseudonyms.

contrasting her responses to the items on the interview schedule with those of the participants who were employed in the store setting to see if employee-organization identification might differ depending upon where an employee spends most of his or her working hours (i.e., on the sales floor of an apparel store or in the corporate office of an
apparel store). Incidentally, one of the participants, Rebecca, who was currently employed as a part-time sales associate also had previous full-time employment experience in the corporate office of the same store where she was currently employed. Hence, Rebecca was questioned about her experiences working for the corporate office as well as her experiences working in the store setting.

Data analysis. Each interview lasted between 30-90 minutes and was audio tape-recorded. Upon completion of each interview, interview data were transcribed verbatim. Using an emergent intuitive design, data analysis began immediately after the first interview was completed. Each interview transcript was read in its entirety several times and key phrases of possible theoretical import were bracketed (Seidman, 1998). Key phrases that shared some commonality were grouped together as conceptual categories, and these categories were used to help determine the direction of the remaining interviews (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). Each subsequent interview was analyzed in the context of previously gathered data and examined for points of similarity or dissimilarity. Existing categories were amended and new categories were created to incorporate all of the data of theoretical import. When all interviews were completed, the final categories were examined for any potential linkages that existed among them (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). Multiple categories that were theoretically linked were expanded into broader, overarching themes. Each of these four themes is listed and described in Table 2.

Findings: Principal Emergent Themes from Phase 1 of the Study

The responses of seven of the nine participants in the first phase of the study seemed to suggest that they identified with their current employment organizations. When specifically asked if they felt like they fit in with their current employment organizations, these seven participants indicated that they did fit in, while the other two participants indicated that they did not feel like they fit in with their employment organizations. No patterns emerged from the data to suggest that employees’ level of identification was related to the length of time they had been employed with the organization, the number of hours they worked each week, whether they felt that their current position was just a job or was a
Table 2

*Descriptions of Principal Emergent Themes from Phase 1 of the Study*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification as congruency between employee self-image and store image</td>
<td>Participants used either the same or similar words to describe both themselves and the store for which they worked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification as congruency between employee, customers, and coworkers</td>
<td>Participants used either the same or similar words to describe themselves, their coworkers, and the customers of the store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The use of apparel products as evidence of employee-organization identification</td>
<td>Participants discussed the use of apparel products to visibly demonstrate the similarities that existed between themselves, their coworkers, the store, and the customers of the store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification and job satisfaction</td>
<td>Participants discussed how the existence of similarities between themselves, their coworkers, the store, and the customers of the store made their jobs more enjoyable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...step in their career path, their position within the organization (i.e., manager or subordinate), or their gender. Instead, the responses of all the store-level participants implied that identification (or lack thereof) with their current employment organizations was based on the level of congruency that these employees perceived to exist between their own personal traits and characteristics possessed by the store and its products as well as characteristics possessed by the other individuals associated with the employment organization (i.e., customers and coworkers).

Identification as congruency between employee self-image and store image. Among the store-level participants who indicated that they fit in with their current employment organizations, a high level of consistency existed between store-level employees’
perceptions of themselves and their perceptions of the image of the store for which they worked. When asked to describe themselves and to describe the image of the store where they were currently working, the participants who identified with that store either used the exact same words or very similar words to describe both themselves and the store. For example, when asked to describe the department store for which she worked, Rebecca mentioned that the store was “hip, trendy, very precise in how they want things.” Later in the interview, when asked to describe herself, she stated, “I’m trendy and hip.” She also described the clothing in her closet as being very precisely organized, much like the store is very precisely organized.

My closet just goes in rainbow order. Roy G. Biv. It starts with red and goes to black. [Rebecca]

In another example, Leslie described herself as being “unique,” “different,” and “bubbly.” When later asked to describe the store where she was currently working, she mentioned that she believed that the store was “unique,” “different,” and “fun.” The quotes from both Rebecca and Leslie are representative of the statements made by all of the store-level employees who believed that they fit in with, or identified with, their current employment organization.

No store-level employees, regardless of their degree of employee-store identification, made a definite distinction between the image of the store and the image of the products sold in that store. This finding suggests that the characteristics associated with the apparel products sold in the store highly contribute to the store’s overall image. The strong relationship between the products’ image and the store’s image that was evidenced in the participants’ responses may be attributable to the fact that many of the stores for which these individuals worked were specialty stores where private label merchandise was sold. As a result of the fact that these stores sell exclusively their own merchandise and that no other store sells this merchandise, it may have been difficult for these employees to separate where the image of the products ended and the image of the store began. In fact, one of these participants, Jeff, actually referred to the store where he worked as a “brand,” a term which, by definition, is associated with products and not stores (Frings, 2005; Solomon &
Rabolt, 2004). Hence, for the participants working in specialty stores, the image the store projects seemed to be intricately tied to the image of the products sold in that store. However, this is not to say that the participants who were employed in local boutiques, which sold a variety of merchandise that was not private label merchandise, could easily separate the image of the store from the image of the products sold in that store. While Leslie mentioned that she believed that it was a more difficult challenge to present a unified product/store image in the local boutique where she was currently working than in the specialty store where she was previously employed, she also indicated that presenting a consistent store image with a variety of national brands was not an impossible feat.

I think they can be separated, although with [previous employer], they have a very specific target market and they definitely organize the store to reflect their clothing.... [Current employer’s] image is fun and playful...and [the owner] tries to reflect that fun image with everything she does, I think.... But it’s definitely a lot harder because of the variety [of merchandise]. [Leslie]

Leslie’s response suggested that the owner of the boutique was doing a good job of selecting merchandise that supported or reinforced the overall store image as one that was fun and playful. And, due to the fact that Leslie, the store, and the products sold in the store all had a fun, playful image, Leslie believed that she fit in with this store.

Leslie and several other participants who identified with their current employment organizations indicated that they had actually decided to leave previous store-level jobs because their perceptions of themselves were or had become incongruous with the image of the store and the products it sold. Leslie stated that she never really fit the store image of her previous employer. When asked why she decided to work there, given the fact that she did not fit in, she indicated that she needed a job and that, although she had applied at many stores in the local mall, the manager of this store was the first person to interview her and to offer her a job.

I needed a job, and I applied everywhere I could, and they gave me a job. I was very prompt with my application. Like they gave me an application and I filled it out and I was like, “Here you go.” I had previous retail experience as well. And I’m just a bubbly person, so maybe that helped. I didn’t shop at [previous employer’s store] before.... [The previous employer’s store image] is classic, casual. Not me. But that’s O.K.... I did at one point work at both
places.... And it was a conflict of interest between the two. So I took a leave of absence, and then I just didn’t come back [to the previous employment organization] because I really enjoyed working at [the new employment organization]. [Leslie]

For Sabrina, her decision to leave her previous employment organization was based on incongruities that had developed between her image of herself and the image of the store and its products during the twelve years that she worked for that organization. While she indicated that she believed that she initially fit in with the image of store and its products when she was in her 20s, she began to feel that she no longer fit in with the store as she approached her 40s.

That’s why I chose this retailer, because of my age and the merchandise. I truly believe you have to love what you’re selling.... I kind-of grew out of where I was working. It was very trendy, younger. And as I grew older, [current employer] became my retailer of choice.... Thinking back, I was with my other retailer back in the late-80s and early-90s. So, the looks have changed. But I still have some of that merchandise and I put it on and I feel like I’m ready for Halloween or something. It’s so outdated, young. The concept that I had of myself...it did have to do with my age, a lot of it. The retailer I left I haven’t shopped in since I left twelve years ago. I absolutely grew out of it. [Sabrina]

The responses of Leslie and Sabrina suggest that apparel retail store employees do not exhibit identification with stores when they believe that those stores and their products do not have images that are similar to the employees’ own self images. Further support for this notion comes from the statements made during the interviews by the two store-level employees who indicated that they did not fit with their employment organizations. Very little evidence of congruity was displayed in these participants’ responses because they described themselves, the store, and the store’s products using different terms. For example, Jackie described herself as “upscale,” “funky, funky but chic,” and “a square peg in a round hole.” However, when she described the store for which she was currently employed, she stated,

Compared to the place I used to work, it’s not as upscale. It’s probably kind-of middle-class, kind-of a middle of the road kind-of store. Not too fancy. Not too divey. [Jackie]
Clearly, Jackie does not believe that she possesses characteristics that are similar to the ones possessed by the store. Scott, another participant who did not feel that he fit in with the store for which he currently works, also described himself and the store using completely different words. He described himself as being “very hardworking, motivated, very dependable.” He described the store as being “old-fashioned,” “traditional,” and “snobby.” Scott’s responses suggested that he felt a great deal of discomfort working for an apparel retailer that possessed a high-class image and sold expensive clothing to members of the upper-class when he himself was a member of the middle-class.

I had truly no interest in coming to [current employment organization]. I’m a very middle-class person. I don’t...I would say that I struggle sometimes with this company dealing with the rich people and the attitudes sometimes.... I guess I’m me. I’m who I am. Even though I work for a company that caters to some very high-end people, I could never in a million years think that I was like those people. I know I’m not. I know that I don’t ever want to be. I just...I’m very simple, laid-back. I guess that’s why I won’t be with this company forever. [Scott]

When Jackie and Scott were asked why they accepted positions with apparel retailers with which they had few characteristics in common, both of these participants indicated that their decisions were driven by financial reasons. Jackie, like Leslie, simply needed a job, and Scott was recruited from his previous job into his current position by the promise of a large raise in pay.

My company went out of business and I needed a job. So I had three part-time jobs, and that was one of them. [Jackie]

I hate to admit this, but I came here strictly for the money.... I told them what I wanted, which was about $12,000 more than I was making. And if you can go somewhere in retail and get a $12,000 raise, you’re going to go because you can’t get that kind-of a raise in retail almost anywhere. [Scott]

Although Erica, the participant who worked in the corporate office and not at the store level, did indicate that she felt she fit in with her employment organization, her responses did not suggest that her identification was related to the retail store’s image or its products. Her responses implied a distaste for the store for which she bought merchandise and the products that she bought for the store.
I have never purchased anything at [current employer’s stores] before.... I know I don’t like it. It’s very embellished. Like, for example, our leather coat line. It’s not just your run-of-the-mill plain leather coat. It’s with fringes and little criss-crossy things on the side or grommets. You name it. [Erica]

When asked how she could determine what merchandise to buy for the store when she did not like the products that store sold, she said that she looked at sales trends.

There are definitely things that we choose that I would never in my life wear. And that’s just the nature of the business. You don’t necessarily pick things that you like.... We decide that off of trends. We look at a three-month trend.... We have some tools to help us figure out what kind of things they like the best. Or we’ll look to the past, what they really liked because we can tell how many they sold or how much they liked it. So, based on sales and trends we can tell. [Erica]

For Erica, the level of identification she felt towards her current employment organization was not based on similarities she believed existed between herself and the store or the products sold in that store. Instead, her identification was based more on the level of fit she perceived existed between herself and her coworkers.

Identification as congruency between employee, customers, and coworkers. The six store-level employees who believed they fit in with the store for which they worked also believed that they fit in with both the customers of the store and the other employees of the store. In other words, the participants felt that they shared common interests or personal traits with the other people who were associated with the store. In terms of the customers, the store-level participants who identified with the store characterized themselves and the typical customer in the store in a similar fashion. For example, Rebecca, a 28-year-old working mother of two, described the target customer of the department store where she worked as follows:

For so long, the age bracket has been late-20s to early-40s. The woman, mother of kids, working mother, has been their target market. [Rebecca]

Jeff, the sales floor manager in a specialty store, indicated that both he and the members of the store’s target market were between the ages of 27 and 37. Because both he and the store’s customers were in the same age cohort, Jeff indicated that he believed that they were
all experiencing similar dress-related issues and that they all had similar interests in terms of apparel products.

It goes back to our target age range, 27 to 37. You know, that customer isn’t interested in logos.... Like I’ve worn some stuff, like I’m at an age now where, a crazy logo t-shirt, I could get away with it. I don’t think it’s comfortable for me, but if I were 21, I think it would be a good look.... There’s age appropriate stuff, too.... I think people in their twenties want to experiment with different fashion styles, which is fun. And that’s the time to do it. Get to know what your style is, so when you get into your thirties and forties, you’re able to really enhance yourself, feel more comfortable in your skin, so to speak.... It’s kind-of going back to the whole store image idea. You be you. It’s really about finding what type of clothing is going to bring out [the customer’s] personality the best. [Jeff]

Being able to relate to the customers not only seems to aid in employee-organization identification in apparel retail stores, but it also seems to aid sales associates and sales floor managers with the selling process. According to Ben, a sales floor manager who is responsible for hiring sales associates, he actually recruits individuals he believes are similar to the customers of the store because he feels that this congruity helps the salespeople to be more effective at their jobs.

And I think that separates sellers from exceptional sellers.... They know they can come to you and you understand their personality. They interest you. They’re interested by you. And you can really just work together to produce a nice outfit. [Ben]

The fact that similarities exist between the store-level employees who identify with their employment organization and customers who patronize the store for which the employees work is not altogether surprising, given the fact that the majority of the participants indicated that they either were customers of the store before they started working for the store or that they aspired to be customers of the store prior to the start of their employment. Both Jeff and Ben mentioned that, although they wanted to purchase apparel products from the stores where they are currently employed while they were undergraduate students, their budgets at the time did not allow them to do so because the average price point of the products sold in these stores was too high. However, now that
they have employee discounts, they are able to fulfill their desires to be customers of the store.

This is, of course, not to say that being an actual customer, or an aspiring customer, before employment begins is a prerequisite for employee-organization identification. For instance, while Christine indicated that she did feel like she fit in with the store, she had not even heard about the store before she applied for her part-time sales job. Simply because Christine had not shopped at the store prior to accepting her job does not imply that she had nothing in common with the customers of the store. Although she is not in the target market in terms of the age of the customers, she does share common personality traits, such as approachability, with the customers of the store. In fact, Christine mentioned that she felt as though she fit in better at her current employment organization than at her previous employment organization because the customers at her current job are not as elitist as the customers from her old job.

I’m pretty easy to talk to. And I’m very approachable.... Yeah, I feel like I fit in. I’m definitely on the younger spectrum of the target market. But I get along with the customers and they kind-of look to me for some advice about what goes with what.... At [previous employment organization], I don’t think I interacted with people as well. Like the atmosphere of [current employment organization] is more approachable and friendly. At [previous employment organization], even before I worked there and I was just shopping, I was like, “These people are snobby.” It’s just, each store has its own kind-of image. And, at [current employment organization], it’s just a lot more comfortable. And it’s easy to talk to people even though I consider myself shy. But, you know, it’s easy for me. The store’s small. The first time someone walks into the store, I’m like, “Hi. How are you? Is there something I can help you find?” And it’s no big deal. Like at [previous employment organization], I was afraid that someone would turn to me and say, “Are you talking to me? Why are you talking to me?” [Christine]

In addition to sharing commonalities with the customers of the store, the store-level participants who seemed to identify with their current employment organizations also mentioned that they shared commonalities with the other employees of the store. Several of the store-level participants indicated that they liked working at their current employment
organization because the other employees were "nice" and that they shared common interests and personality characteristics with the other employees.

[Current employment organization] just sucks you in and it doesn’t let go. So, it’s probably why I’ve been there for so long. It sucks you in and then sucks you back with nice people you work with and you can relate to. [Rebecca]

[The other employees] are all very nice. They’re all around the same age and stuff. [Christine]

It is not surprising that these employees liked each other and seemed to enjoy working with each other, given the fact that they seemed to believe they were similar to one another in terms of demographic and psychographic characteristics. The similarity-attraction principle (Fiske, 2004) points out that an individual tends to be attracted to other individuals who are similar to him or her for interpersonal relationships. In other words, the most successful personal relationships are built on a solid foundation of shared personal characteristics, values, attitudes, and behaviors, despite the popular belief that opposites attract.

One of the reasons why the employees were similar to one another may have been attributable to the fact that the sales floor managers who were responsible for hiring new employees tended to look for similar traits in these individuals. In Jeff’s case, he looked for people who were similar to himself. He indicated that he possessed a “drive to want to succeed,” and he looked for individuals with a similar work ethic.

They need to demonstrate that, in some way, through their answers to my questions, that they are going to be someone who is committed to working 100% on the business. [Jeff]

Ben, another sales floor manager responsible for hiring new employees, also mentioned that he looked for individuals who were similar to or who would serve as a complement to the other employees that he already had on staff.

We’re only a year and a half old, so most of the staff, four out of the original five staff members, are still there. So, I mean, we haven’t had turnover. We have had one person leave, and she was replaced by someone that she found. So, it pretty much was a mirror image of her in a slightly different form. Maybe it was the same person with the same energy and the same opinionation. So really it didn’t change the dynamic of the group at all. And,
with this small of a group, you really have to be careful what dynamic you’re bringing in.... You really have to look at how everyone works as a group and fits in. [Ben]

As the managers’ statements reveal, hiring employees who get along with one another as a result of their perceived similarities with one another is an important task which helps to promote the success of the store. The qualitative responses supported the generality that, when the personal characteristics of employees are congruous, they are less likely to leave their employment organizations. Rebecca, a part-time sales associate, indicated that one of the reasons why she had resigned from a previous job was because she did not feel that she had anything in common with the other employees.

[Previous employment organization] has more older people working there during the day. Talking about knitting and sewing. Back then, I wasn’t interested in anything like that. [Rebecca]

In direct opposition to the statements made by the store-level employees who felt that they fit in with their current employment organizations, the two store-level employees who felt like they did not fit in with their current employment organizations indicated that there were dissimilarities that existed between themselves and at least half of the store’s customers and employees. For Scott, the lack of similarity between himself and others associated with the store seemed to be based on a discrepancy that existed between both his socio-economic status and personal value system and the status and values of some of the store’s customers and employees. In terms of the customers:

I try to keep it positive because there’s a lot of things I like about the company. But I grew up basically on a poor farm. Not a lot of money. There’s no such thing as [the brand name associated with this store] in my family. There’s no such thing as name brands in my family. We were getting the 80% off merchandise from Sears and JC Penney. It’s very different. I would say overall it’s not always a bad thing. I just kind-of go with the flow. But we have customers that come in and think they walk on water. Those are the ones that get the worst service from me. It’s usually the real nice family from Wisconsin or Iowa or North Dakota who’s just real nice. You can tell that they come in and maybe they have some holes in the jeans and they’re actually because they wore them not because of the style. Those are my favorite kinds of customers. I think down the road, me personally, I really want to work with middle-class again.... I think we have a unique mix of customers. There’s obviously the hardworking people that
come from out of town where they’re here and it’s a real treat for them to buy something [from this store]. And then there’s the ones, doctors, lawyers, etc. You know, for them spending $1,000, $2,000 is absolutely no big deal. It really means nothing. That’s like you and me spending $5. So, it really just depends. It’s really a unique mix. There’s a lot of different customers you see in here.... Some of the upper-class, you kind-of want to put your foot out and trip them sometimes. [Scott]

The same sentiments regarding Scott’s lack of fit with the store’s customers are echoed in his statements about his fellow coworkers:

I would say they go back to the half-and-half again. We’ve got a couple here that kind-of work for [this store] and act like they work for [this store]. Kind-of think they are better than everyone. And then we’ve got some that are just really nice, wonderful people who are middle-class and great. It’s kind-of half-and-half. There’s a couple here that work here that I love and will be friends with for the rest of my life. And they’re the ones that just don’t think they are better than everyone. And the ones that do think they are better than everyone, I just get what I can out of them and work with them and just kind-of leave it be. At the end of the day, they go their way and I go mine, and we just respect each other at work. [Scott]

For Jackie, she, like Scott, sees a discrepancy between her socio-economic status and that of the customers who shop in the store where she works, but her discrepancy is in the opposite direction of Scott’s discrepancy. Jackie mentioned in her interview that she viewed herself as more “upscale” than the customers of the store, whom she described as a “middle-class group.” And, like Scott, she admitted to only liking half of the staff members. When asked to describe the one coworker that she indicated that she “loved,” Jackie stated that this individual was “relatively normal, well-adjusted, just a really nice person.” Here again, as in Scott’s comments about the customers and his coworkers and in Christine’s and Rebecca’s comments about their customers and coworkers, the word “nice” is used to describe an individual with whom Jackie believes that she shares common personal traits. While Jackie stated that she did get along with one of the other employees of the store where she currently works, she indicated that there were other employees with whom she did not get along at all. When describing one of these employees, in particular, it is clear that the reason that Jackie does not like her is because she sees very little congruency between herself and this other employee.
The one employee that I don’t particularly care for just doesn’t fit in at the store. She is very low-class, white trash, and isn’t professional and doesn’t know how to handle herself and just, in general, is kind-of a bad seed. 

[Jackie]

Although Erica, the participant who currently works in the buying office for a retail store, did indicate that she fit in with her employment organization, her sense of fit came principally from the similarities she perceived existed between herself and her coworkers in the corporate office.

I think I fit perfectly fine with everybody else that works there. I haven’t had any issues.... It sounds kind-of cheesy, but I like the people that I work with, and I think that really makes all the difference in a job that you work at. If you are really compatible with your boss and your peers and anybody from a different department that you may work with, I think that really makes all the difference. [Erica]

While Erica mentioned that she felt a sense of congruity between herself and her coworkers, she specifically mentioned that she, as a single, childless, working woman in her late-20s, had nothing in common with the store’s customers, mothers in their late-40s who do not work outside of the home.

I’m not the audience. That’s for sure. I’m not the age group. I’m not the demographic whatsoever. It’s a woman. She is 46 years old or older. She doesn’t have any children at home any longer. She has a lot of disposable income. She’s the main customer. [Erica]

If, as Erica suggested, she has little to nothing in common with the target market of the retailer for whom she currently works but she does have many things in common with her coworkers in the corporate office for this retailer, then it seems safe to assume that few, if any, of the individuals who work in the corporate office for this retailer have much in common with the target market of this retailer. Thus, unlike the store-level participants who indicated that their sense of employee-organization identification was related to similarities they felt existed between themselves and the customers of the store as well as the other employees of the store, it may be the case that, for corporate-level retail employees, employee-organization identification is related mainly to similarities that they feel exist between themselves and their coworkers, not between themselves and the final customers.
The physical and spatial barriers that corporate structure places between buyers and customers may eliminate or at least lessen the impact of target customers on corporate employees’ identification with the organization.

The use of apparel products as evidence of employee-organization identification. Seven of the eight participants who worked at the store level, regardless of their level of identification with their employment organization, were strongly encouraged by the store manager or corporate office to wear either apparel products from the store where they worked or apparel products that reflected the image of the store while they were at work. Only one store-level participant, Ben, was specifically required to wear apparel products exclusively from the store for which he worked. Because of this requirement, Ben was given one new item every month for free by the store. Additionally, Ben, like the other seven store-level employees, was given a merchandise discount and/or a store merchandise credit to encourage the wearing of apparel from the store while at work. All of the store-level employees indicated that having the employees wear apparel items from the store was a useful selling tool.

I work here full-time, so I want to be dressed appropriately. It’s the best selling tool that we have.... And the people who I interview to work here, they have to be very passionate about our product, too. I don’t say you have to wear [apparel from this store], but it’s a good selling tool and we encourage it.... As a company, we can’t say that they have to wear [current employer’s] clothes. We can encourage it. And inspire them to want to wear it. But I do, when I’m interviewing people and they ask about the dress code, I do make it perfectly clear that we encourage it. [Sabrina]

You can pick anything you want every month. And now you have to pick from this range, this block, this mark. You still get an assortment, but less of an assortment. And it’s to keep everyone more current with what’s in stock so that you’d be more of a brand ambassador. Beforehand, everyone could select any item. [Current employment organization] wants to go to more brand ambassadors. That’s what we are selling in our stores, so we want to be more trend-forward in what we are wearing. [Ben]

Like, I use myself as an example. I’m trying to find an outfit for someone if they ask for my help. I’m like, “Well, see, I have this color on and I layered it with this and this is kind-of similar. I think it would look good on you.” Then people are going to be like, “Oh, that’s cute. Can you help me put something together that’s kind-of like that?” [Christine]
We want to sell chinos, and it's hard to do that in jeans. [Jeff]

Because all store-level employees were required or encouraged to wear the store’s products while they were at work, all store-level employees indicated that their wardrobes at home contained many of the store’s products. Hence, it was not the case that participants who seemed to identify with their employment organizations owned significantly more of the store’s products than those who did not. Differences in the responses of those store-level employees who identified with their employment organizations and those who did not did emerge during the interviews. Differences were noted in their feelings about themselves while wearing the apparel items and in the times and places they wanted to wear the apparel items from their current employment organizations.

When asked about times in which they felt uncomfortable about the way they were dressed at work, all of the store-level employees who felt like they fit in with their employment organizations indicated that they felt uncomfortable when they were not dressed consistently with the store’s image or with what the customers and other employees were wearing that day.

One time I had on this little sweater that was kind-of cropped a little bit. But I had a tank top on underneath it. But it kept showing a little bit of my stomach. Not a lot, which I’m generally O.K. with. But, in that atmosphere where it’s more like an older target market, I thought they thought, “Oh, she’s showing her stomach.” Looking at me like an immature teenager. I was like, “I wish this would just stay down here.” I kept pulling at it. It wasn’t that bad by my standards, but, by their standards, I felt like it was inappropriate. [Christine]

Sometimes you think something is work-appropriate, and you get there and maybe it’s a little low. And you’re pulling it up all day and you’re like, “Ah, I shouldn’t have worn this.” So, that happens sometimes. [Leslie]

If I would be out of season, maybe. Like last week, I ended up buying something new to wear while I was at work. It was really nice out, so I wore a short-sleeved polo, which we’re selling right now. There’s nothing wrong with that. But no one else was wearing that when I got to the store. I just ended up feeling cold. So I switched. [Jeff]

Unlike the store-level employees who indicated that they did identify with their employment organizations, the two store-level employees who did not identify with their
employment organizations mentioned that they never felt uncomfortable for any reason while wearing the apparel items from the store while at work. However, they both mentioned that they felt uncomfortable wearing the apparel items from their current retail employment organization when they were outside of the store environment.

At the other job [her full-time job], I wear stuff that’s a little more dressy and more professional. For my full-time job, I would want to be more professional. Even though my personality fits more with the casual style, I would feel uncomfortable wearing the clothes from my part-time job to my full-time job. It’s not dressy enough. It’s not worth it. [Jackie]

I feel uncomfortable wearing [the brand name associated with this store] when I go home to see my family, at a family gathering. Most of them probably don’t even know what [the brand name associated with this store] is or how much it costs. But I still feel very self-conscious about wearing it around them. They’re hardworking people. They work hard for their money and they spend their money very carefully. They’re simple people. I don’t want them to think that I have changed, that these brands or these things are important to me now. I don’t want them to think that I spend so much money to look a certain way or to wear a certain brand name. My dad, his name is Joe, and he thinks that the clothing he wears should have his name on it, not some other brand name, if he is going to wear it. [Scott]

Additionally, participants who mentioned that they felt like they did not fit in with their previous employment organizations discussed the fact that they no longer wear the apparel items they wore to their previous jobs. For example, Leslie stated:

I didn’t like [the dress code] because I didn’t shop there, so I pretty much had to buy their clothes. Although they did give you a good discount. I find myself, after I stopped working there, I don’t wear anything that I bought there now. So, I just pretty much, when I bought their clothing, I would just wear it to work. [Leslie]

It is clear from the statements made by Jackie, Scott, and Leslie that the participants who did not identify with their employment organizations felt uncomfortable wearing the apparel items they wore to work to engage in other activities. In this way, the apparel items that these individuals own and wore were role-specific to them. Conversely, the responses of the store-level participants who indicated that they did identify with their employment organizations suggested that these individuals wore the apparel items they wore while they
were at work to engage in most of their other activities. In this respect, the apparel items that they wore to work transcended the various roles they played in their daily lives.

No, there’s basically nowhere I would go where I wouldn’t wear [apparel items from current employer]. Maybe the beach. But if we sold things for the beach, I’d probably buy them from here, too. [Jeff]

Typically, if I’m coming to class, I would change because you’re walking around campus and I probably have on some shoes that are O.K. for maybe just walking around the store but maybe not walking all the way around campus. So, I end up changing shoes.... Usually I’m comfortable in what I’m in. So, basically it’s feet that I consider. [Christine]

Probably 90% of my closet is filled with clothes from [current employment organization], so I wear these clothes everywhere. I guess I wouldn’t wear them to a more formal event. I shop other places for my formalwear. [Sabrina]

For the corporate-level participant, Erica, the apparel items that she chose to wear to work did not necessarily seem to be related to her level of identification with her employment organization. Because she owned no apparel items from the retailer for which she worked, it was impossible for her to wear apparel products sold by the store to work. At the corporate office, the dress code was business casual. In this respect, Erica noted that she dressed similarly to the other employees in her office. However, she also mentioned that she did not believe that the individuals who worked in the corporate office for this particular retail organization looked any different from the individuals who worked within any corporate environment.

Really, the dress code there is business casual. So, it’s either going to be khakis or black pants. Something like that. I usually like to dress up now and then, like wear a blazer or something like that. Never t-shirts or anything of that sort.... I’ve never noticed anybody wearing stuff that we sell, but, then again, I don’t really pay attention because I know I don’t like it.... Yeah, I think we all kind-of look similar, but I don’t think we look too much different from people in other corporations. [Erica]

From Erica’s statements, it does not appear to be the case that the apparel products an individual wears to work provide evidence of that individual’s level of identification with his or her employment organization when that individual works in the corporate office of a retail organization.
Identification and job satisfaction. The existence of an important relationship emerged from the interviews. All of the participants who indicated that they identified with their current employment organizations, both those who worked in the store and the one who worked for the corporate office, stated that they were satisfied with their current jobs. Conversely, Scott and Jackie, the two participants who did not identify with their current employment organizations, stated that they were not satisfied with their current jobs. Incidentally, both Scott and Jackie indicated that they felt they would be more satisfied with their employment situations if they worked in retail stores which they owned.

Well, I'd rather have my own place. So, that's what's not satisfying. [Jackie]

Truly, with all of my experience on both ends of being a salesperson and a stock boy and management and more management, I've kind-of done everything and I'd really like to open my own store, probably in the next four to five years. I haven't quite figured out my niche. It could be anything. It could be a Hallmark store. It could be a hotel. It could be anything. My fiancée is very, very good with computers and the money side of it, and I am good at the merchandising and moving products. It would be a real good fit. It would be a good family business. [Scott]

When the employees who did seem to identify with their current employment organization were asked if they would like to open their own business in the future, they indicated that they would not. For example,

I like what [the boutique's owner] is doing. But, personally, for myself, I don't think that's an avenue I'd like to take. I don't think I'd be the best at it... I don't know if I have the drive, the willpower to stick with it. Because the first few years are hard. You don't know if you're going to make it or not make it. I just want to get right in there and be successful, I guess. [Christine]

I've worked at a chain store before, and it's so much different. And I like working at the smaller business. You get a lot more responsibility. And [the boutique's owner] really loves owning the store. And I really like the personal relationships you get with the customers. But no, I don't think I would like to own my own business. [Leslie]

While the differences in responses regarding small business ownership given by the participants who did and did not identify with their current employment organizations may
have been merely coincidental, the differences in the degree of satisfaction experienced by those participants who did and did not identify with their current employment organizations seemed to be of theoretical import. Researchers (Brown & Peterson, 1993) have found that job satisfaction is positively related to employee-organization commitment. Job satisfaction, defined as “the positive emotional state resulting from appraisal of one’s job or experience” (Locke, 1969, p. 316), consists of two dimensions: intrinsic job satisfaction and extrinsic job satisfaction. Intrinsic job satisfaction is based on employees’ contentment with the content of the job, itself, while extrinsic job satisfaction is based on employees’ contentment with their pay rates, relationships with their supervisors and coworkers, promotion opportunities, and working conditions (Lucas, Babkus, & Ingram, 1990; Shim, Lusch, & O’Brien, 2002).

Commitment, as defined by Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979), is “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization” (p. 226). Based on this constitutive definition, the term “commitment” seems to encompass the definition for the term “identification” (Riketta, 2005). Thus, it seems reasonable to assume that, if a positive relationship exists between commitment and job satisfaction and commitment and identification are positively related, then job satisfaction and identification should also be positively related. This proposition certainly seems to be supported by the participants’ responses in the first phase of the present study.

**Emergent hypotheses.** Because of the information that emerged from the interviews, two additional hypotheses and paths were added to the proposed model. A modified version of the proposed model is presented in Figure 2. One path and hypothesis were based directly on the information gleaned from the interviews and previous research. This hypothesis states:

H10: Employees’ job satisfaction with their employment organization (i.e., the apparel retail store) will be positively related to their organizational identification with their employment organization (i.e., the apparel retail store).

In order to add this additional variable and path to the proposed model, a second new path and hypothesis had to be created. This path and hypothesis allow the job satisfaction
variable not only to be incorporated into the preexisting model but also to be affected by and to affect other variables in the model. A variable which may influence job satisfaction and, in turn, employee-store identification is store image attractiveness. Although their studies involved hypothetical employment scenarios, both Dalal and Singh (1986) and Chow and Neo (1993) found the level of attraction potential employees believed they felt toward an organization was positively related to the level of job satisfaction they believed they would feel if they actually had a job with this employment organization. As such, these findings suggest that job satisfaction can be predicted by store image attractiveness. Thus, the eleventh hypothesis was developed as follows:

\[ H_{11}: \text{Employees' perceptions of the attractiveness of their employment organization (i.e., the apparel retail store) will be positively related to their job satisfaction with their employment organization (i.e., the apparel retail store).} \]
New items to be added to the Mael (1988) identification scale. Due to the fact that the responses from the participants in the first phase of the study suggested that the apparel products they wore both during and outside of work seemed to serve as an indication of employee-organization identification among store-level employees in an apparel retail store, several items which could be incorporated into the Mael (1988) identification scale were written. The first one of these items was written to address the notion that store-level employees who identify with their employment organization feel uncomfortable when they are not dressed consistently with the store’s image. This item states, “I feel uncomfortable at work when I am wearing clothing that is inconsistent with the store’s image.” The second item was written to address the idea that existed among store-level employees who identified with their employment organizations that they felt uncomfortable when they were not dressed consistently with the other employees of the store. This item states, “I feel good at work when I am wearing an outfit that is similar to the ones that are worn that day by my coworkers.” Similarly, the third item was written to capture the perception of the store-level employees who identified with their employment organizations that they felt uncomfortable when they were not dressed consistently with the customers of the store. This item is, “I feel that I am dressed appropriately for work when I am wearing an outfit that is similar to the ones that are worn by the customers in the store that day.” The fourth and fifth items address the notion that store-level employees who identify with their employment organizations are willing to wear the apparel items they wear while at work to engage in other activities, while the store-level employees who do not identify with their employment organizations are not willing to do so. The fourth item states, “I like to wear the clothes that this store sells when I am not at work,” and the fifth item is, “When I am not at work, I am embarrassed when my friends and family members see me wearing the clothes that this store sells.” These five items were included on the questionnaire that was used in the second phase of this present study to test the hypotheses and the modified version of the proposed model.
CHAPTER 5:
METHOD AND FINDINGS FOR PHASE 2: SURVEY FOR MODEL TESTING

Chapter Overview
This chapter presents information concerning the second phase of the study. The chapter begins with a discussion of the sampling and data collection technique used, as well as information pertaining to the questionnaire used for the survey. The findings from data analysis are then presented. The participant profile is described, followed by a discussion of the factor analyses performed on the multi-item measures. A structural equation model is then specified, tested, re-specified, and retested. The results obtained from this model are used for hypothesis testing, and the decomposition of effects from this model is examined. The chapter concludes with the discussion of the results obtained from a post-hoc analysis of the effect of apparel on employee-organization identification.

Method

Sample and data collection. A convenience sample of apparel retail employees in eight regional malls in Iowa, Minnesota, and Nebraska was gathered. Store managers from specialty apparel retail stores in the malls were approached while they were at work and were asked to allow their employees to complete questionnaires for the study. Questionnaires were left with the store managers who agreed to participate, and the store managers were charged with the duty of informing their employees about the questionnaire and requesting their employees' voluntary participation in the study. Approximately two weeks after the initial contact with the store managers, the completed questionnaires were retrieved. This data collection process resulted in the completion of 58 questionnaires.

In order to increase the sample size, an additional sampling method was also employed. A convenience sample of undergraduate students who were currently employed in an apparel retail store was also gathered. The instructors for undergraduate retailing courses in Iowa, Minnesota, North Carolina, North Dakota, and West Virginia asked their employed students to volunteer to complete a questionnaire for extra course credit. This process resulted in the completion of 199 questionnaires.
Questionnaire. In order to facilitate both comparisons with previously published research and the extension of the relationships depicted in the model of employee-organization identification (Figure 2) from other industries into the apparel retail industry, all of the measures used on the questionnaire, with the exception of the new employee-organization identification items, were adapted from previously validated scales. The questionnaire consisted of four sections. The first section contained a measure of perceived organizational identity and a measure of construed external image. Both measures contained identical items based on Chowdhury, Reardon, and Srivastava’s (1998) scale to assess store image. Chowdhury, Reardon, and Srivastava’s structured scale was selected because it was created on the basis of a meta-analysis of items from 21 previously published store image scales and was demonstrated to be superior to an unstructured assessment of store image in terms of the amount of variance explained (Chowdhury, Reardon, & Srivastava, 1998). The reliabilities for the six dimensions of this scale—employee service, product quality, product selection, atmosphere, convenience, price/value—ranged from Chronbach’s \( \alpha = 0.76 \) to 0.92 (Chowdhury, Reardon, & Srivastava, 1998). For the perceived organizational identity measure, participants were asked to rate their level of agreement on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree) with 18 items (a complete list of the items used on the questionnaire is provided in Appendix C). The same 18 items from the perceived organizational identity measure were used for the construed external image measure, but participants were asked to indicate the degree to which they believed that other people agreed with each statement on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree).

The second section of the questionnaire contained items used to assess person-organization fit, attractiveness of the organization to the employee, and employee-organization identification. The first three items in this section of the questionnaire were used to assess person-organization fit and were based on a three-item scale used by Judge and Cable (1997) to assess subjective perceptions of person-organization fit. These items were selected because subjective perceptions of person-organization fit, compared to
objective measures of person-organization fit, are more predictive of actual, subsequent employment-related behaviors (Judge & Cable, 1997; Locke, 1976). Judge and Cable (1997) reported that the three-item scale displayed a reliability of Chronbach’s $\alpha = 0.80$. In the second section of the questionnaire for the present study, participants were asked to indicate the degree to which they agreed with each of the three statements using a seven-point Likert-type scale (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree). Although the original scale items asked participants to consider the degree of consistency that existed between their values, goals, and personality and those of their employment organization, the items used in this study only inquired about the perceived level of consistency that exists between the employees’ personality and that of the store for which they work. While personality is not the same concept as employee identity, the lay definition of the word “identity” is more closely associated with the word “personality” than with the words “values” and “goals.” The narrowed focus of the item wording was used to increase participant understanding. Hence, participants were only asked to assess the degree of consistency they felt existed between their own personality and that of the store for which they worked.

In the second section of the questionnaire, participants were also asked to complete a modified version of the Inclusion of Other in Self Scale (IOS) (Aron, Aron, & Smollan, 1992). To complete this scale, participants were asked to examine a series of seven circle pairs. Each circle pair contained one circle that was labeled “self” and another circle that was labeled “store.” The circle pairs varied in the degree to which they overlapped, with some circle pairs not overlapping at all, some circle pairs overlapping to a small degree, and some circle pairs overlapping to a great degree (see Figure 3). The degree of overlap between the two circles in the pair represents the degree to which the participants believed that the store’s image is similar, or fits in, with their own identity. In previous research, $\alpha$ was calculated to be 0.93 using assessments of alternate-form reliability, suggesting that the scale is reliable (Aron, Aron, & Smollan, 1992). Participants in the present study were asked to circle the circle pair which best represented the degree to which they felt their own identity fit with the store’s image. During data coding, the seven circle pairs were assigned
Figure 3. Modified version of the Inclusion of Other in Self Scale.

Please circle the picture below which best represents the degree to which you fit in with the retail store for which you work.

a number indicating successive degree of overlap (1=no overlap at all, 7=a great deal of overlap).

The second section of the questionnaire also contained items adapted from Schein and Diamante (1988) that were used to assess the amount of attraction participants felt towards their current employer. Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree) with six items. These six items were found by Schein and Diamante (1988) to have a Chronbach’s $\alpha$ level ranging from 0.91-0.93.

In addition to items assessing person-organization fit and attractiveness, the second section of the questionnaire contained six items proposed by Mael (1988) and used to assess participants’ level of identification with the store for which they worked. Mael (1988) found that the measure exhibited an acceptable level of reliability (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.81$). Furthermore, the measure has successfully been used in other research concerning the relationship between employee-organization identification, job involvement, and performance (Riketta, 2005). Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement
with each of the six items on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree). Additionally, this section of the questionnaire contained the five new dress-related items that were written based on the themes that emerged during the first phase of the study.

The third section of the questionnaire contained items used to assess job involvement, job performance, and job satisfaction. The first 10 items appearing in this section of the questionnaire were based on the items used in previous research by Kanungo (1982), who found that these items, in total, displayed an acceptable level of reliability (Chronbach’s $\alpha = 0.87$). On the present questionnaire, participants were asked to indicate on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree) their level of agreement with each of the 10 statements.

The third section of the questionnaire also contained items concerning participants’ job performance. To assess their perceptions of their job performance, participants were asked to indicate on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree) how much they agreed with each of 22 statements. These 22 statements were based on a scale created by Bush, Bush, Ortinau, and Hair (1990) to assess the performance of retail salespeople specifically. In Bush, Bush, Ortinau, and Hair’s (1990) research, the scale, as a whole, displayed acceptable levels of reliability (Chronbach’s $\alpha = 0.86$), and the individual dimensions of the scale (i.e., merchandise procedure ability, customer service ability, sales ability, product-merchandise knowledge, knowledge of store policy) also displayed acceptable levels of reliability (Chronbach’s $\alpha = 0.84$ to 0.88).

In addition to job involvement and job performance, participants’ responses to the interview questions in the first phase of the study indicated that a relationship might exist between employee-organization identification and job satisfaction. Hence, a decision was made to also add items concerning job satisfaction to the third section of the questionnaire. A nine-item job satisfaction scale developed by Johnson (1955) and subsequently used by Lucas, Babakus, and Ingram (1990) was adopted. When used in a Likert-type scale format, this job satisfaction scale displayed acceptable levels of reliability (Chronbach’s $\alpha = 0.79$).
(Lucas, Babakus, & Ingram, 1990). Participants were asked to indicate on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree) how much they agreed with each of the nine job satisfaction items. The first five of these nine items assessed what is known as extrinsic job satisfaction, or employees' contentment with their pay rates, relationships with their supervisors and coworkers, promotion opportunities, and working conditions (Lucas, Babakus, & Ingram, 1990; Shim, Lusch, & O'Brien, 2002). The second four of these nine items assessed what is known as intrinsic job satisfaction, or employees' contentment with the content of the job itself (Lucas, Babakus, & Ingram, 1990; Shim, Lusch, & O'Brien, 2002).

The final section of the questionnaire contained items to assess demographic information and store information, including gender, ethnicity, age, education level, student status and name of major (if applicable), marital status, employment status (i.e., part-time, full-time), length of time with the current employer, current position (i.e., manager, sales associate, intern), type of store in which the participant was currently employed (i.e., department store, specialty store, off-price retailer, mass merchandiser, boutique), the average price point for the merchandise sold in the store in which the participant was currently employed, and the amount of store discount (if applicable). This section of the questionnaire also contained two items to assess whether the employee was required to wear apparel from the store while at work and whether the employee was encouraged, but not required, to wear apparel from the store while at work.

Findings: Hypothesis and Model Tests from Phase 2 of the Study

Participant profile. Usable questionnaires were completed by 251 participants. Six questionnaires contained a large amount of missing data and were not retained for further analysis. All demographic characteristics are summarized in Table 3. The final sample ($N = 251$) was composed of 228 females, 18 males, and 5 unspecified individuals. The mean age of participants was about 23 years, with ages ranging from 18 to 55. The greatest number of participants were European-Americans ($n = 226$), followed by Asian-Americans ($n = 12$), African-Americans ($n = 4$), and Hispanic-Americans ($n = 4$). The majority of participants
Table 3

Participants' and Stores' Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of participants</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18 (7.2%)\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>228 (90.8%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European-American</td>
<td>226 (90.0%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>12 (4.8%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>4 (1.6%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic-American</td>
<td>4 (1.6%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>22.64</td>
<td>18-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>16 (6.4%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>176 (70.1%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>52 (20.7%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some graduate school</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed graduate school</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently enrolled full-time</td>
<td>179 (71.9%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently enrolled part-time</td>
<td>21 (8.4%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently enrolled</td>
<td>49 (19.5%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail merchandising</td>
<td>99 (39.4%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparel studies</td>
<td>37 (14.7%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>8 (3.2%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>6 (2.4%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparel Design</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>38 (15.1%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>219 (87.3%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic partnership</td>
<td>9 (3.6%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Number includes participants who did not answer the question.
Table 3 (continued)

Participants' and Stores' Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>15 (6.0%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>5 (2.0%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary part-time</td>
<td>80 (31.9%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent part-time</td>
<td>110 (43.8%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary full-time</td>
<td>12 (4.8%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent full-time</td>
<td>49 (19.5%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>54 (21.5%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales associate</td>
<td>168 (66.9%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern</td>
<td>17 (6.8%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11 (4.4%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time in current position</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20.28 months</td>
<td>1-384 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary work area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the sales floor</td>
<td>149 (59.4%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the stockroom</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>98 (39.0%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required to wear store's apparel at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99 (39.4%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37 (14.7%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged, but not required, to wear store's apparel at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>38 (15.1%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty store</td>
<td>152 (60.6%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department store</td>
<td>49 (19.5%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boutique</td>
<td>35 (13.9%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount retailer</td>
<td>10 (4.0%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 3 (continued)

*Participants’ and Stores’ Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-price retailer</td>
<td>4 (1.6%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average price point</td>
<td></td>
<td>$493.79</td>
<td>$2-80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store discount</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.49%</td>
<td>0-75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Percentages may not equal 100% due to participant non-response on demographic items.

had achieved as their highest level of education at least some college \( (n = 176) \), and 52 participants had graduated from college. Of the participants enrolled either full-time \( (n = 179) \) or part-time \( (n = 21) \) in college, 99 participants indicated that they were retail merchandising majors, and 37 participants indicated that they were enrolled in an apparel program but did not specify their major as either design or merchandising. Most participants had never been married \( (n = 219) \). When asked to indicate the type of apparel retail store in which they were currently working, the greatest number of the participants indicated that they worked in specialty stores \( (n = 152) \), followed by apparel areas in department stores \( (n = 49) \) and boutiques \( (n = 35) \). Participants indicated that the average price point for the apparel merchandise in the store for which they were currently working was approximately $494, with a range of $2 per item to $80,000 per item. Approximately two-thirds of the participants indicated that they were working part-time, either on a permanent basis \( (n = 110) \) or a temporary basis \( (n = 80) \). Most participants were currently employed as sales associates \( (n = 168) \); however, quite a few sales floor managers \( (n = 54) \) also completed the questionnaire. Virtually all of the participants indicated that they either worked exclusively on the sales floor \( (n = 149) \) or on both the sales floor and in the stockroom \( (n = 98) \). Participants had been employed in their current positions for a mean of about 20 months, with a range of 1 month to 32 years. More participants were encouraged, but not required, to wear apparel from the store while they were at work \( (n = 113) \) than were required to wear
apparel from the store while they were at work \((n = 71)\). As an incentive, most participants received a store discount on the merchandise in the store. The average discount was approximately 30%, but discount percentages ranged from 0% to 75%.

**Data pooling.** Because two different sampling procedures were used in an effort to increase the sample size, it was necessary to ensure that the convenience sample of undergraduates did not differ significantly from the convenience sample of apparel retail store employees in terms of any of the variables under investigation before the data were pooled into one sample. A series of \(t\)-tests were conducted to compare participants’ responses. As Table 4 illustrates, the undergraduate sample and the salesperson sample did not differ significantly from one another in terms of mean response rates on any of the variables under investigation. Therefore, all of the data were pooled into one sample for the remainder of the analyses.

**Exploratory factor analysis.** A principal components factor analysis using orthogonal Varimax rotation was executed on each multiple-item scale. Multiple-item scales were purified based on several considerations including the magnitudes of the factor loadings on each item, average variance extracted, and construct reliabilities (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). For each analysis, eigenvalues greater than 1.0 helped determine the number of factors for each scale. Following Kim and Chen-Yu’s (2005) suggestion, items with factor loadings of at least 0.50 on one factor and less than 0.30 on other factors were retained.

For perceived organizational identity, the sample revealed five underlying factors with an eigenvalue exceeding 1.0. The first factor \((\alpha = 0.88)\) consisted of three items with the highest eigenvalue \((5.96)\) and the most variance explained \((33.08\%)\). This three-item factor captured the employee service component of Chowdhury, Reardon, and Srivastava’s \((1998)\) store image scale. The second factor \((\alpha = 0.86)\) also consisted of three items. This factor had an eigenvalue of 2.24, explained 12.45% of the variance, and corresponded to Chowdhury, Reardon, and Srivastava’s \((1998)\) convenience component. The third factor \((\alpha = 0.68)\) consisted of two items which had an eigenvalue of 1.92 and explained 10.66% of the
Table 4

Mean Comparisons of Undergraduates’ and Salespeople’s Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived store identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>95.11</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salespeople</td>
<td>96.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construed external store image</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>95.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salespeople</td>
<td>95.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-organization fit</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>15.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salespeople</td>
<td>16.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness of the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>30.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salespeople</td>
<td>31.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.61</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>40.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salespeople</td>
<td>43.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee-organization identification</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.62</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>55.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salespeople</td>
<td>58.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>38.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salespeople</td>
<td>40.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.52</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>126.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salespeople</td>
<td>130.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

variance. These two items corresponded to two of the three items in the atmosphere component of Chowdhury, Reardon, and Srivastava’s (1998) original store image scale. The fourth factor (α = 0.80) consisted of two items which corresponded to two of the three items in the price/value component of Chowdhury, Reardon, and Srivastava’s (1998) original store
image scale. This factor had an eigenvalue of 1.38 and explained 7.64% of the variance. Lastly, the fifth factor (α = 0.58) had an eigenvalue of 1.22 and explained 6.78% of the variance. This factor was composed of three items that corresponded to the product selection component of Chowdhury, Reardon, and Srivastava's (1998) store image scale.

Although the initial factor analysis for the perceived organizational identity scale revealed a five-factor solution, an analysis of the internal validity for each individual factor indicated that a one-factor solution consisting of the first factor (i.e., the employee service component of the scale) would be the best for perceived organizational identity because the first factor had the highest Chronbach's \( \alpha \) level (α = 0.88). Due to the fact that greater Chronbach's \( \alpha \) levels indicate greater internal reliability (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003), the one-factor solution was retained for the remainder of the analysis. This factor was renamed Perceived Organizational Identity—Service for the remainder of the analysis.

The results for construed external image were similar to the ones obtained for perceived organizational identity. The sample revealed five underlying factors with an eigenvalue exceeding 1.0 for construed external image. The first factor (α = 0.93) consisted of three items with the highest eigenvalue (6.22) and the most variance explained (34.57%). This three-item factor captured the employee service component of Chowdhury, Reardon, and Srivastava's (1998) store image scale. The second factor (α = 0.88) also consisted of three items. This factor had an eigenvalue of 2.45, explained 13.63% of the variance, and corresponded to Chowdhury, Reardon, and Srivastava's (1998) convenience component. The third factor (α = 0.69) consisted of two items that had an eigenvalue of 1.90 and explained 10.53% of the variance. These two items corresponded to two of the three items in the atmosphere component of Chowdhury, Reardon, and Srivastava's (1998) original store image scale. The fourth factor (α = 0.79) consisted of two items that corresponded to two of the three items in the price/value component of Chowdhury, Reardon, and Srivastava's (1998) original store image scale. This factor had an eigenvalue of 1.29 and explained 7.17% of the variance. Lastly, the fifth factor (α = 0.69) had an eigenvalue of 1.21 and explained 6.73% of the variance. This factor was composed of three items that
corresponded to the product selection component of Chowdhury, Reardon, and Srivastava’s (1998) store image scale. As with perceived organizational identity, the initial factor analysis for the construed external store image scale revealed a five-factor solution. However, an analysis of the internal validity for each factor indicated that a one-factor solution consisting of the first factor (i.e., the employee service component of the scale) would be the best for construed external image because the first factor had a Chronbach’s alpha level in excess of 0.90. Thus, the one-factor solution was retained for the remainder of the analysis, and this factor was renamed Construed External Image—Service.

For person-organization fit, the sample revealed one underlying factor with an eigenvalue exceeding 1.0. The first factor (α = 0.81) consisted of all three items from Judge and Cable’s (1997) original person-organization fit scale, had an eigenvalue of 2.19, and explained 73.03% of the variance. An additional factor analysis was conducted with the three items from Judge and Cable’s (1997) scale and the one item from Aron, Aron, & Smollan’s (1992) Inclusion of Other in Self Scale. All four of these items did work together to compose one factor with an eigenvalue of 2.54. However, the percentage of variance explained with the four-item factor solution was less than that for the three-item factor solution (63.60% versus 73.03%). Additionally, the Chronbach’s alpha coefficient for the three-item factor solution (α = 0.81) was greater than the four-item factor solution (α = 0.80), suggesting that the reliability of the three-item factor solution was greater than the four-item factor solution. Therefore, the three-item factor solution was used in further analysis.

One underlying factor was also revealed for attractiveness of the organization to the employee. The first factor (α = 0.95) consisted of all six items from Schein and Diamante’s (1988) original attractiveness scale. This first factor had the highest eigenvalue (4.76) and explained the most variance (79.30%). Hence, these six items were used in further analysis.

Exploratory factor analysis for the items from Mael’s (1988) original organizational identification scale as well as the items assessing apparel’s role in identification revealed three factors with an eigenvalue greater than 1.0. The first factor (α = 0.91) had the highest
eigenvalue (5.38) and explained the most variance (48.88%). The five items comprising this first factor were five of the six items from Mael’s (1988) original organizational identification scale. The second factor contained three of the five new items concerning the relationship between apparel and identification. This factor (α = 0.65) had an eigenvalue of 1.32 and explained 12.00% of the variance. The third factor contained the last two items assessing the relationship between apparel and identification. This factor (α = 0.42) had an eigenvalue of 1.02 and explained 9.23% of the variance. Because the second and third factors possessed low Chronbach’s alpha coefficients, these factors were excluded from further model analysis.

For job involvement, the sample revealed two factors. The first factor (α = 0.92) had the highest eigenvalue (5.52) and explained the most variance (55.15%). This factor contained five of the original ten items from Kanungo’s (1982) job involvement scale. The second factor (α = 0.53) contained two of the other items from Kanungo’s (1982) scale. This factor had an eigenvalue of 1.17 and explained 11.68% of the variance. Due to the fact that the Chronbach’s alpha coefficient for the second factor was low, only the first factor was retained for further analysis.

Three underlying factors were revealed for job performance. The first factor contained four of the five items from the knowledge of store policy component of Bush, Bush, Ortinau, and Hair’s (1990) original job performance scale. The first factor (α = 0.85) had an eigenvalue of 10.61 and explained 50.51% of the variance. The second factor contained two items from the sales ability component of the original scale and one item related to sales (i.e., “I suggest add-ons or complimentary merchandise to customers”) from the customer service ability component of Bush, Bush, Ortinau, and Hair’s (1990) scale. This factor (α = 0.85) had an eigenvalue of 1.29 and explained 6.16% of the variance. The third factor contained three of the five items from the merchandise procedure ability component from Bush, Bush, Ortinau, and Hair’s (1990) job performance scale. This factor (α = 0.75) had an eigenvalue of 1.11 and explained 5.27% of the variance. Because the first two factors had the highest alpha coefficients and these alpha coefficients were identical to
one another, both of these two job performance factors were retained for further analysis. The first factor was renamed Job Performance—Knowledge of Store Policy, and the second factor was renamed Job Performance—Sales Ability. Although these represent two distinct factors of job performance, it seemed likely that the error terms for these two factors would be correlated with each other because the individual indicators for each factor came from the same scale originally. Therefore, some of the error in the first factor was probably also apparent in the second factor (Bollen, 1989).

Two underlying factors were revealed for job satisfaction. The first factor contained the four items from Johnson's (1955) original job satisfaction scale that represented intrinsic job satisfaction. This factor ($\alpha = 0.87$) had the highest eigenvalue (4.49) and explained the most variance (49.85%). The second factor ($\alpha = 0.77$) contained three of the five items assessing extrinsic job satisfaction from Johnson's (1955) original scale, had an eigenvalue of 1.67, and explained 18.58% of the variance. Because the Chronbach's alpha coefficient for the second factor was less than the coefficient for the first factor, only the first factor was retained for further analysis. This factor was renamed Job Satisfaction—Intrinsic.

**Confirmatory factor analysis.** A confirmatory factor analysis of the multi-item scales in the measurement model (Figure 4) showed that each factor loading of the indicators for each construct was statistically significant and sufficiently high for structural model testing. All standardized factor loadings were greater than .50, which indicates reasonable convergent validity (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Furthermore, the correlations between the error terms for the two factors of job performance were all significant at $p \leq .001$, suggesting some interaction between the two factors. Table 5 presents the results of the first measurement model, including standardized factor loadings, standard errors ($SE$), $t$-values, average variance extracted, and squared multiple correlations for each indicator.

**Model testing.** Structural equation modeling was conducted using a maximum-likelihood estimation procedure using AMOS 5.0. The relationships in the model were based on theoretical associations discussed earlier. The results showed that all of the hypothesized paths, except one, were as predicted and were significant at $p \leq .001$. The
Figure 4. Measurement model for the first model.

*Note. *p < .001

positive and direct relationship predicted in H8 between job involvement and job performance was not supported by the data (β10 = -.13, t = -1.54, p ≤ .13; β11 = -.00, t = -.04, p ≤ .97). Figure 4 provides squared multiple correlations (R^2) for each endogenous construct as well as path coefficients and t-values for each statistically significant path. To assess model fit, the chi-square statistic (χ^2), goodness-of-fit index (GFI), adjusted goodness-of-fit
Table 5
Measurement Model for the First Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct/indicator</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading (λ)</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Average variance extracted</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ξ₁ (Perceived Organizational Identity—Service)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₁: I think customers are pleased with the service they receive at this store.</td>
<td>.89&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₂: I think the service at this store is excellent.</td>
<td>.91&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₃: I think the employees at this store are very friendly.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>13.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ξ₂ (Construed External Image—Service)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₄: Other people think customers are pleased with the service they receive at this store.</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₅: Other people think the service at this store is excellent.</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>21.79</td>
<td></td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₆: Other people at this store think the employees are very friendly.</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>20.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η₁ (Person-Organization Fit)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₁: My personality “matches” or fits this store’s personality.</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₂: The personality of this store reflects my own personality.</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>17.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₃: My personality prevents me from “fitting in” with this store because my personality is different from the personality of this store.</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td></td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 5 (continued)

**Measurement Model for the First Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct/indicator</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading (λ)</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Average variance extracted</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>η₂ (Attractiveness of the Organization)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₄: I very much like working for this store.</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>-.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₅: I feel at home working for this store.</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>21.20</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₆: I feel I fit in this store.</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>19.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₇: This store meets my desires and needs.</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>19.49</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₈: If three other stores recruited me, I still would be pleased to work for this store.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₉: Something about this store compels me to work there.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>18.93</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>η₃ (Job Satisfaction—Intrinsic)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₁₀: I feel a sense of pride and accomplishment as a result of the type of work I do.</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₁₁: My job offers me a career path that I am pleased with.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>13.39</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₁₂: My job performance improves from year to year.</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₁₃: I very much like the type of work I am doing.</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>16.02</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>η₄ (Employee-Organization Identification)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₁₄: When someone criticizes this store, it feels like a personal insult.</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>-.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5 (continued)

*Measurement Model for the First Model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct/indicator</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading ($\lambda$)</th>
<th>$SE$</th>
<th>$t$-value</th>
<th>Average variance extracted</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$Y_{15}$: I am very interested in what others think about this store.</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>16.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_{16}$: When I talk about this store, I usually say “we” rather than “they.”</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>15.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_{17}$: When someone praises this store, it feels like a personal compliment.</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>20.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_{18}$: If a story in the media criticized this store, I would feel embarrassed.</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta_5$ (Job Involvement)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_{19}$: Most of my interests are centered around my job.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_{20}$: I consider my job to be very central to my existence.</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>17.93</td>
<td></td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_{21}$: I like to be absorbed in my job most of the time.</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>15.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_{22}$: The most important things that happen to me involve my job.</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>17.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_{23}$: I live, eat, and breathe my job.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>13.91</td>
<td></td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta_6$ (Job Performance—Knowledge of Store Policy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_{24}$: I provide accurate and complete paperwork related to my work schedule.</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
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Table 5 (continued)

**Measurement Model for the First Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct/indicator</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading ($\lambda$)</th>
<th>$SE$</th>
<th>$t$-value</th>
<th>Average variance extracted</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$Y_{25}$: I provide accurate and complete paperwork for cash and credit transactions.</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_{26}$: I show up on time for work, sales meetings, and training sessions.</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_{27}$: I accurately follow day-to-day instructions of my immediate supervisor.</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta_7$ (Job Performance—Sales Ability)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_{28}$: I suggest add-ons or complimentary merchandise to customers.</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_{29}$: I have a strong ability to close the sale.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_{30}$: I promote sales of merchandise having profit margins.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>12.06</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.*  

\(^a\)First $\lambda$ path was set to 1; therefore, no $SE$s or $t$-values are given.  

\(^b\)All path estimates are significant at $p \leq .001$.  

---
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index (AGFI), normed fit index (NFI), comparative fit index (CFI), and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) were used. Fit statistics above .90 for GFI, NFI, and CFI, above .80 for AGFI, and below .08 for RMSEA were used as an indicator of a good model fit to the data (Bentler & Bonnet, 1980; Hayduk, 1987). The overall fit indices for the proposed model revealed a $\chi^2$ of 1409.93 ($df = 573; p < .001$), GFI of .76, AGFI of .73, NFI of .83, CFI of .89, and RMSEA of .08. These indices indicated that the proposed model did not fit the data well.

**Model re-specification.** When an initial model does not fit the data well, the model can be re-specified in an effort to improve the fit of the model to the data (Bollen, 1989). Rather than using the empirical data alone to re-specify the model, the re-specification process works the best when theory- and substantive-based revisions are used in conjunction with the empirical data to re-specify the model (Bollen, 1989). Thus, the model for the current study was re-specified using both previously published literature as well as the data from the quantitative phase of the study.

In search of a better fitting model, further analyses were conducted on the data. The results of an analysis of the correlations between the summed indicators for each construct revealed two particularly troublesome patterns. First, the perceived organizational identity—service and construed external image—service constructs were highly correlated with one another, and second, four of the endogenous constructs (i.e., Person-Organization Fit, Attractiveness of the Organization to the Employee, Employee-Organization Identification, and Job Satisfaction—Intrinsic) were highly correlated with one another (see Table 6 for all correlations). A high level of multicollinearity between either exogenous constructs or endogenous constructs is worrisome because no estimates of the independent direct and indirect effects between the constructs can be obtained (Bollen, 1989; Gordon, 1968; Parasuraman & Alutto, 1984).

Because multicollinearity appeared to be a major problem with the data, a new model was specified using only one of the two exogenous constructs and one of the four endogenous constructs that were highly correlated with one another. The decisions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model variables</th>
<th>Mean (Possible range)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Perceived Store Identity—Service</td>
<td>16.98 (3-21)</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Construed External Store Image—</td>
<td>16.55 (3-21)</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.76**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Person-Organization Fit</td>
<td>15.93 (3-21)</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Attractiveness of the Organization</td>
<td>30.96 (6-42)</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Job Satisfaction—Intrinsic</td>
<td>20.04 (4-28)</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Employee-Organization Identification</td>
<td>25.06 (5-35)</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Job Performance—Knowledge of Store</td>
<td>25.00 (4-28)</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Job Performance—Sales Ability</td>
<td>17.19 (3-21)</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Job Involvement</td>
<td>17.11 (5-35)</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level; ** Correlation is significant at the .01 level.
concerning which constructs to retain and which constructs to eliminate from the model were guided by previously published literature and the empirical data.

In terms of the exogenous constructs, some researchers (Hatch & Schultz, 2002; Scott & Lane, 2000a) have suggested that perceived organizational identity and construed external image should be related. In fact, this assumption that a model allowing for interaction between perceived organizational identity and construed external image would fit the data better than a model that did not allow for any such interaction was stated in H3. The high level of correlation between these two constructs ($r = 0.76$) suggested that the item comprising these constructs were assessing one construct and not two separate constructs. Hence, it seemed likely that only one construct, as opposed to two, was needed in the model, and, therefore, it seemed unlikely that H3 would be supported by the data.

To test this assumption, a series of three models were created and analyzed. Each model contained all of the endogenous constructs and paths as depicted in Figure 4. The three models differed from each other in terms of the exogenous constructs contained within the model. One model contained only the perceived organizational identity—service construct and subsequent path to Person-Organization Fit. One model contained only the construed external image—service construct and subsequent path to Person-Organization Fit. The last model contained both Perceived Organizational Identity—Service and Construed External Image—Service, contained the paths to Person-Organization Fit from both exogenous constructs, and allowed for interaction to occur between Perceived Organizational Identity—Service and Construed External Image—Service.

The results of the analyses indicated that similarly well fitting models could be obtained by using either Perceived Organizational Identity—Service ($\chi^2$ of 1049.33 $(df = 475; p \leq .000)$, GFI of .79, AGFI of .75, NFI of .86, CFI of .92, and RMSEA of .07) or Construed External Image—Service ($\chi^2$ of 1031.29 $(df = 475; p \leq .000)$, GFI of .79, AGFI of .75, NFI of .86, CFI of .92, and RMSEA of .07) in the model and that the fit of the model did not improve by having both constructs interact in the model ($\chi^2$ of 1186.31 $(df = 572; p$
Thus, as suspected, $H_3$ was not supported by the data.

Because the construed external image—service construct was more reliable ($\alpha = 0.93$) than the perceived organizational identity—service construct ($\alpha = 0.88$), both constructs displayed the same level of variance (0.81) when used in models by themselves, and the model containing the construed external image—service construct had the lowest $\chi^2$ value of the three models, the construed external image—service construct was retained for further analysis.

In terms of the highly correlated endogenous variables, several empirically-based decision rules were first used to determine which construct to retain and which constructs to eliminate as the original model from Figure 4 was re-specified. Using the Chronbach’s alpha coefficients and the $R^2$ values obtained from the first model, a decision was made to eliminate both Person-Organization Fit and Job Satisfaction—Intrinsic from the model because they had the lowest alpha levels and $R^2$ values of the four constructs, indicating that both Attractiveness of the Organization to the Employee and Employee-Organization Identification were more reliable and explained more of the variance in the model.

Next, given a choice between Attractiveness of the Organization to the Employee and Employee-Organization Identification, the employee-organization identification construct should have been the next construct eliminated if the decision were based solely on alpha levels and $R^2$ values because the attractiveness construct was more reliable and explained more of the variance in the first model. However, considering the model in its entirety, along with the findings from previous research, a decision was made to eliminate Attractiveness and retain Employee-Organization Identification. While previous research suggests the existence of a direct and positive relationship between employee-organization identification and job involvement (Gould & Werbel, 1983; Schneider, Hall, & Nygren, 1971; van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000) and between employee-organization identification and job performance (Bartel, 2001; Benkoff, 1997; Efraty & Wolfe, 1988), previous research does not support the existence of a direct and positive relationship
between either attractiveness of the organization to the employee and job involvement or attractiveness of the organization to the employee and job performance. Therefore, in order to retain job involvement and job performance as constructs in a substantively-based model, Employee-Organization Identification, which possessed an acceptable alpha and $R^2$ value, was retained and Attractiveness of the Organization to the Employee was eliminated from the model.

After adjusting the model in an effort to minimize multicollinearity between the remaining variables, the distributions of the remaining variables were examined for evidence of skewness. As the statistics in Table 7 demonstrate, with the exception of Job Involvement, the data for all of the other variables remaining in the re-specified model were negatively skewed because the ratio of each variable's skewness value to each variable's standard error of skewness exceeds -2 (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2000). Because the validity of the estimates obtained for a structural equation model is compromised when the data are not normally distributed (Bollen, 1989), a correction needed to be made in order to continue analyzing the data for the present study using a structural equation modeling technique. This correction involved changing the estimation procedure used in AMOS 5.0 from the usual maximum-likelihood estimation procedure to the asymptotically distribution-free estimation method because the asymptotically distribution-free estimation method adjusts for multivariate non-normality in the data (Browne, 1984; Hardie, 2005).

The re-specified model containing Construed External Image—Service, Employee-Organization Identification, Job Involvement, Job Performance—Knowledge of Store Policy, and Job Performance—Sales Ability was examined for fit. This model is shown in Figure 5. Like the first model, the results again showed that all of the paths were significant at $p \leq .001$. However, unlike the originally proposed model, this second model indicated that a direct path which was not hypothesized existed between construed external image and employee-organization identification. Table 8 provides the squared multiple correlations ($R^2$) for each endogenous construct as well as path coefficients and $t$-values for each statistically significant path. The overall fit indices for this model revealed a $\chi^2$ of 469.53
Table 7

Skewness of the Distributions of the Variables in the Re-specified Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Skewness value</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Skewness value/SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construed External Store Image—Service</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee-Organization Identification</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Involvement</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance—Knowledge of Store Policy</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-8.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance—Sales Ability</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-4.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$(df = 154; p \leq .000)$, GFI of .95, AGFI of .93; NFI of .90, CFI of .92, and RMSEA of .09. These indices indicated that eliminating Perceived Organizational Identity—Service, Person-Organization Fit, Attractiveness, and Job Satisfaction—Intrinsic from the model did improve the fit of the model to the data to a satisfactory degree. Although the RMSEA statistic is slightly above the .08 cutoff recommended by some researchers (Bentler & Bonnet, 1980; Hayduk, 1987), the RMSEA statistic is sensitive to sample size, so other researchers recommend a slightly higher cutoff of .10 (Byrne, 2001; Hardie, 2005). Using the .10 cutoff, the RMSEA for the re-specified model is acceptable because it is less than .10. Additionally, even though the model’s $\chi^2$ value was statistically significant, a significant $\chi^2$ value does not, in and of itself, indicate a poor fit if the sample size exceeds 200 (Mathieu & Farr, 1991). A better statistic for examining the fit of the model to the data is the ratio of the model’s $\chi^2$ to degrees of freedom ($\chi^2/df$). Because the re-specified model’s $\chi^2/df$ was just slightly above the 3.0 cutoff recommended by several researchers (Bentler, 1990; Byrne, 2001; Hardie, 2005; Hoetler, 1983), this $\chi^2/df$ statistic indicates that the fit of the model to the data is acceptable. Given that this was the best fitting model obtained, this model was used for hypothesis testing.
Hypothesis testing. Only two of the original ten hypotheses were supported by the re-specified model. Hypothesis 6, predicting the positive direct effect of employees' organizational identification with their employment organization (i.e., the apparel retail store) on their perceived job involvement, was supported ($b_2 = .65, t = 20.51, p \leq .000$). Also, $H_7$, which predicted a positive direct effect of employees' organizational identification with their employment organization (i.e., the apparel retail store) on their perceived job
Table 8

*Measurement Model for the Re-specified Model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct/Indicator</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading (λ)</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Average variance extracted</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ξ₁ (Construed External Image—Service)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₁: Other people think customers are pleased with the service they receive at this store.</td>
<td>.92&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₂: Other people think the service at this store is excellent.</td>
<td>.96&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>53.67</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₃: Other people at this store think the employees are very friendly.</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>52.41</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η₁ (Employee-Organization Identification)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₁: When someone criticizes this store, it feels like a personal insult.</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₂: I am very interested in what others think about this store.</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>38.12</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₃: When I talk about this store, I usually say “we” rather than “they.”</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>31.11</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₄: When someone praises this store, it feels like a personal compliment.</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>48.47</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₅: If a story in the media criticized this store, I would feel embarrassed.</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>25.40</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η₂ (Job Involvement)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₆: Most of my interests are centered around my job.</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 8 (continued)

Measurement Model for the Re-specified Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct/indicator</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading ($\lambda$)</th>
<th>$SE$</th>
<th>$t$-value</th>
<th>Average variance extracted</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s $\alpha$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$Y_7$: I consider my job to be very central to my existence.</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>54.88</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_8$: I like to be absorbed in my job most of the time.</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>43.64</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_9$: The most important things that happen to me involve my job.</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>37.25</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_{10}$: I live, eat, and breathe my job.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>29.56</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta_3$ (Job Performance—Knowledge of Store Policy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_{11}$: I provide accurate and complete paperwork related to my work schedule.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_{12}$: I provide accurate and complete paperwork for cash and credit transactions.</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_{13}$: I show up on time for work, sales meetings, and training sessions.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>22.20</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_{14}$: I accurately follow day-to-day instructions of my immediate supervisor.</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>17.88</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta_4$ (Job Performance—Sales Ability)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_{15}$: I suggest add-ons or complimentary merchandise to customers.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_{16}$: I have a strong ability to close the sale.</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>25.16</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 8 (continued)

Measurement Model for the Re-specified Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct/indicator</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading ($\lambda$)</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>$t$-value</th>
<th>Average variance extracted</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y17: I promote sales of merchandise having profit margins.</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>24.13</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(^a\)First $\lambda$ path was set to 1; therefore, no SEs or $t$-values are given. 
\(^b\)All path estimates are significant at $p \leq .001$. 


performance, was supported in terms of their knowledge of store policy ($\beta_3 = .55, t = 14.52, p \leq .000$) and their sales ability ($\beta_4 = .70, t = 16.65, p \leq .000$). Although an indirect path between construed external image and employee-organization identification through person-organization fit (H2), attractiveness of the organization to the employee (H4 and H5), and job satisfaction (H10 and H11) was originally hypothesized, only a direct path from Construed External Image—Service to Employee-Organization Identification was identified in this model ($\beta_1 = .65, t = 17.81, p \leq .000$). In sum, H1, H2, H3, H4, H5, H8, H9, H10, and H11 were not supported by the data; H6 and H7 were supported by the data.

**Decomposition of effects.** To further examine the effects of construed external image and employee-organization identification on job involvement and job performance, the decomposition of indirect, direct, and total effects of a predictor variable on endogenous variables was conducted (see Table 9). The direct effects of Construed External Image—Service ($\beta = .65$) on Employee-Organization Identification, Employee-Organization Identification on Job Involvement ($\beta = .65$), and Employee-Organization Identification on Job Performance—Knowledge of Store Policy ($\beta = .55$) and Job Performance—Sales Ability ($\beta = .70$) were significant. And, a significant indirect effect also showed that Employee-Organization Identification mediated the effect of Construed External Image—Service on Job Involvement ($\beta = .43$), the effect of Construed External Image—Service on Job Performance—Knowledge of Store Policy ($\beta = .36$), and the effect of Construed External Image—Service on Job Performance—Sales Ability ($\beta = .46$). Thus, a positive assessment of construed external image stimulates employee-organization identification, which then increases job involvement and job performance.

**The effect of apparel on employee-organization identification.** Hypothesis 9 predicted that a model containing items concerning the appearance dimension of employee-organization identification would fit the data better than a model that did not include such items. This hypothesis was not supported by the data, mainly because the items used to assess the appearance dimension of the employee-organization identification construct possessed a low level of reliability ($\alpha = 0.65$ for the first factor and $\alpha = 0.42$ for the second
Table 9  
**Direct, Indirect, and Total Effects for All Constructs in the Re-specified Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Direct effects</th>
<th>Indirect effects</th>
<th>Total effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job performance—Sales ability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained External Image—Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee-Organization Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2 = .28$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Performance—Knowledge of Store Policy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained External Image—Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee-Organization Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2 = .28$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained External Image—Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee-Organization Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2 = .33$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee-Organization Identification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained External Image—Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2 = .23$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Standardized path estimates are reported. All path estimates are significant at $p \leq .001$. 

factor). Because the findings from the qualitative phase of the study suggested that the apparel worn to work could have an effect on an employee’s level of identification with his or her employment organization, post-hoc analysis of the quantitative data was conducted using other items from the questionnaire. 

One item from the questionnaire that was related to apparel and had a significant effect on several constructs was the item concerning whether the employee was required to wear apparel from the store while at work. A series of $t$-tests were conducted to compare the responses of the participants who indicated that they were required to wear apparel from the store to work ($n = 71$) to those of the participants who were not required to wear apparel from the store to work ($n = 180$). Participants who were required to wear apparel from the
store to work displayed a higher degree of Person-Organization Fit ($M_{\text{req}} = 16.93; M_{\text{not}} = 15.54; t = 2.63; p = .01$) and were significantly more attracted to the store’s image ($M_{\text{req}} = 32.93; M_{\text{not}} = 30.18; t = 2.41; p = .02$). Participants who were required to wear the store’s clothing were also significantly more satisfied with their jobs ($M_{\text{req}} = 21.58; M_{\text{not}} = 19.44; t = 3.04; p = .003$). In terms of employee-organization identification, participants who were required to wear the store’s clothes displayed a higher degree of employee-organization identification using both the first factor derived during the exploratory factor analysis (i.e., the items from the Mael (1988) scale) ($M_{\text{req}} = 26.51; M_{\text{not}} = 24.49; t = 2.03; p = .04$) and the second factor derived during the exploratory factor analysis (i.e., the new items concerning apparel and identification) ($M_{\text{req}} = 15.43; M_{\text{not}} = 14.07; t = 2.55; p = .01$). Lastly, those participants who were required to wear the store’s apparel during work were significantly more involved in their jobs ($M_{\text{req}} = 18.87; M_{\text{not}} = 16.41; t = 2.49; p = .01$). No statistical differences were found between the participants who were encouraged, but not required, to wear apparel from the store while at work ($n = 113$) and the participants who were not encouraged or required to wear such apparel while at work ($n = 136$).

Because the sample sizes for the group of individuals who were required to wear apparel from their store while at work and the group of individuals who were not required to wear apparel from their store while at work were not balanced, the $t$-tests used to compare these two groups many not have been accurate. To correct for this potential problem and to lend support to the finding that these two groups of participants did differ significantly from each other in terms of many of the variables, two additional post-hoc means comparison tests were conducted on the data. Both the Hochberg’s GF2 and the Gabriel test were used to compare the means of the two groups of participants because these means tests use the studentized maximum modulus distribution instead of the studentized range to estimate the $t$-values and are, therefore, more conservative in their estimates of the $t$-value (SAS Institute, 1999). The results of both of these tests revealed the same pattern of significance revealed using the non-corrected $t$-tests. Hence, evidence exists to suggest that individuals who are required to wear apparel from the store while they are at work are significantly different
from the individuals who are not required to wear apparel from the store to work in terms of person-organization fit, attraction to the store’s image, job satisfaction, employee-organization identification, and job involvement.

Given the differences noted in the responses of the participants who were required to wear apparel from the store to work, other potential differences were also explored. In terms of demographic information, no differences were significant between those who were required and those who were not required to wear their store’s apparel to work. In terms of store characteristics, it was noted that significantly more participants who were required to wear apparel from the store to work were employed in specialty stores than in any other type of store ($\chi^2 = 11.56; p = .001$). While no significant difference was found in terms of the discounts offered to employees who were required to wear the store’s clothing versus those who were not, specialty stores, in general, offered their employees a significantly higher discount on store merchandise than was offered to employees of any other kind of store ($M_{\text{spec}} = 33.54\%, M_{\text{other}} = 23.52\%; t = 6.59; p = .00$). Thus, while the data from this study tell us little about which types of individuals work in apparel retail stores that require their employees to wear the store’s apparel while at work, it seems to be the case that the management teams at specialty stores are the ones most likely to require their employees to wear the store’s apparel while at work. Furthermore, the management teams at specialty stores seem to offer their employees the highest discounts on the merchandise, presumably to cover or minimize the cost of requiring or encouraging their employees to wear the store’s merchandise.
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS

Chapter Overview

In this final chapter, the findings from both the phases of the study are discussed. The limitations of the present study are presented, and directions for future research are delineated.

Discussion

In this study, the nature of employee-organization identification in apparel retail stores was explored. The results of both the qualitative and quantitative phases of the study suggest that employee-organization identification, as defined by Dutton, Dukerich, and Harquail (1994) and as assessed using Mael's (1988) identification scale, can occur among the employees in apparel retail stores. Based on the interview data, employees within apparel retail stores believed that their employment store had an identity or image. Furthermore, the employees indicated that the store’s image was consistent with the image of the apparel products sold in the store, the identities of the other employees in the store, and the identities of the customers in the store. If identification occurs when an employee “defines him- or herself by the same attributes that he or she believes define the organization for which he or she works” (Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994, p. 239), then six of the eight store-level employees who participated in the first phase of this study did exhibit identification with their employment store. These employees expressed similarities between their own identity, the store’s image, the image of the products sold by the store, the identities of the other employees of the store, and the identities of the customers of the store. Moreover, in the quantitative phase of the study, the Mael (1988) scale items reliably captured a range of identification levels among the apparel store employees. Therefore, it seems that employee-organization identification does occur among employees of an apparel retail store as it occurs among employees of other types of organizations, such as insurance companies (Bell & Menguc, 2002) and transportation agencies (Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994).
Variations in employees' level of identification with their employment store in the first phase of the study were related to a lack of perceived congruency between the employees' identity and the image or identity of the store, the products sold in the store, the customers, or the other employees of the store. However, according to the best fitting model from the second phase of the study, Person-Organization Fit, the variable used to assess congruency in the model, was not a necessary antecedent of Employee-Organization Identification. Perhaps this variable did not add any explanatory power to the model because the items only took into account the participants' perceived level of congruency between themselves and the image of the store. No items addressed the perceived level of congruency between the employee's identity and the image of the products sold in the store or the identities of the customers and other employees of the store. It may be necessary to add items specifically addressing the congruency of all four components to Judge and Cable's (1997) person-organization fit scale to adequately assess person-organization fit as it was defined by the apparel retail store employees in the first phase of the study. In fact, based on the interview responses of the individual who worked in the corporate office of an apparel retail store, it may be necessary to add items concerning the human dimension of fit (i.e., congruency between self identity, other employees' identities, and customers' identities) to the person-organization fit scale when it is used in any employment context. This individual from the corporate office mentioned that she believed that she fit in at her employment organization based primarily on similarities she perceived existed between her own identity and the identities of her coworkers. Thus, the person-organization fit scale could benefit from the addition of items specifically measuring the level of congruency between people associated with the employment organization.

Although not originally hypothesized, the best fitting model created using the quantitative data indicated that a direct, positive path existed between Construed External Image—Service and Employee-Organization Identification. This finding suggests that the more positively an employee believes others assess the image of the store for which he or she works in terms of the customer service provided in that store, the more he or she will
identify with that store. This direct path between a store image variable and the identification variable is logical, considering the tenets of social identity theory. According to Tajfel and Turner's social identity theory, individuals use the characteristics associated with the groups into which they can categorize themselves as the basis for their social identities. It would be unusual for an individual to desire to possess a negative social identity, so most individuals prefer to be associated with groups that possess positive characteristics. Because individuals are not required to use all of the social groups of which they are members to form their notions of themselves, individuals tend to select the social groups that are the most important to them, and presumably most positively regarded by others, when they are forming their social identities (Goffman, 1959; Michelman, 1998; Sandstrom, Martin, & Fine, 2003; van Knippenberg, 2000). As a result, while employees of an apparel retail store might use their association with a positively-evaluated store in the formation of their social identities, employees of a negatively-evaluated apparel retail store may try to dissociate with the store and may use their association with other groups as the basis for their social identities. This may be particularly true when the primary component of store image that they are considering is the type and level of customer service provided by the store's employees. If the participants in the present study indicated that other individuals believed that the store for which they worked possessed a negative image in terms of the type and level of customer service provided by the employees, then these participants would also be indicating that they were, as employees of that store, contributing to that store's negative image. In this case where a sales associate is not performing to the customers' standards, it is highly doubtful that that employee would want to use his or her association with that negatively evaluated store in the formation of his or her own identity. Hence, a higher level of Employee-Organization Identification was displayed when the participants believed that the apparel retail store for which they worked was regarded more positively by others in terms of the customer service provided by the employees than when that store was regarded less positively by others.
At first glance, the finding that Construed External Image—Service leads to Employee-Organization Identification may seem to be at odds with the findings from the qualitative phase of the study because the participants did not specifically mention that they based their assessments of the store’s image or their level of congruency with that store’s image on what they believed others thought of the store. However, if the theory of symbolic interaction holds true, then one way in which an employee could know about the image of the store or his or her own identity, for that matter, would be through negotiations with other people (Blumer, 1969; Sandstrom et al., 2003). Of course, the employees who were interviewed most likely lacked a conscious awareness of these negotiations and, when asked about their impressions of the store and themselves, expressed their beliefs as if they were entirely their own without regard to the contributions of others in forming those beliefs. However, when the employees’ beliefs concerning what other individuals thought about the store for which they worked were specifically assessed in the second phase of the study, the contributions of others were measured. Thus, it is not altogether surprising that Construed External Image—Service was directly linked to Employee-Organization Identification.

Although some researchers (Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994; Dukerich, Golden, & Shortell, 2002) have suggested that both employees’ own beliefs about their employment organization’s identity as well as their beliefs about the ways in which others perceive their employment organization’s identity must be included in a model of employee-organization identification, the data for the second phase of this study did not support this contention. The perceived organizational identity—service and construed external image—service constructs were highly correlated with one another and explained approximately the same amount of variance. Thus, for the participants in this study, only one store image construct was required. This finding, however, may not hold true for all employees in all situations. The participants in the second phase of this study had a relatively low mean age of about 23. In this respect, the participants in this study may have placed more emphasis on what others thought of the store than what they, themselves, thought of the store because, as Sirgy, Grewal, and Mangleburg (2000) suggest, younger individuals tend to be more concerned
than older individuals with impression management within a group or organization they
belong to. As a result, the differences that may exist between the employees' own
perceptions of the store and their perceptions of what other people think about the store may
have been minimized by the young participants' desire to appear cognitively consistent with
their significant others. Perhaps the differences that exist between Perceived Organizational
Identity—Service and Construed External Image—Service would be maximized among a
sample of significantly older apparel retail store employees. In fact, in the study in which
Dukerich, Golden, and Shortell (2002) explicitly examine both perceived organizational
identity and construed external image as two separate constructs, the mean age of the
participants was about 47. Hence, it seems to be the case that a relationship exists between
the age of the employee and their perceptions of the apparel retail store’s image. Future
researchers could explore this notion in more detail by purposively sampling apparel retail
employees from both ends of the age spectrum and comparing the responses of the younger
employees to those of the older employees.

Another possible explanation for the lack of distinction between Perceived
Organizational Identity—Service and Construed External Image—Service among these
participants may be attributable to the fact that the employees of the stores seemed to also be
customers of the stores. In the interviews, many of the participants admitted to being or
aspiring to be customers of the store before the start of their employment with the store.
Additionally, after becoming employed by the store, all of the participants indicated that
they had become customers of the store, either out of necessity (e.g., they were required or
encouraged to wear the apparel from the store while working) or by choice. These
employees may not be able to completely differentiate their own perceptions of the store
from their beliefs about other individuals’ perceptions of the store because these employees
may not be able to completely separate their roles as employees from their roles as
customers. As a result, their perceptions of the store for which they work may be an
amalgamation of their perceptions as employees and their perceptions as customers, and,
therefore, their responses to questionnaire items concerning Perceived Organizational
Identity—Service and Construed External Image—Service may be very similar. This may be particularly true for the part-time sales associates who are not privy to the same type or amount of information concerning the apparel retail store that those who work full-time as sales associates or managers have access to. Again, future researchers could purposively sample managers and sales associates or full-time employees and part-time employees to compare the differences in their responses concerning the apparel retail store’s perceived organizational identity and construed external image.

In the model for the current study, as participants’ perceptions of the construed external image of their employment organization in terms of customer service became more positive, they tended to exhibit a higher degree of identification with that organization. As participants exhibited a greater degree of identification with their employment organization, they also tended to be more involved with their jobs and tended to more positively evaluate their job performance in terms of their sales ability and knowledge of store policy. These findings support the work of van Knippenberg and van Schie (2000), Gould and Werbel (1983), and Schneider, Hall, and Nygren (1971), all of whom found a positive relationship between employee-organization identification and job involvement. These findings also support the work of Efraty and Wolfe (1988), Benkhoff (1997), and Bartel (2001), all of whom found a positive relationship between employee-organization identification and job performance. Although both Job Involvement and Job Performance were found to be related to Employee-Organization Identification, no relationship was found between Job Involvement and either of the job performance constructs, as was predicted based on the work of Diefendorff, Brown, Kamin, and Lord (2002), Lawler and Hall (1970), and Farris (1969). Thus, while retailers may be interested in finding ways to improve identification among their employees to increase job performance in terms of sales, retail practitioners may be less concerned about the fact that identification may lead to job involvement because Job Involvement was not shown to be related to Job Performance. However, some researchers (Lee & Mowday, 1987) have demonstrated that greater job involvement does tend to lead to less employee turnover. Because the turnover rates of front-line sales
associates are extremely high, retail practitioners are always looking for ways to reduce turnover (Daves, 2002). One way to reduce turnover could be to increase job involvement by hiring those sales associates who are most likely to exhibit employee-organization identification. The direct and indirect relationships that exist among employee-organization identification, job involvement, and turnover could be explored in future research.

While useful insight did come from the best fitting model from the second phase of this study, the quantitative data were troublesome because of the extremely high multicollinearity among four variables that were supposed to represent four distinct constructs in the model: Person-Organization Fit, Attractiveness of the Organization to the Employee, Job Satisfaction—Intrinsic, and Employee-Organization Identification. While other researchers (Chow & Neo, 1993; Dalal & Singh, 1986; Dineen, Ash, & Noe, 2002; Dukerich, Golden, & Shortell, 2002; Judge & Cable, 1997) have used combinations of all of these variables successfully in the same model, the scales for these variables all appeared to be assessing the same or a highly similar construct in the model for the present study. Mathieu and Farr (1991) suggested that the correlations between some of these variables may be high as a result of the method variance that occurs from assessing all of the variables at the same time using only one questionnaire. However, the results of a meta-analysis conducted by Mathieu and Zajac (1990) revealed that multicollinearity is not an uncommon occurrence in studies of employee-organization identification. In fact, many researchers (Gautam, van Dick, & Wagner, 2004; Riketta, 2005) have expressed concern about the lack of clear distinction among the conceptual and operational definitions of the variables related to identification, including attractiveness of the organization to the employee and job satisfaction. The findings of the present study provide evidence to support these researchers’ claims that more attention needs to be paid to the proper conceptualization and operationalization of these variables under investigation.

Although the interview data indicated that apparel played a role in employee-organization identification, this finding was not replicated during the quantitative phase of the study. This may have been due to the wording of the items on the questionnaire. The
items concerning the apparel the employees wore both inside and outside of work displayed a fairly low level of reliability, suggesting that they were not consistently assessing the same construct across respondents. The distinctive discussion of apparel as a means of identification from the qualitative phase of the study warrants further validation and refinement of these items.

Another possibility that warrants further investigation is the potential relationship that exists between apparel-related items and employee-organization commitment, as opposed to employee-organization identification. Employee-organization commitment is a related, but broader, concept than employee-organization identification. Mowday, Steers, and Porter's (1979) definition states that employee-organization commitment is "the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization" (p. 226). Thus, employee-organization commitment seems to incorporate both employee-organization identification and job involvement into one construct as opposed to three (Riketta, 2005). Another distinction that has been made between employee-organization identification and employee-organization commitment concerns the fact that the employee-organization commitment construct appears to contain both a cognitive and an affective component while the employee-organization identification construct is strictly "a perceptual cognitive construct that is not necessarily associated with any specific behaviors or affective states" (Ashforth & Mael, 1989, p. 21). Because the items concerning appearance deal with not only specific behaviors but also behaviors about which the individual employees may feel strong emotions, the appearance of employees at work may be a sign of employee-organization commitment rather than employee-organization identification. The construct of employee-organization commitment has been successfully assessed in retail environments in the United States (Darden, McKee, & Hampton, 1993; Jaramillo, Mulki, & Marshall, 2005), and employee-organization commitment has been shown to be positively related to job performance (Jaramillo, Mulki, & Marshall, 2005). Because the results of the present study indicated that a positive relationship existed between Employee-Organization Identification and both constructs of job performance, perhaps future researchers could
repeat the present study using employee-organization commitment in place of employee-organization identification in the model and compare the results of the two studies.

Another issue worthy of further investigation is the relationship between employee-organization identification and the requirement that apparel from the store be worn during work. Although caution is recommended with the interpretation of the findings due to the differences in sample sizes between the comparison groups, the results from several means comparisons suggested that the employees who were required to wear apparel from the store while they were working displayed a higher degree of Employee-Organization Identification, Job Involvement, Job Performance—Knowledge of Store Policy, and Job Performance—Sales Ability. However, it is not clear from the present study whether these employees start out differently or become different over time from the employees who are not required to wear apparel from the store while they are working. It may be the case that individuals with certain traits are more likely to work in stores that require certain apparel items to be worn at work. Joseph and Alex (1972) suggested that some individuals may “flee to the safety of [a] uniform to avoid the anomie of ordinary life” (p. 726). In other words, some individuals may be particularly susceptible to the stresses associated with a society in which social statuses are not always clearly defined or identified through external cues. These individuals may feel reassured in an employment environment where at least one of their social roles is clearly defined and delineated through the uniform associated with that role. Furthermore, these employees’ desire to firmly mark their place in society may also make these employees more likely than other employees to identify with their employment organizations. Or, it could be the case that, over time, all employees who are required to wear apparel from the store while they are working come to exhibit a higher degree of identification with that store than those employees who are not required to wear apparel items from the store while at work. A longitudinal study could be conducted to assess changes in employee-organization identification levels over time and to investigate the effects of self-selection into an environment in which particular apparel products are
required to be worn versus the effects of length of employment in an environment in which particular apparel products are required to be worn on employee-organization identification.

Limitations

The generalizability of the findings from the two phases of this study is limited by the fact that a convenience sampling method was used to gather participants. Neither the results from the qualitative phase of the study nor the quantitative phase of the study should be widely applied across the entire population of apparel retail store employees. With respect to the quantitative phase of the study, a random sample of employees from all apparel retail stores across the United States would be an ideal sample. However, given the time and financial constraints associated with the present study, the convenience sampling method was deemed an appropriate alternative.

As it was, finding apparel retail store employees who were willing and able to complete the questionnaire was challenging. Many employees complained that the questionnaire was too long and, despite the fact that all of the items (except the ones concerning apparel) on the questionnaire were obtained from previously validated scales, some employees remarked that the questionnaire was too invasive. In fact, one of the students who completed the questionnaire during a class stated that she felt “violated” after completing the questionnaire. It may have been the case that the employees felt uncomfortable completing the questionnaires without having prior knowledge of exactly what was going to happen after the questionnaires were completed. That is to say, because the study was not officially sanctioned by individuals in the corporate offices of their employment organizations, some employees may have felt uneasy about revealing information concerning their impressions of their store, job satisfaction, job involvement, and job performance. In other research in which retail employees were participants (Darden, McKee, & Hampton, 1993), employees were informed by their employment organizations about the study and, therefore, may have been more willing to participate in the study and reveal personal information about themselves. In addition to seeking the assistance of the corporate offices of large retail organizations, future researchers should consider paring the
questionnaire down to only the most pertinent items. It has been shown that individuals are less likely to complete long questionnaires and are more likely to make mistakes in the completion of long questionnaires due to fatigue (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). Thus, careful editing of the items on the questionnaire would most likely increase participation and improve reliability.

Another issue related to the data collection technique used for the second phase of the study that may limit the generalizability of the findings is the fact that individuals other than the researcher (e.g., store managers, instructors, students) were charged with the responsibility of having the employees complete the questionnaires. Because the researcher was not present during the time in which the employees actually completed the questionnaires, the employees were not able to ask questions if they did not understand how to complete a part of the questionnaire. As a result, some of the responses to some of the items may not accurately reflect the employees’ beliefs. Respondent confusion may have been one of the reasons why Aron, Aron, and Smollan’s (1992) Inclusion of Other in Self item was not as reliable a measure as expected.

In addition to respondent confusion, another issue stemming from the relinquishment of researcher control is participant dishonesty, particularly among the undergraduate student participants. Because the students were offered extra course credit to complete the questionnaires and many were given the opportunity to complete the questionnaires on their own time outside of the classroom, some students may have been compelled to complete a questionnaire even if they did not specifically meet the qualifications for participation in the study (e.g., currently working in an apparel retail store). Although the students were instructed not to complete a fraudulent questionnaire, the possibility exists that a portion of the data was falsified, particularly in light of the fact that an estimated two-thirds to three-fourths of all undergraduates admit to cheating at least once during their undergraduate careers (Whitehouse & Nichols, 2004). Again, caution is suggested when generalizing the results of the present study to the population.
Another limitation of this study is the fact that participants were sampled from a variety of retailers. Hence, differences in organizational structure and policies may have confounded the results. If possible, an ideal situation for future research would be to sample employees from various locations of one national store chain to minimize potential organizational differences, as was done in Darden, McKee, and Hampton’s (1993) study of employee-organization commitment among retail employees.

In addition to the limitations in generalizability that are related to the sampling methods employed in the present study, caution should be exercised when generalizing the results of the present study to the population because the distribution of the data analyzed was negatively skewed. While it is not altogether surprising that the participants’ self-reported estimates of job performance were inflated (Pransky, Finkelstein, Berndt, Kyle, Mackell, & Tortorice, 2005), it is interesting to note that the data for only one variable, Job Involvement, in the re-specified model had a normally shaped distribution. The data for all of the other variables in the model were negatively skewed. It is possible that this pattern of response reflects participants’ need for social desirability (Hardie, 2005). Given the fact that many of the participants completed the questionnaires used for the present study in a location in which a supervisor or an authority figure was present (e.g., while at work with a manager, while in a classroom with an instructor), participants, particularly those with a high need for social desirability, may have felt compelled to respond to the questionnaire items in a more positive fashion than they would have responded if they were completing the questionnaire in a more secluded location. Researchers interested in continuing an investigation of employee-organization identification and job-related outcome variables, like job performance, should consider not only including a measure of social desirability (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) on future questionnaires but should also consider alternative methods of data collection that would allow participants to complete the questionnaires at a time and location in which they felt more secure responding to the items as honestly as possible.
While social desirability may have affected the responses of individuals who completed the questionnaire at work, the skewness of the responses on the questionnaires completed by the undergraduate participants may be attributable to the students’ overestimation of their personal abilities and performance. Current undergraduates tend to display above-average self-esteem because, throughout their educational careers, they have not received accurate feedback concerning their capabilities. According to Benton (2006), undergraduates are not likely to see themselves as ineffective because they have not been given realistic evaluations of their skills and academic performance and have instead been subjected to “dumbed-down courses” and “inflated grades” (p. C4). Because current undergraduates have had exposure to overwhelmingly positive feedback throughout lives, they tend to have high self-esteem, and any negative feedback they do receive is perceived as being inconsistent with their general beliefs about themselves. According to self-consistency theory (Shrauger, 1975; Swann, 1987), when individuals receive information about themselves that does not reinforce their pre-existing beliefs about themselves, these individuals tend to see the incongruent information as invalid. Thus, when undergraduates do receive any negative feedback, this information is unlikely to affect their beliefs about their abilities because they attribute the negative feedback not to a lack of ability on their part but to an inaccurate assessment on the evaluator’s part (Benton, 2006). This pattern of rationalization was evident in a study conducted by Woo and Frank (2000), who found that students who had lower GPAs tended to see the grades as less valid than those who had higher GPAs. It seems to be the case that years of repeated praise and positive reinforcement by teachers, and perhaps parents, have contributed to current undergraduates’ high level of self-esteem, and altering their beliefs about themselves may prove difficult when they are likely to attribute poor assessments they receive in any context (e.g., at school, at work) to the evaluator’s inability to assess their performance appropriately. Thus, obtaining more accurate, less skewed estimates of skill level and performance at work from current undergraduates using self-report measures may not be possible. Instead, future researchers may want to consider using alternative measures of participants’ skills and
performance (e.g., actual sales records, supervisors’ evaluations, customers’ evaluations) when studying participants who are members of Gen-Y (Solomon & Rabolt, 2004).

Future Research Directions

In addition to further exploration of the relationship between salesperson appearance and employee-organization identification in apparel retail stores, future research could be conducted on employee-organization identification in other types of retail stores (e.g., electronics, books) to see what role, if any, appearance plays in the identification process for salespeople in other types of retail stores. It may be the case that appearance is related to employee-organization identification even when the products sold are not appearance-related products. Perhaps having the appearance of a “computer geek” or a “bookworm” is an indication of an employee’s level of identification with an electronics store or a bookstore, respectively. Future researchers interested in employee-organization identification in retail stores could also investigate the effects of employee-organization identification on consumer-related variables, such as actual purchase behavior, satisfaction, and intention to re-patronize the store. The results of the present study provide further support for the notion that employee-organization identification does have a positive impact on employee-related variables, such as job involvement and job performance. However, questions remain concerning the impact of employee-organization identification on consumer behavior, so attention could be directed towards this area of research in the future.
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SECTION II: IRB SECTION - STUDY SPECIFIC INFORMATION

STUDY OBJECTIVES

Briefly explain in language understandable to a layperson the specific aim(s) of the study.

The purpose of this study is to explore the ways in which, if any, salesperson appearance in terms of dress is related to employee-organization identification in an apparel retail store setting. Employee-organization identification is said to occur when employees use the same attributes that contribute to their employment organization’s identity to describe aspects of their own identity. In other words, employee-organization identification occurs in an apparel retail store setting when the salespeople’s self-images are consistent with the apparel retail store’s image. Employee-organization identification is a topic worthy of investigation because identification has been positively linked to employees’ level of job involvement and job performance. Although previous researchers have suggested that the apparel products an employee chooses to wear could be visible manifestations of his or her level of identification with his or her employment organization, the existence of a relationship between employees’ appearance in terms of dress and their level of identification with their employment organizations has not yet been empirically examined. By exploring the relationship between appearance and identification, another one of the ways in which employee-organization identification might be displayed could be identified.

BENEFIT

Explain in language understandable to a layperson how the information gained in this study will benefit participants or the advancement of knowledge, and/or serve the good of society.

If it were shown that a relationship between salesperson appearance and employee-organization identification existed, apparel retail salespeople could use this information to better select positions that would make them more satisfied with their work in the future. Additionally, the information gleaned from this study could help individuals in the retail industry better screen applicants for both longer term employment and greater satisfaction of employees. Thus, understanding the relationships that exist between salesperson appearance, store image, and employee-organization identification would be of both practical and theoretical interest.

PART A: PROJECT INVOLVEMENT

1) ☐ Yes ☒ No Is this project part of a Training, Center, Program Project Grant?
   Director Name: Overall IRB ID:

2) ☐ Yes ☒ No Is the purpose of this project to develop survey instruments?

3) ☐ Yes ☒ No Does this project involve an investigational new drug (IND)? Number:

4) ☐ Yes ☒ No Does this project involve an investigational device exemption (IDE)?
   Number:
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5) □ Yes ☒ No Does this project involve existing data or records?

6) □ Yes ☒ No Does this project involve secondary analysis?

7) □ Yes ☒ No Does this project involve pathology or diagnostic specimens?

8) □ Yes ☒ No Does this project require approval from another institution? Please attach letters of approval.

9) □ Yes ☒ No Does this project involve DEXA/CT scans or X-rays?

**PART B: MEDICAL HEALTH INFORMATION OR RECORDS**

1) □ Yes ☒ No Does your project require the use of a health care provider’s records concerning past, present, or future physical, dental, or mental health information about a subject? The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act established the conditions under which protected health information may be used or disclosed for research purposes. If your project will involve the use of any past or present clinical information about someone, or if you will add clinical information to someone's treatment record (electronic or paper) during the study you must complete and submit the Application for Use of Protected Health Information.

**PART C: ANTICIPATED ENROLLMENT**

| Estimated number of subjects contacted to reach required enrollment: 15 |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Number of subjects to be enrolled in the study | Total: 12 Males: 6 Females: 6 |
| Check if any enrolled subjects are: | Check below if this project involves either: |
| ☐ Minors (Under 18) | ☒ Adults, non-students |
| Age Range of Minors: | ☐ Minor ISU students |
| ☐ Pregnant Women/Fetuses | ☐ ISU students 18 and older |
| ☐ Cognitively Impaired | ☐ Other (explain) |
| ☐ Prisoners | |

**List estimated percent of the anticipated enrollment that will be minorities if known: Not known**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American Indian:</th>
<th>Alaskan Native:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander:</td>
<td>Black or African American:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino or Hispanic:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART D: SUBJECT SELECTION**

Please use additional space as necessary to adequately answer each question.

11. Explain the procedures for selecting subjects including any inclusion/exclusion criteria (i.e., Where will the names come from? Will a sample be purchased, will ads, fliers, word of mouth, email list, etc. be used?).
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The managers of several local retail stores will be contacted via telephone by the PI. The study will be explained to them, and they will be asked if they would be willing to have their salespeople volunteer to be interviewed by the PI. With the managers’ permission, individual salespeople will be contacted directly by the PI, who will enter the store at a date and time specified by the manager, introduce herself and the study, provide the salespeople with a handout explaining the purpose of the interviews, and request the participation of the salespeople in the interviews. All of the interviews will be scheduled for a date and time that is convenient for the interviewees. All of the interviews will be conducted outside of the store at a location specified by the interviewees.

12. Attach a copy of any recruitment telephone scripts or materials such as ad, fliers, e-mail messages, etc. Recruitment material must include a statement of the voluntary and confidential nature of the research. Do not include the amount of compensation, (e.g., compensation available).

Note: Please answer each question. If the question does not pertain to this study, please type not applicable (N/A).

PART E: RESEARCH PLAN

Include sufficient detail for IRB review of this project independent of the grant, protocol, or other documents.

13. Describe the flow of events used in this research protocol. Include information from the first contact with the volunteers to the end of the study. Use a diagram or flow chart if appropriate. Also, include a description of the study procedures or tasks that participants will be exposed to or asked to complete. This information is intended to inform the committee of the procedures used in the study and their potential risk. Please do not respond with “see attached” or “not applicable.”

First, the store managers will be contacted by telephone. The PI will visit the stores where the managers are willing to allow their salespeople to volunteer to be interviewed. The PI will explain the purpose of the interviews to the salespeople and will schedule interviews with those salespeople who volunteer to participate. The PI will meet the interviewees at the specified location at the designated time and will notify the interviewees of their rights by both verbal introduction and through the written consent form. After the interviewees read and sign the consent form, they will be asked a series of questions from the attached interview schedule. With the interviewees’ permission, the interviews will be tape recorded. If the interviewees’ do not wish to be tape recorded, then extensive notes will be taken by the PI.

14. For studies involving pathology/diagnostic specimens, indicate whether specimens will be collected prospectively and/or already exist “on the shelf” at the time of submission of this review form. If prospective, describe specimen procurement procedures; indicate whether any additional medical information about the subject is being gathered, and whether specimens are linked at any time by code number to the subject’s identity. If this question is not applicable, please type N/A in the response cell.
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15. For studies involving deception, please justify the deception and indicate the debriefing procedure, including the timing and information to be presented to subjects. If this question is not applicable, please type N/A in the response cell.

PART F: CONSENT PROCESS

16. Describe the consent process for participants who are age 18 and older. If the consent process does not include documented consent, a waiver of documentation of consent must be requested.

The PI will give instructions to potential participants to read the consent form explaining the study and rights of participants. If the participants are interested in continuing with the interview, they will sign the consent form and the interview will begin. If they are not interested, the PI will thank the salespeople for their time and will leave the interview location.

17. If your study involves minors, please explain how parental consent will be obtained prior to enrollment of the minor(s).

PART G: DATA ANALYSIS

19. Describe how the data will be analyzed (e.g. statistical methodology, statistical evaluation, statistical measures used to evaluate results)

In cases in which the interviews were tape recorded, these interviews will be transcribed into a Word document by the PI. In cases in which notes were taken at the interviews, these notes will be re-typed into a Word document. These Word documents will then be read several times by the PI. The PI will highlight words and phrases within these documents that seem to be of theoretical or practical import. These words and phrases will then be categorized into themes, and these themes will be used to support or refute the existence of a relationship between salesperson appearance and employee-organization identification.
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20. If applicable, please indicate the anticipated date that identifiers will be removed from completed survey instruments and/or audio or visual tapes will be erased:

05/31/06   Month/Day/Year

PART II: BENEFITS

21. Describe the benefit to the volunteer from participating in this study, if any, and the benefit to society that will be gained from the study. Please note that monetary compensation is not considered a benefit.

This research may produce results that may enable salespeople to better select positions that will make them more satisfied with their work in the future. No other direct benefits to the participants are expected. This research may also help the retail industry better screen applicants for both longer term employment and greater satisfaction of employees.

PART I: RISKS

The concept of risk goes beyond physical risk and includes risks to subjects' dignity and self-respect as well as psychological, emotional, legal, social or financial risk.

22. □ Yes  ☒ No Is the probability of the harm or discomfort anticipated in the proposed research greater than that encountered ordinarily in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests?

23. □ Yes  ☒ No Is the magnitude of the harm or discomfort greater than that encountered ordinarily in daily life, or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests?

24. Describe any risks or discomforts to the subjects and how they will be minimized and precautions taken. Do not respond with N/A. If you believe that there will not be risk or discomfort to subjects you must explain why.

No risks are foreseen. However, the participants will be explained their rights and their ability to quit at any time both verbally and in the consent document, so, in the event of any discomfort, they can immediately stop completing the interview.

25. If this study involves vulnerable populations, including minors, pregnant women, prisoners, educationally or economically disadvantaged, what additional protections will be provided to minimize risks?

N/A
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PART J: COMPENSATION

26. □ Yes  ☒ No  Will subjects receive compensation for their participation? If yes, please explain.

Do not make the payment an inducement, only a compensation for expenses and inconvenience. If a person is to receive money or another token of appreciation for their participation, explain when it will be given and any conditions of full or partial payment. (E.g., volunteers will receive $5.00 for each of the five visits in the study or a total of $25.00 if he/she completes the study. If a participant withdraws from participation, they will receive $5.00 for each of the visits completed.) It is considered undue influence to make completion of the study the basis for compensation.

N/A

PART K: CONFIDENTIALITY

27. Describe below the methods that will be used to ensure the confidentiality of data obtained. For example, who has access to the data, where the data will be stored, security measures for web-based surveys and computer storage, how long data (specimens) will be retained, etc.

No interviewees, managers, or stores will be identified by name on the transcripts. The transcripts will be numbered and any reference to the managers or store names will be erased from the transcripts. Only the PI will have access to the original tape recordings of the interviews and the notes taken during the interviews. The faculty advisor may have access to the transcriptions of the interviews only after all potentially identifying information has been removed. The original tape recordings will be stored in a locked file cabinet until the end of the study period, at which time they will be erased. The electronic files for the transcripts will be stored on a 3.5" floppy disk, and this information will be erased at the completion of the study. The hard copies of the transcripts containing the highlighted words and phrases will be kept in a locked file cabinet, and these hard copies will be shredded at the completion of the study.

PART L: REGISTRY PROJECTS

To be considered a registry: (1) the individuals must have a common condition or demonstrate common responses to questions; (2) the individuals in the registry might be contacted in the future; and (3) the names/data of the individuals in the registry might be used by investigators other than the one maintaining the registry.

□ Yes  ☒ No  Does this project establish a registry?

If “yes,” please provide the registry name below.

N/A
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Checklist for Attachments

The following are attached (please check ones that are applicable):

☐ A copy of the informed consent document OR □ Letter of introduction to subjects containing the elements of consent
☐ A copy of the assent form if minors will be enrolled
☐ Letter of approval from cooperating organizations or institutions allowing you to conduct research at their facility
☒ Data-gathering instruments (including surveys)
☒ Recruitment fliers, phone scripts, or any other documents or materials the subjects will see

Two sets of materials should be submitted for each project – the original signed copy of the application form and one copy and two sets of accompanying materials. Federal regulations require that one copy of the grant application or proposal be submitted for comparison with the application for approval.

FOR IRB USE ONLY:

Initial action by the Institutional Review Board (IRB):

☐ Project approved. Date: 
☐ Pending further review. Date: 
☐ Project not approved. Date: 

Follow-up action by the IRB:

IRB Approval Signature

Date

SECTION III: ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AND SAFETY INFORMATION

☐ Yes ☒ No Does this project involve human cell or tissue cultures (primary OR immortalized), or human blood components, body fluids or tissues? If the answer is “no”, please proceed to SECTION III: APPLICATION FOR IRB APPROVAL. If the answer is “yes,” please proceed to Part A: Human Cell Lines.

PART A: HUMAN CELL LINES

☐ Yes ☒ No Does this project involve human cell or tissue cultures (primary OR immortalized cell lines/strains) that have been documented to be free of bloodborne pathogens? If the answer is “yes,” please attach copies of the documentation. If the answer is “no,” please answer question 1 below.
1) Please list the specific cell lines/strains to be used, their source and description of use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CELL LINE</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Add New Row

2) Please refer to the ISU "Bloodborne Pathogens Manual," which contains the requirements of the OSHA Bloodborne Pathogens Standard. Please list the specific precautions to be followed for this project below (e.g., retractable needles used for blood draws):

| N/A |

Anyone working with human cell lines/strains that have not been documented to be free of bloodborne pathogens is required to have Bloodborne Pathogen Training annually. Current Bloodborne Pathogen Training dates must be listed in Section I for all Key Personnel. Please contact Environmental Health and Safety (294-5359) if you need to sign up for training and/or to get a copy of the Bloodborne Pathogens Manual (http://www.ehs.iastate.edu/bs/bbp.htm).

PART B: HUMAN BLOOD COMPONENTS, BODY FLUIDS OR TISSUES

☐ Yes ☒ No Does this project involve human blood components, body fluids or tissues? If “yes”, please answer all of the questions in the “Human Blood Components, Body Fluids or Tissues” section.

1) Please list the specific human substances used, their source, amount and description of use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSTANCE</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.g., Blood</td>
<td>Normal healthy volunteers</td>
<td>2 ml</td>
<td>Approximate quantity, assays to be done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Add New Row

2) Please refer to the ISU "Bloodborne Pathogens Manual," which contains the requirements of the OSHA Bloodborne Pathogens Standard. Specific sections to be followed for this project are:

| N/A |
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Anyone working with human blood components, body fluids or tissues is required to have Bloodborne Pathogen Training annually. Current Bloodborne Pathogen Training dates must be listed in Section I for all Key Personnel. Please contact Environmental Health and Safety (294-5359) if you need to sign up for training and/or to get a copy of the Bloodborne Pathogens Manual (http://www.ehs.iastate.edu/bs/bbp.htm).

FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AND SAFETY USE ONLY

Signature of Biological Safety Officer

Date
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Phase 2 Human Subjects Application

**ISU NEW HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH FORM**

**SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Investigator (PI): Jennifer Yurchisin</th>
<th>Phone: 515-268-3127 (H) 952-381-7566 (C)</th>
<th>Fax: 515-294-6364</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degrees: B.S., M.A.</td>
<td>Correspondence Address: 4611 Mortensen Road, #315, Ames, IA, 50014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department: Apparel, Educational Studies, &amp; Hospitality Management</td>
<td>Email Address: <a href="mailto:jyurchis@iastate.edu">jyurchis@iastate.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center/Institute:</td>
<td>College: Human Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI Level: Faculty</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Postdoctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of Project: Apparel Salesperson-Retail Store Image Congruence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Period (Include Start and End Date): [mm/dd/yy][04/02/06] to [mm/yy/dd][07/01/06]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FOR STUDENT PROJECTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Major Professor/Supervising Faculty: Mary Lynn Damhorst</th>
<th>Signature of Major Professor/Supervising Faculty:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 294-9919</td>
<td>Campus Address: 31 MacKay Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department: Apparel, Educational Studies, and Hospitality Management</td>
<td>Email Address: <a href="mailto:mldmhrst@iastate.edu">mldmhrst@iastate.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Project: (check all that apply)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Research</td>
<td>☐ Thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Independent Study (490, 590, Honors project)</td>
<td>☐ Other. Please specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY PERSONNEL**

List all members and relevant experience of the project personnel. This information is intended to inform the committee of the training and background related to the specific procedures that the each person will perform on the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME &amp; DEGREE(S)</th>
<th>SPECIFIC DUTIES ON PROJECT</th>
<th>TRAINING &amp; EXPERIENCE RELATED TO PROCEDURES PERFORMED, DATE OF TRAINING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Yurchisin, B.S., M.A.</td>
<td>Principal Investigator; will collect data, perform statistical analysis,</td>
<td>ISU Human Subjects Training, 08/21/04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Compliance 04/10/03


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>and write up results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Add New Row

**FUNDING INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internally funded, please provide account number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Externally funded, please provide funding source and account number:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding is pending please provide OSPA Record ID on GoldSheet:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title on GoldSheet if Different Than Above:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: e.g., funding will be applied for later.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCIENTIFIC REVIEW**

Although the compliance committees are not intended to conduct peer review of research proposals, the federal regulations include language such as “consistent with sound research design,” “rationale for involving animals or humans” and “scientifically valuable research,” which requires that the committees consider in their review the general scientific relevance of a research study. Proposals that do not meet these basic tests are not justifiable and cannot be approved. If a compliance review committee(s) has concerns about the scientific merit of a project and the project was not competitively funded by peer review or was funded by corporate sponsors, the project may be referred to a scientific review committee. The scientific review committee will be ad hoc and will consist of your ISU peers and outside experts as needed. If this situation arises, the PI will be contacted and given the option of agreeing that a consultant may be contacted or withdrawing the proposal from consideration.

☐ Yes ☑ No Has or will this project receive peer review?

If the answer is “yes,” please indicate who did or will conduct the review:

If a review was conducted, please indicate the outcome of the review:

**NOTE: RESPONSE CELLS WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE AND PROVIDE SUFFICIENT SPACE FOR YOUR RESPONSE.**

**COLLECTION OR RECEIPT OF SAMPLES**

Will you be: (Please check all that apply.)

☐ Yes ☑ No Receiving samples from outside of ISU? See examples below.

☐ Yes ☑ No Sending samples outside of ISU? See examples below.

Examples include: genetically modified organisms, body fluids, tissue samples, blood samples, pathogens.
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If you will be receiving samples from or sending samples outside of ISU, please identify the name of the outside organization(s) and the identity of the samples you will be sending or receiving outside of ISU:

Please note that some samples may require a USDA Animal Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) permit, a USPHS Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Import Permit for Etiologic Agents, a Registration for Select Agents, High Consequence Livestock Pathogens and Toxins or Listed Plant Pathogens, or a Material Transfer Agreement (MTA) (http://www.ehs.iastate.edu/bs/shipping.htm).

SECTION II: APPLICATION FOR INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB) APPROVAL

☐ Yes ☐ No Does this project involve human research participants? If the answer “no” is checked, you will automatically moves to a question regarding the involvement of radiation producing devices in your project.

SECTION III: ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AND SAFETY INFORMATION (EH&S)

☐ Yes ☒ No Does this project involve laboratory chemicals, human cell lines or tissue culture (primary OR immortalized), or human blood components, body fluid or tissues? If the answer is “no” is checked you will automatically move to a question regarding the involvement of human research participants in your project.

ASSURANCE

- I certify that the information provided in this application is complete and accurate and consistent with any proposal(s) submitted to external funding agencies.
- I agree to provide proper surveillance of this project to ensure that the rights and welfare of the human subject or welfare of animal subjects are protected. I will report any problems to the appropriate compliance review committee(s).
- I agree that I will not begin this project until receipt of official approval from all appropriate committee(s).
- I agree that modifications to the originally approved project will not take place without prior review and approval by the appropriate committee(s), and that all activities will be performed in accordance with all applicable federal, state, local and Iowa State University policies.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

A conflict of interest can be defined as a set of conditions in which an investigator’s or key personnel’s judgment regarding a project (including human or animal subject welfare, integrity of the research) may be influenced by a secondary interest (e.g., the proposed project and/or a relationship with the sponsor). ISU’s Conflict of Interest Policy requires that investigators and key personnel provide a complete representation of their interests and responsibilities related to the project.
personnel disclose any significant financial interests or relationships that may present an actual or potential conflict of interest. By signing this form below, you are certifying that all members of the research team, including yourself, have read and understand ISU’s Conflict of Interest policy as addressed by the ISU Faculty Handbook (http://www.provost.iastate.edu/faculty ) and have made all required disclosures.

☐ Yes  ☒ No  Do you or any member of your research team have an actual or potential conflict of interest?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  If yes, have the appropriate disclosure form(s) been completed?

SIGNATURES

Signature of Principal Investigator  Date

Signature of Department Chair  Date

PLEASE NOTE: Any changes to an approved protocol must be submitted to the appropriate committee(s) before the changes may be implemented.

Please proceed to SECTION II.

Research Compliance 04/10/03
SECTION II: IRB SECTION - STUDY SPECIFIC INFORMATION

STUDY OBJECTIVES

Briefly explain in language understandable to a layperson the specific aim(s) of the study.

This project seeks to determine if apparel salespeople feel better about their jobs (i.e., are more involved with their jobs, are more satisfied with their jobs, and perform better in their jobs) if they identify with the apparel retail stores that they work for. Employee-organization identification is said to occur when employees use the same attributes that contribute to their employment organization’s identity to describe aspects of their own identity. In other words, employee-organization identification occurs in an apparel retail store setting when the salespeople’s self-images are consistent with the apparel retail store’s image. By investigating whether and to what extent employee-organization identification is related to job involvement, job satisfaction, and job performance in an apparel retail store setting, apparel retail store managers can implement strategies to increase employee-organization identification and, consequently, job involvement, job satisfaction, and job performance among their salespeople. This project will be done via a survey methodology where we will target apparel salespeople who are 18+ years old. In the survey we will ask the respondents about their perception of the ‘personality’ of the store they work in and to what degree they believe their own personality is (dis)similar to that of the store’s personality. Participants will also be asked to indicate their level of identification with the store, their level of involvement with their job, their satisfaction with that job, and their perceptions of their performance in their current job. Through analysis, we can determine whether a relationship exists between employee-organization identification and job involvement, job satisfaction, and job performance among apparel salespeople. We suspect that the greater the identification, the greater the salespeople’s involvement with, satisfaction with, and performance in their jobs.

BENEFIT

Explain in language understandable to a layperson how the information gained in this study will benefit participants or the advancement of knowledge, and/or serve the good of society.

If it were shown that relationships existed between employee-organization identification and job involvement, job satisfaction, and job performance in an apparel retail store setting, apparel salespeople could use this information to better select positions that would make them feel better about their work in the future. Additionally, the information gleaned from this study could help individuals in the retail industry better screen applicants for greater involvement, greater satisfaction, and better performance. Thus, understanding the relationships that exist between employee-organization identification, job involvement, job satisfaction, and job performance would be of both practical and theoretical interest.

PART A: PROJECT INVOLVEMENT

1) ☐ Yes ☒ No Is this project part of a Training, Center, Program Project Grant?
   
   Director Name: Overall IRB ID:
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2) ☐ Yes ☒ No  Is the purpose of this project to develop survey instruments?

3) ☐ Yes ☒ No  Does this project involve an investigational new drug (IND)? Number:

4) ☐ Yes ☒ No  Does this project involve an investigational device exemption (IDE)? Number:

5) ☐ Yes ☒ No  Does this project involve existing data or records?

6) ☐ Yes ☒ No  Does this project involve secondary analysis?

7) ☐ Yes ☒ No  Does this project involve pathology or diagnostic specimens?

8) ☐ Yes ☒ No  Does this project require approval from another institution? Please attach letters of approval.

9) ☐ Yes ☒ No  Does this project involve DEXA/CT scans or X-rays?

**PART B: MEDICAL HEALTH INFORMATION OR RECORDS**

1) ☐ Yes ☒ No  Does your project require the use of a health care provider's records concerning past, present, or future physical, dental, or mental health information about a subject? The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act established the conditions under which protected health information may be used or disclosed for research purposes. If your project will involve the use of any past or present clinical information about someone, or if you will add clinical information to someone's treatment record (electronic or paper) during the study you must complete and submit the Application for Use of Protected Health Information.

**PART C: ANTICIPATED ENROLLMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated number of subjects contacted to reach required enrollment:</th>
<th>300</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of subjects to be enrolled in the study</td>
<td>Total: 250  Males: 75  Females: 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check if any enrolled subjects are:</td>
<td>Check below if this project involves either:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Minors (Under 18)</td>
<td>☒ Adults, non-students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Range of Minors:</td>
<td>☐ Minor ISU students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Pregnant Women/Fetuses</td>
<td>☐ ISU students 18 and older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Cognitively Impaired</td>
<td>☐ Other (explain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Prisoners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List estimated percent of the anticipated enrollment that will be minorities if known: Not known</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian:</td>
<td>Alaskan Native:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander:</td>
<td>Black or African American:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino or Hispanic:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PART D: SUBJECT SELECTION

Please use additional space as necessary to adequately answer each question.

11. Explain the procedures for selecting subjects including any inclusion/exclusion criteria (i.e., *Where will the names come from? Will a sample be purchased, will ads, fliers, word of mouth, email list, etc. be used?*).

The managers of several local retail stores will be contacted via telephone by the PI. The study will be explained to them, and they will be asked if they would be willing to have their salespeople volunteer to participate in the survey (see attached phone script). With the managers' permission, individual salespeople will be contacted directly by the PI, who will enter the store at a date and time specified by the manager, introduce herself and the study, and request the participation of the salespeople in the survey. All participants will be notified of their rights by both verbal introduction and through the instructions at the beginning of each survey (see attached salesperson recruitment script and informed consent form).

12. Attach a copy of any recruitment telephone scripts or materials such as ad, fliers, e-mail messages, etc. Recruitment material must include a statement of the voluntary and confidential nature of the research. Do not include the amount of compensation, (e.g., compensation available).

**Note:** Please answer each question. If the question does not pertain to this study, please type not applicable (N/A).

PART E: RESEARCH PLAN

Include sufficient detail for IRB review of this project independent of the grant, protocol, or other documents.

13. Describe the flow of events used in this research protocol. Include information from the first contact with the volunteers to the end of the study. Use a diagram or flow chart if appropriate. Also, include a description of the study procedures or tasks that participants will be exposed to or asked to complete. This information is intended to inform the committee of the procedures used in the study and their potential risk. Please do not respond with “see attached” or “not applicable.”

First, the store managers will be contacted by telephone. The PI will visit the stores where the managers are willing to allow their salespeople to volunteer to be surveyed. Written permission will be acquired from the managers (see attached manager consent form). The PI will explain the purpose of the survey to the salespeople and will ask the salespeople to volunteer to participate. The PI will notify those salespeople who agree to participate in the study of their rights by both verbal introduction and through the written consent form. After the participants read and sign the consent form, they will be asked to complete the questionnaire (see attached questionnaire). Participants will be given time to complete the questionnaire during their breaks or over their lunch hour. After they complete the questionnaire, they will be asked to seal their questionnaire in an envelope. The PI will return
at the end of the day to retrieve the envelopes containing the completed questionnaires. The PI will randomly assign a code to each completed questionnaire before data entry and analysis begins.

14. For studies involving pathology/diagnostic specimens, indicate whether specimens will be collected prospectively and/or already exist “on the shelf” at the time of submission of this review form. If prospective, describe specimen procurement procedures; indicate whether any additional medical information about the subject is being gathered, and whether specimens are linked at any time by code number to the subject’s identity. If this question is not applicable, please type N/A in the response cell.

N/A

15. For studies involving deception, please justify the deception and indicate the debriefing procedure, including the timing and information to be presented to subjects. If this question is not applicable, please type N/A in the response cell.

N/A

PART F: CONSENT PROCESS

16. Describe the consent process for participants who are age 18 and older. If the consent process does not include documented consent, a waiver of documentation of consent must be requested.

The PI will give instructions to potential participants to read the consent form explaining the study and rights of participants. If the participants are interested in continuing with the survey, they will sign the consent form and they will complete the questionnaire. If a potential participant is not interested, the PI will thank the salesperson for his or her time and will not pursue the individual further.

17. If your study involves minors, please explain how parental consent will be obtained prior to enrollment of the minor(s).

N/A

18. Please explain how assent will be obtained from minors (younger than 18 years of age), prior to their enrollment. Also, please explain if the assent process will be documented (e.g., a simplified version of the consent form, combined with the parental informed consent document).

According to the federal regulations, "...means a child’s affirmative agreement to participate in research. Mere failure to object should not, absent affirmative agreement, be construed as assent."

N/A

PART G: DATA ANALYSIS
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19. Describe how the data will be analyzed (e.g. statistical methodology, statistical evaluation, statistical measures used to evaluate results)

The envelopes containing the completed questionnaires will be randomly ordered and then unsealed by the PI. The PI will assign each questionnaire a unique code and will enter the data from the questionnaire into an SPSS file. This file will be stored on a 3.5” floppy disk. When all the data has been entered, SPSS will be used to obtain descriptive statistics about the sample population and to factor analyze the data. The factors for each variable will then be used to create a structural equation model using the AMOS statistical software package.

20. If applicable, please indicate the anticipated date that identifiers will be removed from completed survey instruments and/or audio or visual tapes will be erased:

07/01/06   Month/Day/Year

PART H: BENEFITS

21. Describe the benefit to the volunteer from participating in this study, if any, and the benefit to society that will be gained from the study. Please note that monetary compensation is not considered a benefit.

This research may produce results that may enable salespeople to better select positions that will make them feel good about their work in the future. No other direct benefits to the participants are expected. This research may also help the retail industry better screen applicants for greater job involvement, greater job satisfaction, and better job performance. These factors are all related to employee turnover, so hiring salespeople who will be more likely to remain employed for an extended period of time will benefit both the employers and the employees.

PART I: RISKS

The concept of risk goes beyond physical risk and includes risks to subjects' dignity and self-respect as well as psychological, emotional, legal, social or financial risk.

22. □ Yes  X No  Is the probability of the harm or discomfort anticipated in the proposed research greater than that encountered ordinarily in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests?

23. □ Yes  X No  Is the magnitude of the harm or discomfort greater than that encountered ordinarily in daily life, or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests?
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24. Describe any risks or discomforts to the subjects and how they will be minimized and precautions taken. Do not respond with N/A. If you believe that there will not be risk or discomfort to subjects you must explain why.

No risks are foreseen. However, the participants will have their rights and their ability to quit at any time explained both verbally and in the consent document. In the event of any discomfort, they may immediately stop completing the questionnaire.

25. If this study involves vulnerable populations, including minors, pregnant women, prisoners, educationally or economically disadvantaged, what additional protections will be provided to minimize risks?

N/A

PART J: COMPENSATION

26. □ Yes [X] No Will subjects receive compensation for their participation? If yes, please explain.

Do not make the payment an inducement, only a compensation for expenses and inconvenience. If a person is to receive money or another token of appreciation for their participation, explain when it will be given and any conditions of full or partial payment. (E.g., volunteers will receive $5.00 for each of the five visits in the study or a total of $25.00 if he/she completes the study. If a participant withdraws from participation, they will receive $5.00 for each of the visits completed.) It is considered undue influence to make completion of the study the basis for compensation.

N/A

PART K: CONFIDENTIALITY

27. Describe below the methods that will be used to ensure the confidentiality of data obtained. For example, who has access to the data, where the data will be stored, security measures for web-based surveys and computer storage, how long data (specimens) will be retained, etc.

No salespeople, managers, or stores will be identified by name on the questionnaires. Upon completion, participants will place their questionnaires in a sealed envelope. This envelope will be randomly ordered and then unsealed to allow for entry of data into a computer file by the researcher. Each questionnaire will be assigned a unique code which will be used during data analysis. Only the principal investigator will have access to the questionnaires. The original questionnaires will be stored in a locked file cabinet until the end of the study period. Once all information from the questionnaires has been entered into the computer file, the original questionnaires will be destroyed. During data analysis, the electronic data from the questionnaires will be stored on a 3.5" floppy disk, and this information will be erased at the completion of the study. If the results are published, the identity of the participant and the store will remain confidential.
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PART L: REGISTRY PROJECTS

To be considered a registry: (1) the individuals must have a common condition or demonstrate common responses to questions; (2) the individuals in the registry might be contacted in the future; and (3) the names/data of the individuals in the registry might be used by investigators other than the one maintaining the registry.

☐ Yes  ☒ No Does this project establish a registry?

If “yes,” please provide the registry name below.

N/A

Checklist for Attachments

The following are attached (please check ones that are applicable):

☐ A copy of the informed consent document OR ☐ Letter of introduction to subjects containing the elements of consent
☐ A copy of the assent form if minors will be enrolled
☐ Letter of approval from cooperating organizations or institutions allowing you to conduct research at their facility
☒ Data-gathering instruments (including surveys)
☒ Recruitment fliers, phone scripts, or any other documents or materials the subjects will see

Two sets of materials should be submitted for each project – the original signed copy of the application form and one copy and two sets of accompanying materials. **Federal regulations require that one copy of the grant application or proposal be submitted for comparison with the application for approval.**

FOR IRB USE ONLY:

Initial action by the Institutional Review Board (IRB):

☐ Project approved. Date: ________________________________
☐ Pending further review. Date: ________________________________
☐ Project not approved. Date: ________________________________

Follow-up action by the IRB:

__________________________________________________________________________________________ Date

IRB Approval Signature Date
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SECTION III: ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AND SAFETY INFORMATION

☐ Yes ☒ No Does this project involve human cell or tissue cultures (primary OR immortalized), or human blood components, body fluids or tissues? If the answer is “no”, please proceed to SECTION III: APPLICATION FOR IRB APPROVAL. If the answer is “yes,” please proceed to Part A: Human Cell Lines.

PART A: HUMAN CELL LINES

☐ Yes ☒ No Does this project involve human cell or tissue cultures (primary OR immortalized cell lines/strains) that have been documented to be free of bloodborne pathogens? If the answer is “yes,” please attach copies of the documentation. If the answer is “no,” please answer question 1 below.

1) Please list the specific cell lines/strains to be used, their source and description of use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CELL LINE</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Add New Row

2) Please refer to the ISU “Bloodborne Pathogens Manual,” which contains the requirements of the OSHA Bloodborne Pathogens Standard. Please list the specific precautions to be followed for this project below (e.g., retractable needles used for blood draws):

N/A

Anyone working with human cell lines/strains that have not been documented to be free of bloodborne pathogens is required to have Bloodborne Pathogen Training annually. Current Bloodborne Pathogen Training dates must be listed in Section I for all Key Personnel. Please contact Environmental Health and Safety (294-5359) if you need to sign up for training and/or to get a copy of the Bloodborne Pathogens Manual (http://www.ehs.iastate.edu/bs/bbp.htm).

PART B: HUMAN BLOOD COMPONENTS, BODY FLUIDS OR TISSUES

☐ Yes ☒ No Does this project involve human blood components, body fluids or tissues? If “yes”, please answer all of the questions in the “Human Blood Components, Body Fluids or Tissues” section.

1) Please list the specific human substances used, their source, amount and description of use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSTANCE</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E.g., Blood</th>
<th>Normal healthy volunteers</th>
<th>2 ml</th>
<th>Approximate quantity, assays to be done.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Add New Row

2) Please refer to the ISU "Bloodborne Pathogens Manual," which contains the requirements of the OSHA Bloodborne Pathogens Standard. Specific sections to be followed for this project are:

| N/A |

Anyone working with human blood components, body fluids or tissues is required to have Bloodborne Pathogen Training annually. Current Bloodborne Pathogen Training dates must be listed in Section I for all Key Personnel. Please contact Environmental Health and Safety (294-5359) if you need to sign up for training and/or to get a copy of the Bloodborne Pathogens Manual (http://www.ehs.iastate.edu/bs/bbp.htm).

FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AND SAFETY USE ONLY

______________________________  __________________________
Signature of Biological Safety Officer  Date
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APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. Approximately how long have you worked for this retailer?

2. Approximately how many hours do you work at this retail job each week?

3. Are you satisfied with the number of hours that you work there each week? Are you satisfied with the particular days of the week and times of day that you are typically scheduled?

4. What type of store discount do you receive at this retail job? How often do you purchase new items from this store? Did you shop at this store before you were employed here? Why or why not?

5. What are your major responsibilities/duties in your current position at this retail job?

6. Do you consider your current position to be more of a temporary job or more of a step in your career path? Why? Are there any other retailers that you might like to work for in the future? Are there any other retailers that you definitely would not want to work for in the future? Why?

7. Thinking back to when you first started, what made you decide to start working for this retailer?

8. How would you describe the image of this retailer? What are some words you would use to describe the store where you currently work?

9. In general, would you say that you are satisfied your current job? Why or why not?

10. Do you feel like you identify with this retailer as your employment organization? Do you feel like you fit in with the other employees? Do you feel like you fit in with the store’s image? Why?

11. On a daily basis, what are some of the things that you consider when you are dressing for work?

12. Is there a formal dress code? If so, what is it? If not, what do you think the store expects of you in terms of what you wear?

13. How did you learn about the dress code/what is expected of you at this store?

14. In general, do you like what you wear to work? Why or why not?
15. Have you ever worked anywhere else before? Have you changed the way you dress from the last position that you had to the position that you have now? Why?

16. Tell me about situations or times in the store when you have felt really good about the way you dressed at work. What was the situation? Why did you feel good?

17. Tell me about the situations or times in the store when you felt uncomfortable about the way you were dressed at work. What was the situation? Why did you feel uncomfortable?

18. Do you think the apparel items you wear to work are similar to the ones that you wear when you go other places or do other things? Why?

19. What words would you use to describe yourself? How do you know that these words accurately describe you?

20. To what extent do you think an individual salesperson’s personality traits are communicated through his or her dress or appearance? What do you think an individual salesperson’s appearance conveys about the store as a whole?

21. Do you think your perception of yourself has changed since you started working for this retailer? Why or why not?
Demographic Questionnaire

Please answer the following demographic questions.

1. Gender: _____ Male _____ Female

2. Age: _____ years

3. Ethnicity:
   _____ White/Caucasian _____ African-American
   _____ Hispanic/Latino(a) _____ Asian-American
   _____ Other (please specify: ____________________)

4. Education level:
   _____ Less than high school _____ College graduate
   _____ High school graduate _____ Some graduate school
   _____ Some college _____ Completed graduate school

5. Marital status:
   _____ Married _____ Never married
   _____ Widowed _____ Divorced/Separated
   _____ Domestic partnership
APPENDIX C: ITEMS FOR THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Store Image

Employee Service
Store name employees are very friendly.
The service at store name is excellent.
I am pleased with the service I receive at store name.

Product Quality
Store name sells only high quality products.
I like store name brand products.
I can count on the products I buy at store name being excellent.

Product Selection
Store name has a large variety of products.
Everything I need is at store name.
Store name carries many national brands.

Atmosphere
The appearance of store name is appealing.
Store name is always dirty.
Store name is old-fashioned.

Convenience
Store name is easily accessible.
Store name is convenient.
It is easy to get into the store.

Prices/Value
The prices at store name are fair.
I obtain value for my money at store name.
I can buy products for less at store name.
**Person-Organization Fit**

To what degree does your personality ‘match’ or fit this organization?  
To what degree does your personality prevent you from ‘fitting in’ this organization because it is different from the personality of this organization?  
Do you think the personality of this organization reflects your own personality?

**Attractiveness**

I feel I fit in the organization.  
I would feel at home working for an organization like this.  
I would very much like to work for this organization.  
This organization will likely meet my desires and needs.  
If I were waiting for offers from three other firms, I still would be pleased with my decision to accept this organization’s offer right now.  
Something about the organization compels me to work there.

**Identification**

When someone criticizes (name of store), it feels like a personal insult.  
I am very interested in what others think about (name of store).  
When I talk about this store, I usually say “we” rather than “they.”  
This store’s successes are my successes.  
When someone praises this store, it feels like a personal compliment.  
If a story in the media criticized the store, I would feel embarrassed.

**Job Involvement**

I am very much personally involved in my job.  
Most of my personal life goals are job-oriented.  
Most of my interests are centered around my job.  
I consider my job to be very central to my existence.
I like to be absorbed in my job most of the time.
The most important things that happen to me involve my job.
To me, my job is only a small part of who I am.
Usually I feel detached from my job.
I live, eat and breathe my job.
I have very strong ties with my present jobs which would be very difficult to break.

**Job Performance**

**Merchandise Procedure Ability**
Employee accuracy in counting and inventorying merchandise.
Prevents merchandise shrinkage due to mishandling of merchandise.
Keeps merchandise in a neat and orderly manner on sales floor.
Gets merchandise on sales floor (shelves, racks, displays) quickly after merchandise arrival.
Knows the design and specifications of warranties and guarantees of the merchandise groups.

**Customer Service Ability**
Provides courteous service to customers.
Handles customers’ complaints and/or service problems as indicated by store procedure.
Follows proper procedures concerning merchandise returns and lay-aways when conducted through credit transactions.
Suggests add-ons or complimentary merchandise to customers.

**Sales Ability**
Has strong ability to close the sale.
Promotes sales of merchandise items having profit margins.
Acts as a resource to other departments or other salespeople needing assistance.
Works well with fellow workers in primary merchandise department.

**Product-Merchandise Knowledge**
Knowledge of design, style, and construction of merchandise group.
Knowledge of special promotions and/or advertised sale items.
Knowledge of material (fabric), color coordination, and complimentary accessories related to merchandise group.

Provides accurate and complete paperwork related to work schedules.

**Knowledge of Store Policy**

Provides accurate and complete paperwork related to work schedules.

Provides accurate and complete paperwork for cash and credit transactions.

Shows up on time for work, sales meetings, and training sessions.

Accurately follows day-to-day instructions of immediate supervisor.

Employee’s overall job-related attitude.

---

**Job Satisfaction**

**Extrinsic Job Satisfaction**

Given the work I do, I feel that I am not paid fairly.

The benefits (insurance, medical, etc.) provided by the retailer I work for are not satisfactory.

I am relatively well rewarded financially for my work.

I am satisfied with the amount of my pay for being a retail store employee.

I am satisfied with my working conditions.

**Intrinsic Job Satisfaction**

I feel a sense of pride and accomplishment as a result of the type of work I do.

My job offers me a career path that I am pleased with.

My job performance improves from year to year.

I very much like the type of work I am doing.

---

**Demographics**

Gender

Ethnicity

Age

Education level
Student status
Marital status
Work status
Length of employment in current store
Current position in the store
Annual income
Type of store where working
Average price point for merchandise in the store