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The situational self-image, which recognizes the affect of situational influences, particularly social roles, was the specific topic of investigation of this study. It has generally been hypothesized in marketing literature that consumers will purchase the brand with the image most congruent with the consumers' self-image. Symbolic Interactionism, a field of study in sociology, provides the theoretical foundations for the construct situational self-image. Realization of the relationship between the situational self-consciousness and involvement was also investigated.

A convenience sample of 235 college students was the basis of the investigation. A three-part survey, administered over a five-week period, was employed to obtain measures of purchase intention, public and private self-consciousness and various brand-images and self-images. The instrument was developed using the results of prior research and several pretests.

In order to analyze the data, several techniques were employed, including a number of tests from nonparametric
statistics. One-way analysis of variance was employed, with resulting F tests. Several t-tests and chi-square tests with Yates' correction were also performed. When proportions were tested, the Binomial test was computed. The McNemar test was also applied.

In general, the situational self-image clearly demonstrated its potential usefulness for marketing communication strategy. For a majority of the situations tested, the situational self-image was more closely congruent to the image of the chosen brand than the other brands involved in the test. In addition, when compared with the real and ideal self-images, the situational self-image had a greater level of image congruency with the chosen brand in a specified product usage situation.

Although two of the moderator variables, namely involvement and public self-consciousness, did not produce significant results when tested for possible interactive effect on the product choice, they were both considered viable variables for other research in the area. Private self-consciousness demonstrated some interesting results when tested with image scores.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This research explored the application of the concept of situational self-image to marketing strategy. The self-image, or self-concept, has been analyzed as an important variable in marketing research in many forms. However, the situational self-image is a relatively new perspective in the study of self-images, and previously unexplored in marketing research. In addition, related topics were also studied as theories, or concepts from the field of symbolic interactionism were incorporated into the research design. Symbolic interactionism gave theoretical credence to the concept of situational self-image.

Other topics analyzed included product symbolism (a necessary precursor to the study of brand-image/self-image congruency), product involvement and self-consciousness. The latter two concepts were considered to be important moderator variables in the brand-image/situational self-image issue.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the degree of image congruence between the situational self-image and
brand-images. The effects of involvement and self-consciousness were also considered.

This study drew on two theoretical fields, one from the marketing literature, the other from sociology. First, the area of brand image/self-image congruency has been actively analyzed in marketing research. Second, the perspective of symbolic interactionism, as looked at from a sociological point of view, can give valuable insight into consumer behavior concerning image congruency.

This research attempted to demonstrate that brands are symbols, or props, which consumers choose according to the roles the consumers are to play in a particular situation. In different situations, confronted with different roles to play, the consumer will reportedly choose different brands. The brand chosen will be the one with the image that best matches the image the consumer intends to portray in that situation. It was believed by this author that the brand with the image that best matches the situational self-image influences the individual’s decision-making regarding his/her purchase of that brand.

The construct of situation self-image has yet to be empirically explored. Although Schenk and Holman (1980) presented the concept of situational self-image, it had not been empirically tested. In general, marketers have traditionally studied the effects of products and objects on
consumer behavior and have ignored the effects that the situation has on how the object is perceived and used. This study attempted to bridge this deficiency.

The effect of product involvement on brand choice will also be examined as a covariant. There has been research concerning involvement and product choice, but none has explored self-image and involvement in relation to brand choice. It was felt that product involvement would have considerable influence on the image congruency issue and, therefore, was deemed a valuable issue in this research.

The influence of self-consciousness on self-image/brand-image congruency was also be explored. In the past, Sirgy (1982) has claimed that moderator variables in self-image studies have been void of theory. This is not true of self-consciousness. In addition, although self-consciousness is recognized as a precursor to self-image development by social psychologists, its effects have seldom been studied in marketing research.

The findings of this study will contribute to a better understanding of the relationship between the situation, the self-image, and purchasing behavior. Additionally, insight is provided into the potential contribution of the concepts of self-consciousness and product involvement to the congruency issues. The findings will add to the growing body of knowledge in consumer behavior.
Major Concepts

The major concepts, relevant to this study, to be introduced and discussed will be product symbolism, the situational self-image, symbolic interactionism, role theory, self-consciousness, and involvement.

The concept of product symbolism was considered in this study because of its inherent importance to the brand-image/self-image congruency issue. It will be shown in this section that from the initial conception of product symbolism the brand-image/self-image congruency theory eventually evolved.

Since the major concern of this research was the potential relevance of the situational self-image to consumer behavior research, it is important that the concept be introduced and developed. Therefore, not only will the construct situational self-image be discussed, but also its theoretical basis, symbolic interactionism. It is hoped that by first discussing the concept of situational self-image and then looking at its theoretical foundation, a clearer insight into the potential strength of this concept will be developed.

Role theory is a subunit of symbolic interactionism. It is felt that a brief discussion of this theoretical framework will help provide additional insight to the reader as well as provide a theoretical foundation for the study.
Self-consciousness and product involvement are introduced here because they will be involved in the study as moderator variables. Each of these constructs was deemed important to the overall understanding of brand-image/situational self-image congruency issues. Self-consciousness is being considered because it is recognized that not all consumers' purchases are dramatically affected by the situation in which the consumers find themselves. In addition, not all product categories will be affected as substantially by situational influences. Therefore, product involvement will be studied as a possible influencing factor.

**Product Symbolism**

In the late 1940's and 1950's, researchers in the field of marketing grew increasingly interested in the ideas and methods of the behavioral sciences. An outgrowth of this interest was the development of the concept of product symbolism.

The conception of the notion of products as symbols was introduced in the mid-1950's and has been widely discussed (Gardner and Levy 1955, Levy 1959). In early work on consumer behavior, Tucker clarified the concept of product symbolism by stating, "... there has long been an implicit concept that consumers can be defined in terms of either the products they acquire or use in terms of the meaning
products have for them or their attitudes of those products" (Tucker 1957, p. 139).

Brands, therefore, have value as symbols, and such symbols can be used by consumers to convey meaning to others. The notion of products as symbols can thereby help explain why consumers prefer certain brands when, in fact, the products in the category are virtually identical.

Actually, the idea of products as symbols is a well developed idea that can be traced back at least as far as Veblen and his concept of conspicuous consumption. Veblen very clearly states that products are purchased and consumed to make a statement to others (Veblen 1899).

Evolving from this idea of products as symbols is the idea that individuals use products as symbols to express something about themselves (Grubb and Hupp 1968, Grubb and Stern 1971). An individual strives to sustain and enhance his/her self-image in order to maintain a harmonious and internally consistent self (Festinger 1954). Therefore, a product that is perceived as fitting an individual's self-image has a greater probability of being selected than one that is not. One would like to own products which are congruent with one's self-image. Consequently, one's self-image influences the brands one selects. The types of houses people live in, the cars they drive, the clothes they wear, the food they eat, all these specific goal-objectives
are often chosen because symbolically they reflect the individual's own self-image (Grubb and Stern 1971).

It has been formally proposed that, "... the consuming behavior of an individual will be directed toward the furthering and enhancing of his self-concept through the consumption of goods as symbols" (Grubbs and Grathwohl 1967, p. 58). Products as symbols are self-enhancing because their purchase and use will sustain and improve the individual's self-concept as a result of being viewed positively by those around the individual. Also, their purchase and use are means for getting the desired reactions from other people (Levy 1959a). Ultimately, this notion of a consumer choosing the product which will best match his/her self-image has become known as the self-concept congruity hypothesis. The self-image is perceived to affect product choice and, ultimately, brand choice, because, theoretically, the consumer will choose the brand which best expresses his/her self-image.

Therefore, the self-concept, or self-image, has long been of interest to marketing researchers. More recent studies have found that the relationship between brand and self-image is somewhat more complicated because a consumer's self-image changes with the situation. This fact has led to interest in the situational self-image which will be discussed in the following section.
Situational Self-Image

The situational self-image is a relatively new variation of the self-image in marketing literature. It is a new addition to the list of self-images studied by marketers in an attempt to better understand consumer behavior. However, it is proposed here that this more specific construct, the situational self-image, could be of most relevance to marketing research and strategy.

Although the self-concept has been of theoretical interest for centuries by social scientists, it wasn't until the 1940's that the self-concept became a common research concern in any discipline (Lauer and Handel 1977). Carl Rogers, an early and leading advocate of self theory, has proposed the following definition of self:

... it may be thought of as an organized configuration of perceptions of the self which are admissible to awareness. It's composed of such elements as the perceptions of one's characteristics and abilities; the percepts and concepts of the self in relation to others and the environment; the value of qualities which are perceived as associated with experiences and objects; and goals and ideas which are perceived as having positive or negative valence (Rogers 1951, p. 17).

Interactionists, based on the writings of Mead, Cooley, and others, have attempted to explain the conception the individual has of him/herself in terms of his/her interaction with others. Agreement seems to have been reached on the following definition: "The self-concept is
that organization of qualities that the individual attributes to himself" (Kinch 1963, p. 481). It should be noted that the word "qualities" is used in a very broad sense to include both the attributes that the individual might use to express him/herself and the roles the individual sees him/herself in. In very general terms, the basic ideas of the interactionist theory of self concept have been stated in a single sentence: "The individual's conception of himself emerges from social interaction and, in turn, guides or influences the behavior of that individual" (Kinch 1963, p. 482).

As early as 1892, William James, a pioneer in symbolic interactionism, said a man has, ". . . as many different social selves as there are distinct groups of persons about whose opinion he cares" (Gergen 1971, p. 16). It has been asserted by social psychologists that along with a multitude of different roles each individual has a multitude of self-concepts in various stages of development (Gergen 1971). Actually, not only have the social psychologists recognized "multiple selves," which vary depending on the social context with which the self is in interaction, but they also coined the term "situational self" (Chadwich-Jones 1976).

Social psychologists have recognized that the self-concept is indeed complex and is a product of social
interaction and the situation. The self-concept is thus both general and situationally specific. Self-concepts both arise out of interaction and influence the course of interaction (Lauer and Handel 1977).

If one's attitudes towards self are indeed learned through interaction with others, then one's perception of self is colored by relationships, and by how others see one. Recent research has explored the construct of the self-monitoring of expressive behavior and self-presentation. The concept of self-monitoring considers self-observation and self-control as influenced by situational cues to social appropriateness (Snyder 1974). The process by which the self-concept is developed through social interaction may in part be seen as the assignment of the individual to various social roles. For each role occupied, the individual learns behaviors that others expect from the role, and develops an identity and self-concept in order to meet those expectations. Therefore, it is the expectations of significant others, or reference groups, that develop and reinforce the self-image. The family provides the background upon which an individual develops a self-concept during childhood. Other reference groups may become dominant in adult life, causing the self-concept to be reinforced or changed over time, a process that may cause changes in consumer behavior (Kinch
The individual protects and modifies his/her self-concept while interacting with others in the reference group. One form of social interaction is the consumption of products. Consumers communicate meaning to others when they buy and use products.

Numerous studies over several decades in marketing have dealt with the self-image and buying behavior. The conceptualization of the self-image has varied and has lacked consistency. Examples of self-concepts previously explored have been the actual or real self, the ideal self, the reference group self, and the looking glass self, among many others.

Schenk and Holman, using a symbolic interactionist perspective, have proposed the situational self-image as being a richer conception of self for marketing research.

Situational self-image is defined simply as the meaning of self that the individual wishes others to have of him/herself. This situation-specific image includes attitudes, perceptions and feelings the individual wishes other individuals in the situation to formulate about his/her character, and appropriate behavior (Schenk and Holman 1980, p. 612).

This definition clearly shows that situational self-image is a logical consequence of the propositions of symbolic interactionism.

Schenk and Holman argue that the situational self-image may offer an integrated and parsimonious approach to the
topic of self-concept and consumer behavior. The situational self-image is situation specific and takes into account the other self-image constructs (i.e., ideal-self, real-self, etc.).

In general, the concept of situational self-image has several advantages for marketing researchers over other conceptualizations of self-image. The first advantage is that the situational self-image accounts for the influence of the audience, to whom the self-image is expressed, on the image expression process. The situational self-image also includes a behavioral component which is derived from the desire of the individual to complete the plans formulated. In addition, the situational self-image acknowledges consumers have many self-images, and consumption of a particular brand may be highly congruent with a self-image in one situation and not in another and could account for seemingly incongruent purchasing patterns.

In summary, the individual has a repertoire of self-images which he/she displays depending on his/her own perception of others and his/her own role in a specific situation. An individual will display the self that best represents the image he/she wishes others to have of him/her in that situation. The individual's choice of which self in his/her repertoire to express is, therefore, influenced by
specific characteristics of a given situation, according to Schenk and Holman.

The individual will look for ways to express his/her desired image. One way the individual accomplishes this expression is through consumption behavior. As the self-image changes from one image to another then the preference for a particular product might also change to communicate the new self (O'Brien, Tapia and Brown 1977). Thus, products that are conspicuous, that have a high repurchase rate, or for which differentiated brands are available might be used by consumers to express self-image in a given situation (Sirgy 1982a).

Supporting the concept of situational self-image is the social identity theory (Festinger 1954). This theory states that people who are about to enter a situation attempt to determine the expression which is most likely to be rewarded in that particular situation. From the individual's repertoire of self-images he/she will project the one most likely to be rewarded. Therefore, images are not stable and can be manipulated to achieve positive outcomes.

Basically, consumers may see themselves as many things simultaneously, depending on the perspective taken (Rogers 1951). The interaction between the self-image and the brand-image is, very likely, situation specific; that is, the situation may heighten or lessen the degree to which a
brand would enhance an individual's self-image (Schenk and Holman 1980).

**Symbolic Interactionism**

As stated earlier, symbolic interactionism helped spawn the concept of situational self-image. The construct of situational self-image will be demonstrated to be a logical consequence of the propositions of symbolic interaction in the following brief review of this major sociological perspective.

Symbolic interactionism is one of the most prominent theoretical perspectives in sociology. The title "symbolic interactionism" was coined by Herber Blumer, a student of George Herbert Mead. Blumer is often noted as an important integrator and interpreter of the field, whereas Mead is the primary founder of the perspective. Other pioneers in the perspective of symbolic interactionism are John Dewey, William James, W. I. Thomas and Charles Cooley (Meltzer, Petras and Reynolds 1975, Charon 1979).

An understanding of the general principles of pragmatism, a central influence, serves as important insight into symbolic interactionism. The four general principles of pragmatism are as follows:

1. Truth is possible for the human being only through the individual's own intervention.
2. Knowledge for the human being is based on its usefulness.

3. Objects we encounter are defined according to their use for us. The meaning things have are determined by how we intend to use them.

4. Understanding about the human being must be inferred from what he or she does. (Charon 1979, p. 29).

Indeed, the basic premises of symbolic interactionism, as proposed by Meltzer, Petras and Reynolds (1975), are a logical deduction from those attributed to pragmatism. These authors state the premises of symbolic interactionism as follows:

1. Human beings act toward things on the basis of the meanings that the things have for them.

2. These meanings are a product of social interaction in human society.

3. These meanings are modified and handled through an interpretive process that is used by each person in dealing with the things he/she encounters. (Meltzer, Petras and Reynolds 1975, p. 27).

In short, human beings construct their reality in a process of interactionism with other human beings. It is through interaction with others that people learn how to view themselves and the world.

Symbolic interactionism focuses on the nature of the interaction and sees it as a dynamic social activity taking place between persons. As individuals interact they undergo change. "Interaction implies human beings acting in
relation to each other taking each other into account, acting, perceiving, interpreting, acting again" (Charon 1979, p. 23).

Both society and persons are seen as abstractions from ongoing social interaction. 'Selves' and 'society' have no reality apart from one another, or from the interpersonal interaction from which they are derived. Social structure creates social persons who (re)create social structure who ... ad infinitum (Stryker 1980, p. 53).

Another topic addressed in symbolic interactionism is perspectives. A perspective is one's ordered view of one's world, it is what we take for granted about what ought to be. Individuals use perspectives to define situations; perspectives are symbolic frameworks. In addition, "each individual has a multitude of perspectives. To know how a person will act in a situation we must know minimally which one of the individual's perspectives will be used. Thus, to some extent, inconsistency and contradictions characterize the human from situation to situation" (Charon 1979, p. 24).

On the topic of self-image, symbolic interactionism asserts at least three fundamental postulates:

1. A consumer's self-concept is based on perceptions of responses of others.

2. A consumer's self-concept functions to direct behavior.

3. A consumer's perception of the responses of others to some degree reflects those responses (Solomon 1983, p. 319).
The first two postulates have been empirically supported, while evidence for the third is mixed (Shrauger and Schoeneman 1979).

Symbolic interactionism focuses on the importance of symbols in understanding the relationship between people and society. Physical objects may become social objects, which are objects that have been given meaning. Social objects are constantly changing as they are redefined in interaction. Objects are given importance by humans. Objects do not change, but their definitions do. As we interact with others, objects take on meaning. An object may have many social meanings as it is defined according to its use, and uses may change.

Symbols are one class of social object. Not all social objects are symbols. Symbols are used and defined according to their use. Symbols are used for representation and stand for whatever people agree they stand for. In short, symbols are social objects used for representation and communication.

Symbols are defined as mental representations of objects and events with agreed upon social meanings (Duncan 1968). Symbols can be viewed as a stimulus with a learned meaning and value (Solomon 1983). Symbols are organized and evaluated within our frame of reference, or perspective. Consequently, there is potential ambiguity in how individuals see the world.
Therefore, situations are defined by the participants in the interaction. Objects, events and actions lack meaning until they are placed in a situational context and the content is constructed by the individuals interacting. Once the situation is defined, behavior appropriate to it becomes obvious to the participants (Ashworth 1979).

The importance of symbols and their development can be understood in the following statement:

Symbols acquire their meaning through the socialization process that begins in childhood. For this reason individuals with a common history of enculturation should exhibit considerable overlap in their interpretation of symbolic meanings. In other words, the ascribed meanings of many symbols possess a high degree of consensual validation. Cultural symbols are vital to the interpretation of social reality: they allow the role player to assign meaning to the world (Solomon 1983, p. 324).

In general, sociology is a rich field of study for the researcher in consumer behavior. Many times it has been recognized as being particularly applicable to consumer behavior research (Nicosia and Mayer 1976, Zaltman and Wallendorf 1977). Symbolic interactionism is particularly appropriate to the investigation of product symbolism.

There are several perspectives in sociology which are related and seem intermarried with symbolic interactionism. Some of these perspectives are labeling theory in the study of deviance, Erving Goffman's dramaturgical perspective, and role theory. The implications and importance of role theory
in this study are considerable. In different social situations individuals find themselves confronted with others with which to interact. The self-image the individuals choose to display will be closely associated with the role situation in which they perceive themselves to be involved. Therefore role theory will be explored next.

Role Theory

Role theory is a component of symbolic interactionism that deals with roles and positions in society. Positions are symbols of the various kinds of persons it is possible to be in a society. Positions are cues and predictors of behavior. By attaching a label to a person we are pre-determining his/her expected behavior. These expectations attached to a position are called roles (Biddle 1979). Sanctions are applied if one fails to meet the requirements of an assigned role (Stryker 1980).

Role taking occurs when an individual anticipates the attitudes of another and thus anticipates the other's behavior in order to react appropriately. Role taking is situational. "To 'define a situation' is to represent it to the self symbolically so that a response can be made" (Lauer and Handel 1977, p. 84).

When an individual plays at a role he or she may take on the appropriate aspects of that role (certain attitudes)
with the result that his or her opinion about something changes (Lauer and Handel 1977). Therefore, playing a role results in one modifying one's self.

An "identity" is a part of the self. One has an identity when others assign the same label to an individual that one has already assigned him/herself. An individual can have any number of identities, limited only by the number of structured role relationships one is involved in. All identities taken together comprise the self (Stryker 1980). "Role set" is a term used to define the set of interrelated roles enacted by one person (Vernon 1978).

Identities, or roles, may be hierarchical. The higher the identity is in the hierarchy the more likely it is to be invoked in a particular situation. The degree to which one is committed to a social identity determines the power of that identity to influence behavior.

The consumer is a social actor with a variety of role relationships, all of which are potential sources of influence. These influences may affect purchasing behavior. It has been proposed that role behavior is facilitated, or harmed, by the presence or absence of material symbols, or products, that have been culturally associated with a particular role (Solomon 1983).
Self Consciousness

The concept of self consciousness is an underlying premise in the definition of self-image. Self-consciousness is particularly relevant to the issue of the effects of the situational self-image on the brands purchased; therefore, the concept of self consciousness will be explored.

A fundamental premise of social psychology is the belief that the presence of others can have a strong effect on an individual's behavior and expressed beliefs. Some individuals are more sensitive to the pressures of social transactions than others. In a social situation individuals are likely to become self-conscious, or, "... aware of the self as a social object that can be observed and evaluated by others." (Fenigstein 1979, p. 75).

Specifically, self-consciousness involves each individual being aware of himself or herself as an individual self, reflecting on this and reacting to him/herself as an object. Self-consciousness is the human property of reflexivity, or the capacity to think about oneself. Individuals need this ability to develop a self-concept. Therefore, self-consciousness is an important precursor to the self-concept (Scheir and Carver 1980).

During social interaction, attention may be directed either into the self or away from the self. If attention is
self-directed the individual becomes conscious of the self as an object of attention to others. A major consequence of self-consciousness is a concern with the presentation of self and the reaction of others to that presentation.

Specifically, self-attention is presumed to evoke a matching-to-standard process, whereby the person conforms to whatever he or she takes as the standard of appropriate behavior. Hence, the major outcome of increased self-focus is a greater correspondence between behavior and behavioral standards (Scheier and Carver 1980, p. 231).

Situational stimuli can increase or decrease self-awareness. However, another factor, disposition, also affects self-reflectiveness. This disposition is labeled self-consciousness (Scheier and Carver 1980).

Extensive research has determined that self-consciousness can be better understood by examining two of its three subcomponents: private self-consciousness and public self-consciousness (Fenigstein 1979). Private self-consciousness is the covert and personal aspect of oneself. An individual high in private self-consciousness is very aware of bodily sensations, beliefs, moods, and feelings. Such an individual will be better in touch with him/herself, and will maintain a rich imagery life. This type of person is very introspective (Fenistein, Scheir and Buss 1975).

Public self-consciousness is the concern with and awareness of the self as a social object. Some people are
more sensitive than others to the proper impressions called for in a given interaction. These individuals are more inclined to present an image of themselves that would lead to a desirable impression in that situation. An individual high in public self-consciousness is very concerned with social appearances and the impressions of others. Such a person has a need for social approval and views him/herself as a social object.

Those high in public self-consciousness think about what others think of them and how they are presenting themselves in social contexts. Also, individuals with this tendency are more sensitive to rejection by peer groups. Someone high in public self-consciousness would be likely to adopt the perspective of other people and view him/herself as others do. In addition, he/she is more aware of the thoughts, actions and feelings of relevant others (Scheier and Carver 1980).

In terms of the temporal stability of self-reported attitudes, the individual high in private self-consciousness, having reflected about him/herself, is more certain about his/her attitudes. Therefore, the temporal stability for this type of individual is high.

Individuals high in public self-consciousness are more aware of how others perceive them and will attempt to create a favorable public image. Therefore, this type of
individual is more likely to waiver in his/her beliefs, to make him/herself more consistent with the beliefs of those around him/her (Scheier 1980).

Involvement

Recently, interest in "involvement" and its effect on consumer behavior has been growing. The introduction of ego involvement as a social psychological variable can be traced to the 1940's; however, the topic was not effectively introduced to consumer behavior research until 1965 with Krugman's work on television advertising. There appears to be a general agreement that involvement is a potentially important mediator of consumer behavior.

The most perplexing issue facing the discussion of involvement, however, is its definition. It is generally agreed that involvement is related to relative interest in the purchase process triggered by the need to consider a particular purchase (Mitchell 1979). The issue of involvement is inherently intertwined with consumer problem-solving, as can be ascertained from the definition by Engel and Blackwell in which involvement is defined as "... the activation of extended problem-solving behavior where the act of purchase or consumption is seen by the decision maker as having high personal importance or relevance. This can take place when the product itself is
perceived as reflecting on one's self-image" (Engel and Blackwell 1982).

Levels of involvement will vary. This variability is dependent upon a number of factors, including cost, interest, perceived risk, the situation and social visibility (Mitchell 1979). Therefore, involvement varies by product category and by brand. In addition, involvement is a temporary state influenced by the interaction of the individual, the product, and, relevant to this research, the situational characteristics (Kassarjian 1981).

On the other hand, high involvement products are best detected by the number of product attributes which are weighed and evaluated. When several evaluative criteria are employed, high involvement decision-making is taking place. Active search takes place and the use of information is extensive, also. High involvement situations tend to involve important high risk, ego-related, or value-expressive products (Kassarjian 1981).

Involvement, like all areas of consumer behavior research, is highly situational (Ray 1979). When discussing involvement as a potentially important mediator of consumer behavior, researchers agree the situation will affect the amount of cognitive effort which will be expended (Mitchell 1979).
Product involvement becomes relevant to this study due to its relationship with brand choice based on brand image. Where ego involvement with the product is high, the brand image is believed to be important to the consumer (Woods 1960). Involvement is generally seen to exist on a continuum (De Bruicker 1979). At one end of the continuum is the low involvement product, where the consumer does not consider the product sufficiently important to his or her belief system and does not strongly identify with the product. At the other end of the continuum are high involvement products which are considered important to the consumer (Assael 1984).

Major Problem

This study approached one major problem or question, and two interrelated subproblems. The major problem concerned the general topic of situational self-image/brand-image congruency. The subproblems each dealt with a plausible covariant, namely product involvement and self-consciousness. The major problem of this study was: What is the relationship, if any, between situational self-image and brand-image? The potential of the situational self-image to aid in the determination of brand choice was explored.

Although brand-image/self-image congruency has been explored by others it had never been explored in the
situational context. The situational self-image/brand-image congruency had only been hypothetically proposed and never empirically tested. This study was one of the first attempts to empirically test the concept of situational self-image.

Since marketers have considered products as symbols that consumers use to express their personality, they have been interested in product-image/self-image congruency. Do consumers use products to express their self images, and if so, under what circumstances? These are some of the questions that have been addressed and still require further exploration.

Subproblems

Not all products will be as influenced by image congruency and situational influences as others. Therefore, the relationship between involvement and image congruence was explored. High and low involvement products were chosen because it was felt that consumers would be more concerned with high involvement products and would, therefore, be concerned about their social implications as symbols. This study attempted to discover if involvement does affect congruency. Therefore, subproblem one was as follows.

1. What is the relationship, if any, between products with high and low involvement and brand-image/situational self-image congruency?
Not all consumers will be equally susceptible to situational differences. Therefore, self-consciousness was be studied as an important influence on the individual. Self-consciousness is recognized by social psychologists as an important influence on behavior. However, this area had not been explored extensively in marketing research. Therefore, the question of self-consciousness and its influence on image congruency was examined here.

Subproblem two was stated as:

2. What effect, if any, does self-consciousness have on brand-image/situational self-image congruency?

Since self-consciousness is a precursor to the self-concept, the relationship between self-consciousness and the situational self-image/brand-image congruency was studied.

Hypotheses

To carry out the purposes of this study the following hypotheses were tested:

H1. There will be a significant difference between intent to purchase given no constraints or considerations, and intent-to-purchase given a specific situation, for the same product category.

In order for situational self-image to be a relevant construct it needs to be empirically tested to determine whether or not situational influences affect self-images,
and whether or not they result in significantly different purchase intentions. The contention has been that a consumer chooses products that best express his/her self-concept (Levy 1959); therefore, if one's self-image is changed because of the situation, then one's brand choice should subsequently be altered as well.

H2. There will be a significant difference between situational self-images in each of the four specified situations as measured by congruency scores for each pair of situations.

The situational self-image is theorized to be one choice from among a repertoire of self-images the individual maintains, which he/she may display in a particular situation (Schenk and Holman 1980). Therefore, when the situation is changed, or in this case specified, the image of oneself will change, ultimately causing a change in brand choice.

H3. The brand-image/situational self-image congruency score for the most preferred brand, as measured by intent to purchase, will be significantly lower than the other possible brand-image/situational self-image congruency scores in that particular situation.

The major topic, situational self-image, was tested here to determine situational self-image/brand-image congruency. Brand-image is felt to be a more useful construct than product image. Schenk and Holman (1980) have asserted that the situational self-concept will affect purchasing decisions. It has been theorized that consumers
prefer the product that has an image that best matches the image of themselves that they choose to display in a particular situation. Therefore, the chosen brand, as measured by intent to purchase, should provide an image to the respondent which is closest to the respondent's situational self-image.

H4. Situational self-image/brand-image congruency scores will be significantly lower than real self-image/brand-image and ideal self/brand-image congruency scores.

Situational self-image is felt to be superior to previously tested self-image constructs. The ideal self-image has never been empirically proven to be superior to the real self-image (Dolich 1969, Ross 1971, Landon 1974). However, the situational self-image was believed to be superior because it recognizes that the consumer has more than one self-image (Schenk and Holman 1980) and should thereby be shown to be so empirically in relation to the one-dimension real and ideal self-image.

H5. Situational self-image/brand-image congruency scores for low involvement products will be significantly higher than situational self-image/brand-image congruency scores for high involvement products (high and low involvement products as determined by previous research with students as respondents) (Lastovic and Gardner 1977).

Respondents will be more motivated with high involvement products to consider situational influences and more motivated to be concerned with the reactions of
significant others. High involvement products require more extensive problem solving (Engel and Blackwell 1982), particularly when the product is perceived to be reflective of one's own self-image. Low involvement products are not considered important to the individual's belief system (DeBruicker 1979); therefore, the situational self-image should be more applicable for high involvement products.

H6. Those high in public self-consciousness, as measured by the Self-Consciousness Scale, will have a significantly different intent to purchase given-no-constraint values from intent to purchase given-a-specific situation values than those low in public self-consciousness.

"Public self-conscious people should be particularly susceptible to what happens in social situations" (Buss 1980). Those high in public self-consciousness are more sensitive to others and the impressions they make in social situations, and are more aware of the actions, thoughts and feelings of relevant others (Fenigstein, Scheier and Buss 1975). Therefore, it is reasonable to expect that they will be more inclined to use consumer goods to create a favorable impression, thereby changing purchase preferences when the social situation, or roles, are altered.

H7. Respondents high in private self-consciousness, as measured by the Self-Consciousness Scale, will have significantly higher brand-image scores than those low in private self-consciousness.

Those high in private self-consciousness will be more imageful and more prone to introspection (Fenigstein, Scheier and Buss 1975) and, therefore, will tend to develop a
more vivid perception of brands; thus, those high in private self-consciousness will assign a stronger image to the specified brands. Put another way, those high in private self-consciousness will have affective reactions more extreme than those low in private self-consciousness (Buss 1980).

Basic Assumptions

Prior to proceeding with the proposed research a number of assumptions were made and clarified. The following assumptions are based on sociological and marketing research. Although some of the assumptions may seem general, it was necessary that they be specified and clarified so that a common frame of reference could be established.

1. The individual's self-image is based on his/her perception of the way others see him/her.

   The "looking glass self" implies that people see themselves as a reflection of what others see in them. Therefore, interaction is necessary for the development and maintenance of the self-image.

2. The individual's self-image directs behavior.

   It is assumed that one's image of oneself affects behavior. Individuals will attempt to enhance and protect their self image by behaving in a particular manner. This will include purchasing behavior.

3. Products are symbols which individuals use to communicate to significant others.

   Levy (1959) and others have long proposed the idea that products are symbols which consumers use to display their personalities to others. In sociology, Goffman (1973) has claimed that individuals are actors; therefore, products would be props they might use to help them play their roles.
4. Brands convey certain images to consumers.

Marketers have long been interested in brand images. Countless dollars are spent by marketers to develop and communicate these images to consumers on the assumption that the images mean something to consumers and, therefore, have inherent value.

5. Consumers seek out products which are congruent with their self-image.

It is assumed that consumers attempt to maintain internal consistency. One way this is achieved is through self-image/brand-image congruency.

6. People are concerned about winning the approval of others and will attempt to present themselves in a positive manner to maintain the social approval of others.

Individuals see themselves as social objects and will try to maintain harmonious relationships with others. In order to do so, the individuals will behave in such a manner so as to gain the approval of others. This behavior is directed by the repertoire of self-images the individual maintains. In addition, the individual will see consumption behavior as a way to present him/herself in a positive manner.

7. The respondents are familiar with the brands employed in the experiment.

The chosen brands were obtained from a pretest of similar respondents. Therefore, it is assumed the brands listed are familiar to the respondents.
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At this point it is appropriate to survey and acknowledge the prior research in related areas to this work. By doing so it is possible to see what has been accomplished in self-concept research and what has yet to be discovered, or any apparent gaps in existing research and literature.

This survey of relevant literature will begin with a study of the work on product symbolism. As has been mentioned previously, product symbolism gave root to the product-image/self-image congruency issue. It is appropriate, therefore, to follow the product symbolism literature review with a discussion of the work, in the marketing literature, on the self-concept and its effect on consumer behavior.

This is followed by the literature concerning social influences, as the situational self-image is primarily a social phenomenon. A very brief review of the most relevant works for this present study is included.

The final section in the literature review includes a discussion of the major works published concerning self-
consciousness. With the exclusion of this study, research in self-consciousness is documented in social psychology literature rather than specific marketing publications. However, it is felt that self-consciousness is not only of vital interest to this study, but could be of vital interest to consumer research in general.

Product Symbolism

The early thought and research in the area of product symbolism is dominated by the work of Sidney Levy. In 1955 product symbolism was touted as "new insight" in the field of marketing (Gardner and Levy 1955). At this time, the social and psychological nature of the product was explored and it was recognized that the image, or personality, of the product may be more important than the technical aspects.

Levy, in later research, claimed products were really symbols which can be used by the consumer to express his/her self-concept (Levy 1959b). Levy continued on to say that, "... modern goods are recognized as essentially psychological things which are symbolic of personal attributes and goals and of social patterns and striving" (Levy 1959b, p. 119). A symbol is appropriate (and the product will be used and enjoyed) when it joins with, meshes with, adds to, or reinforces the way the consumer thinks about himself. The basic concept of product symbolism was advanced further when Levy stated that, "... a consumer's personality can be seen as
the peculiar total of the products he consumes" (Levy 1964, p. 140). He continued that products are objects which, in fact, are symbols and represent a lifestyle, and marketers sell symbols of lifestyles.

One of the earliest techniques in the study of product symbolism was the Q-sort. This technique was refined by Sommers in 1964 when he used the technique to analyze product symbolism and social stratification (Sommers 1964). How self-actualization, measured as the difference between the actual and ideal self concepts, affects product perception was measured by using the Q-sort technique (Hamm and Cundiff 1969). Other researchers used the Q-sort to measure product symbolism and personality types (Martin 1973).

In the early 1980's several writers called for theoretical frameworks to study symbolic consumption (Hirschman 1980, Schlenker 1980, Solomon 1983). It was generally agreed that the field of sociology could help provide that framework. The perspective of symbolic interactionism is recognized as the richest area of study for this type of research.

Recent research has dealt with consumption symbolism. This area of consumer behavior deals with how people decode messages conveyed by others' visible consumption. In other words, the researchers' investigation of how we interpret
the symbolic consumption of others is consumption symbolism (Belk, Bahn and Mayer 1982, Belk, Mayer and Bahn 1982, Belk, Mayer and Driscoll 1984).

**Self-Concept**

There are several key articles in the marketing literature pertaining to self-concept and purchasing behavior. These articles have been widely quoted and some have become classics in the field. Several researchers, most notably Edward L. Grubb, have contributed much to this area of study. The majority of these key articles were written in the late 1960's and early 1970's. A review of these articles is an important start for any new research in the field.

One of the earliest works on the topic of self-theory and symbolism was done by Grubb (1965). He proposed that products were symbols. In addition, he theorized that these symbols have an effect on the interaction process and, therefore, have an effect on the individual's self-concept. Quite interestingly, Grubb also noted the importance of the environment in the interaction process. He quoted Erving Goffman in saying that individuals are affected by both the environmental setting and the "personal attire" of each involved individual.

Basically, in this early article Grubb tested the following hypothesis:
The consuming behavior of an individual through the consumption of brands as symbols will be directed toward the furthering and enhancing of his self-concept. (Grubb 1965, p. 420).

He discovered that in some cases users and nonusers of beer did perceive themselves differently and he called for more research in this area.

Later, Grubb, along with Grathwohl, presented a theoretical approach to the topic of self-concept, symbolism, and purchasing behavior (Grubb and Grathwohl 1967). They stated that there was significant research and theory in other fields on self-theory which marketers should employ to better understand purchasing behavior.

The term "image incongruence" appears to have been coined by Birdwell (1968) in another early, key article in the field. He hypothesized that an automobile owner's perception of his/her car is essentially congruent with his/her perception of him/herself. He also asserted that different car owners will have different images of specific car types. Birdwell's analysis concluded there was a close relationship between owners' perceptions of themselves and their cars.

In a later article, Grubb, this time in association with Hupp, suggested consumers of a specific brand would hold self-concepts similar to the self-concepts they attributed to other consumers of the same brand, and consumers would attribute different self-concepts to consumers of other
brands. Again, automobiles were used in the study. The hypotheses were supported (Grubb and Hupp 1968).

Real and ideal self-concepts were explored by Dolich, along with publicly and privately consumed products (Dolich 1969). It was proposed that ideal self-concept would be superior to real self-concept in image congruence. This was not supported by the research.

The effect of significant others was included as an independent variable by Grubb and Stern in an adapted replication of the earlier Grubb and Hupp study (Grubb and Stern 1971). Automobiles were again used as the product category to be studied. Respondents were asked to provide a profile of themselves, the cars and other owners of each brand of cars. In addition, they were asked to supply a list of respected friends and associates. These significant others were contacted and their profiles of the same items solicited. The results determined the consumer and the significant other had remarkably similar perceptions of the tested phenomena. This was attributed to the influences of self-perception through the interaction process.

Actual and ideal self-concepts were also analyzed by Ross (Ross 1971). The tested hypothesis was that ideal self-concept would be more closely related to consumption preferences for conspicuous products and real self-concept would be more closely related to less conspicuous products.
Again, this hypothesis was not supported. There has been no empirical evidence to date to verify the position that the ideal self-concept is more closely related to purchase preference than the real self-concept.

To dispel the criticism that previous research looked only at post purchase images, Landon studied purchase intentions (1974). It was found that consumers may change their self-images after the purchase, to be more congruent with the images of the chosen brand.

After the first major wave of self-concept research (the 1960's and early 1970's), several other researchers looked at more specific issues in the area. The congruence between store image and self-image was studied by some researchers and others analyzed the techniques employed.

Several researchers have studied the relationship between self-image and store-image. Dornoff and Tatham tested the hypothesis that an individual's self-image is congruent with the image of his/her most preferred store. This hypothesis was supported (Dornoff and Tatham 1972). A similar study was conducted by other researchers with the same results (Stern, Bush and Hair 1977, Bellenger, Steinberg, and Stanton 1976).

The scales and the techniques of self-concept studies have been analyzed by several researchers. The discriminant validity of a product-anchored self-concept measure was
supported (Belch and Landon 1977). Later work developed a method to create a validated scale to measure self-concepts (Malhotra 1981). Multidimensional scaling has also been applied to the problems of self-concept analysis (Green, Maheshwari and Rao 1969).

During the latter part of the 1970's and early 1980's, relatively little work was published which contributed significantly to the study of self-image and purchasing behavior. The next few works summarized here may be called the 'second wave' of self-concept research. Much of the most recent work in this area has not appeared in major marketing journals.

The effects of masculinity and femininity factors in product perception and self-image have been investigated, as well as the sex role self-concept in masculine and feminine product perceptions (Genry, Doering and O'Brien 1978, Golden, Allison and Clee 1979). Both studies were concerned with the changing sex roles in our society and the possible effects on consumer behavior.

Belief systems were employed to determine the relationship between purchase intentions and the real and ideal self-image (Belch 1978). A product-anchored self-concept scale was employed.

Munson and Spivey (1978) advocated two new self-concept constructs: self perception given a product preference, and
others' perceptions of self given a product preference. Of particular relevance to this study is Schenk and Holman's (1980) theoretical work on the development of the construct of situational self-concept.

Much of the most recent work concerning self-concept has been done by Sirgy. Besides ideal and actual self-image, Sirgy has studied two other perspectives of self-concept (Sirgy 1980). These two constructs are similar to the construct of situational self-image. They are the social self-image, how one believes others perceive him/her, and the ideal social self-image, how one would like to be perceived by others.

Sirgy has also explained how a self-image/product image congruity hypothesis can be used in advertising strategy (Sirgy 1982b). In some of his most recent work Sirgy presents a critical review of the self-concept in consumer behavior research and calls for more research in the area (Sirgy 1982a). He states that research on self-concept theory is still in the infancy stage, and provides recommendations for future research.

Social Influences

One aspect of the situational self-image that seems to dominate is the effect of the presence of others. The situational self-image recognizes the importance of social
interaction. Therefore, literature pertaining to the influence of others is relevant and is examined here.

The self-concept and the perceived expectations of others have been investigated using a symbolic interactionist approach to examine the self-function of reference groups (Kemper 1966). Stafford looked at the small informal social group, its degree of influence, which was found to be related to cohesiveness, and its effect on a preference for unbranded bread (Stafford 1966). The Q-sort technique has been employed to measure the relationship between the attractiveness of a socially distant reference group and the amount of influence that group exerts.

The persuasiveness and importance of social influence on behavior has also been researched. It was hypothesized that information provided by others regarding the relative quality of a product should have a direct bearing on a consumer's evaluation of the product. The hypothesis was confirmed (Cohen and Golden 1972).

Eleven situations were examined by Bearden and Woodside (1976), and although social factors were not stressed in this study, the researchers did present the respondents with various situations to respond to. Behavior intentions were measured as well as the interaction between attitudes toward the object and situational variables.
Interpersonal influences have been studied. Scenarios were given indicating whether the product would be used at work, or for an evening out. Interpersonal influences were found to be stronger for products consumed conspicuously (Calder and Burnkrant 1977).

Usage situations and appropriateness of the product have been studied using breath fresheners. Perceptions were plotted as well (Srivastava, Shocker and Day 1978). Belk, a pioneer in the study of situational influences has examined visible consumption and impressions. This exploratory work revealed that a person's possessions do affect the impressions others have of him/her (Belk 1979).

Self-Consciousness

Social psychologists provide us with the majority of the research concerning self-consciousness. The concept has been empirically tested and the scale validated, these facts make self-consciousness particularly attractive to subsequent research.

In 1975 Fenigstein, Scheir and Buss published a scale to measure individual differences in self-consciousness. The scale has consequently been examined for discriminant validity (Carver and Glass 1976). It was determined that the scale was relatively independent of the other measures tested. Other researchers, using a large sample of students from several universities, determined that both the
construct validity and the discriminant validity of the scale were supported by their research (Turner, Carver, Scheier and Ickes 1978). The low magnitude of the correlations obtained by their study was interpreted as supporting the distinctive contribution of the Self-Consciousness Scale to personality assessment.

Several experiments have been conducted to test the phenomena of self-consciousness. Group rejection, self-attention and self-awareness have been studied (Fenigstein 1979). The effects of public and private self-consciousness on the public expression of personal beliefs were measured in another experiment. The respondents high in public self-consciousness tended to express more moderate views.

The concept of self-consciousness was explored in the marketing literature first in 1982 (Burnkrant and Page 1982). It was hypothesized that those high in public self-consciousness would be more likely to be sensitive to the behavior of the persons they were interacting with. Scenarios were employed describing either a boss who promoted those like himself or a boss who promoted those who were different. All the respondents were wives who were asked to plan a meal for the gourmet boss. It was discovered a sophisticated meal was planned when a sophisticated impression was likely to be rewarded.
CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY


50


CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

After reviewing the relevant literature and analyzing the current state of the awareness, it is now desirable to address the issue of methodology. An experiment was undertaken, using a projective technique. In order to proceed with the experiment, an instrument had to be designed and a population of respondents chosen from which a sample was taken. These issues, as well as data collection procedures and analytical procedures employed, will be discussed in the following chapter.

Research Design

Basically, a 4 x 4 and a 4 x 4 x 2 factorial was employed. Four product related situations were explored along with four roles and, in some tests, two levels of both product involvement and self-consciousness were analyzed.

Instrumental Design

Prior to the formation of the instrument a number of pretests were conducted to collect relevant data. In one pretest fifty respondents were measured to determine whom they considered influential in their lives. This study was
persons and roles for the subsequent research. The pretest sample were given the following instructions (Kemper, 1966, p. 325):

Considering yourself as you are today—the positions you hold, the relationships you have with others, the things that best describe and are most characteristic of you—who are the specific persons, both past and present, that have influenced you, who are important to you and have helped to make you the kind of person you are? (Rank the ten most important in order.)

An analysis, considering not only frequency of appearance but order of appearance also, concluded that both mothers and fathers were considered principle referent persons for the pretest group. Therefore, the role of parent will be used in the subsequent instrument. Friends, employers, and spouses, or boy/girlfriend were also commonly included in the respondent answers and were considered to be applicable for this study. Consequently, the roles chosen for the instrument were called "reference roles." The roles included are parent/child, employer/employee, friend/friend, and spouse or boy/girlfriend.

The "reference role" determination was considered an important portion of this research since not all interactions are equally important in terms of the development and sustainment of the self-concept. Generally, relationships, particularly family relationships, are crucial to the self-concept. Friends are also considered important in self-concept relationships (Lauer and Handel
These theoretical premises were supported by the limited pretest.

A second pretest was conducted to determine which brands in the product category were in the population's evoked set. In addition, data were collected to determine the respondents' stereotypical images of these brands. The product categories used for this study, namely bar soap, facial tissue, blue jeans, and automobiles, were chosen as a result of prior research by Lastovicka and Gardner (1979). Their research also used students, and determined high and low involvement products for this population group. Bar soap and facial tissues represented low involvement products and jeans and automobiles represented high involvement products for student respondents.

The specific brands to be included in the instrument were chosen primarily as a result of frequency of appearance in the pretest. The respondents were instructed to list all the brands that were familiar to them in each product category. Each respondent was given two of the four product categories to respond and approximately fifty persons responded to each product category.

Several criteria were used in order to select the specific brands for inclusion in the ultimate instrument. The criteria employed were as follows:
1. Frequency of inclusion by respondents.

2. A distinct image must be recorded by the respondents.

3. The recorded brand-image must be different from other included brands.

4. Brands must be available in the trading area.

5. Brands must be available for both sexes.

The brands to be used fit all the selection criteria and are referred to as the "evoked brands." The selected brands are as follows:

Facial tissues—Kleenex, Puffs, Coronet, and store brand
Bar soap—Dial, Ivory, Irish Spring, and Dove
Blue jeans—Levis, Calvin Klein, Jordache, and Lee's
Automobiles—Mercedes, Ford, Cadillac, and Toyota.

In the research instruments a number of semantic differential scales were employed. Instead of using a random selection of adjectives, which was considered a weakness in previous studies (Sirgy 1982a), brand-specific adjectives were collected in a pretest. For each brand listed in the evoked brand section respondents were asked to include their stereotypic image for that brand. A content analysis of the pretest resulted in twenty pairs of adjectives that best reflected the images of the sixteen brands in the "evoked brand." These adjectives also had to be applicable to the self-image measures. The resulting twenty adjective pairs were used in all semantic differential scales in this study.
The semantic differential scale has been widely used by social scientists to measure many characteristics, including the self-image (Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum 1957). This technique was created in order to measure the meaning that various phenomena have to an individual. Subjects were given a series of bipolar adjectives, separated by seven spaces. Each subject was to place a check in one of the seven spaces for each dimension according to which of the paired adjectives is closer to his or her self-concept (Lauer and Handel 1977). The semantic differential scale can, and has been, used to measure many variations of the self-concept.

The scale to measure public and private self-consciousness was developed in prior studies (Fenigstein, Scheier and Buss 1975). The scale contained twenty-three statements to which the subject responded using a five item range from "extremely uncharacteristic" to "extremely characteristic."

The situations applied in the third section of the instrument were designed specifically for this study. The four situations were created to represent plausible uses of the experimental products. The situations represent typical usage situations for the products and also allow for the manipulation of the involved roles. The respondents were asked to respond to the hypothetical situations. If the situation did not apply to them at that particular time they were asked to think into the future or to use their imagination.
The Instrument

The instrument, which appears in Appendix A, was
distributed, and information collected in three parts. The
three individual parts collected the following information:

Part One

a. real self-image
b. ideal self-image
c. self-consciousness rating
d. intent to purchase (given no constraints)

Part Two—brand-images (all 16 brands)

Part Three—(containing the four scenarios with different roles)

a. intent to purchase (given a situation)
b. situational self-images

Each section will be discussed separately. If
appropriate, the method used to devise a measure will also be explained.

Part One.—The real and ideal self-images were
measured using a semantic differential scale of the
previously developed twenty adjective pairs. The adjective
pairs were obtained from the pretest. The semantic
differential scale is a common technique for self-image
measurement. Both the variables public and private
self-consciousness were measured by the Self-Consciousness
Scale. As mentioned in the literature review, this scale has
been previously validated. The Self-Consciousness Scale is
also relatively short and easy to administer. Intent to
purchase was measured using a forced choice between the four
possible brands in each category. All four product categories were measured.

**Part Two.**—The brand-images for all sixteen products (four brands in each of the four product categories) were measured. Semantic differential scales were used. Twelve pairs of the most appropriate adjectives for each product category were used, based on adjective pairs derived from the pretest.

**Part Three.**—The four product related scenarios were devised to represent logical and reasonable usage situations for the four products being tested. In some cases the respondents were asked to either think ahead into the future or to use their imaginations in order to comply with the measurement process. The referent roles will vary in the different situations such that one-fourth of the respondents had a specific 'referent role' in each situation.

Next, the respondents were asked to select the brand they would most likely buy or rent in that specific situation. The same evoked brands were employed as in the previous measure of intent in Part One. Finally, Part Three also contained measures of situational self-images. A twenty pair semantic differential scale was again employed. The adjectives were the same as those used to
measure real and ideal self-images. The respondents were asked to respond to the statement, "Considering this situation, the person I would like to be seen as is . . .". This statement is consistent with previously employed measures of self-image and had been based on prior research (Dolich 1969).

In all semantic differential scales the adjective pairs were rotated and occasionally transposed. Each respondent analyzed all four product-related situations. However, the roles were rotated and varied, thus producing a 4 x 4 factorial. Since the respondents viewed all four situations, four unique versions of Part Three were developed. The allocation of roles to the four versions was done using a Latin Square allocation, as follows:

TABLE I

SELECTION OF PRODUCT ROLE SITUATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Situation</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Friend</th>
<th>Spouse or Boy/Girl-Friend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar Soap</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeans</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tissues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The numbers 1 through 4 represent the different versions of Part Three of the measurement instrument)
The Population

The population for the study was students enrolled in marketing courses in a southwest university (specifically, the University of Texas at Arlington) in a large metropolitan area. A sample of significant size could be obtained relatively easily from this population, at little cost. Previous research and several pretests have been carried out using this, or similar populations. A convenience sample was used because of the theoretical nature of the research.

This sampling procedure was considered acceptable because the purpose of this study is to empirically explore a basic precept and not to generalize to any specific population. In addition, prior research, which this study was based on, used similar student populations. As an example, the research concerning high and low involvement products (the results of which will be used here) used a student sample (Lastovicka and Gardner 1979). It is also felt that a significant sample size was achieved through this procedure.

The Sample

A sample of 235 was collected from students enrolled in several marketing classes during the Spring 1986 semester. Everyone in the chosen classes was asked to participate. Since the pretests and prior research were conducted on
business students at the junior and senior level, this study sampled Marketing Principles and higher level marketing classes.

Data Collection Procedures

The data was collected on three different dates. Part One, containing measures of real and ideal self-image, self consciousness and intent to purchase, given no particular circumstances, was administered first to all students. The same instructions were given to all five classes. The respondents were asked at the end of Part One, as well as at the ends of Parts Two and Three, to include their Social Security numbers so that the information could be coordinated later. The respondents were assured that their responses would be kept confidential. Part Two was administered a week later. It was felt that the data on brand-image should not have been collected at the same date as the real and ideal self-images due to concern for testing effect and the fatigue factor.

The final section (Part Three) contained the manipulation and had the sixteen treatments, with each respondent randomly assigned to four treatments. The final section was distributed three weeks after the first section and two weeks after the second. This allowed enough time to dispel the effects of the first measure, and
it was short enough so that the individual's self-image would not have changed dramatically (Malhotra 1981).


CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS

This study had four major purposes, which are as follows: 1. To investigate the general experimental effects of the situational self-image on purchasing intent. 2. To investigate the alleged superiority of the situational self-image over the real and ideal self-image as a predictor of consumer behavior. 3. To investigate the effect of product involvement on brand-image/situational self-image congruency. 4. To investigate the effect of self-consciousness on brand-image/situational self-image congruency.

In order to study these questions the data collected in the three-part instrument was coordinated, coded and kept in a file for analysis. Each hypothesis was restated in the null form for testing. Levels of significance will be reported for each test.

Image congruency scores were calculated when appropriate. The congruency between a self-image and a brand-image was obtained by computing the absolute arithmetic difference, scale by scale, between the two semantic differential instruments. By summing the differences a value
resulted which represented the congruency between the self-image and the brand-image. Thus, low scores indicated greater congruence than high scores (Dolich 1969). This method for determining congruency scores is in accordance with previous research in self-image/brand-image congruency.

In this study it was necessary at times to test the effect of two or more treatments at various levels. An experiment of this type was considered appropriate because there was reason to believe the treatments (in this case, the situation and the roles) might interact to produce an effect upon the dependent variables (brand choice and situational self-image) which neither treatment alone would produce. A factorial design provides the means for conducting experiments under these circumstances (Cox and Enis 1969). Congruency scores will be analyzed using a factorial analysis of variance design.

One-way ANOVA is commonly used in the analysis of experimental results. It is a method of determining whether the observed differences of mean scores for groups receiving different experimental treatments are the result of sampling variations (Tull and Hawkins 1984). Furthermore, the F test is a procedure for comparing one sample variance versus another sample variance. The F test determines whether or not there is more variability in the scores of one sample than the variability of the scores in another sample (Zikmund 1982).
Another statistical procedure used in this research is among one of the most widely used of all statistical procedures. The Chi-Square Test of Independence was employed in the analysis of the data. The Chi-Square Test answers the frequently asked research question, "Are two variables associated?" If no association exists the two variables are independent, and therefore, the distribution of one in no way depends on the distribution of the other (Malec 1977).

For this research a 2x2 contingency table was analyzed with the Chi-Square Test. This situation occurs when each of the two criteria of classification occur at two levels. When this was encountered in the analysis of the data the Yate's corrections was performed. "The purpose of this procedure is to 'correct' for the use of a continuous distribution $x^2$ to approximate the discrete distribution $x^2$" (Malec 1977).

In some cases, hypotheses about population proportions were tested. It was necessary to use the Binomial test, another commonly employed nonparametric procedure, in these cases. The Binomial test enables a researcher to compute the probability that a sample contains a specified number of elements under certain assumptions (Siegel 1956). The Binomial test is used when repeated trials of a given event produce outcomes that are statistically independent (Smith and Williams 1976).
The McNemar test for related samples was another nonparametric technique which was employed in this research. This test was used for paired samples falling into two categories. The McNemar test was employed when the researcher was interested in the frequency of occurrence (proportions) of subjects falling into two categories. Consequently, the results could be displayed in a 2x2 contingency table. The McNemar test has been recommended for use in before-and-after experiments of this kind, particularly when the researcher is interested in the number of subjects who respond differently after they are exposed to some intervening condition or treatment than prior (Siegel 1956).

Testing of Hypotheses

The seven hypotheses were analyzed independently and their results interpreted independently. A discussion of the individual hypotheses and their subsequent analysis and findings will be presented in the following section.

Hypothesis One

The first hypothesis test sought to determine if respondents would react to a situation. It was hypothesized that brand choice would differ when a situation was specified from a prior choice, when a situation was not specified. In other words, will the consumer change his/her brand choice when the situation is specified?
Each brand was analyzed on a before-after basis. The "before" was the measure, in Part One of the instrument, of the non-specified brand choice. The "after" was the measure, in Part Three of the questionnaire, which asked the respondents to choose a brand, given a specified situation.

A nonparametric test was performed on a new variable created to reflect a comparison of unspecified choice and situational choice. For each of the sixteen brands in the study the unspecified choice and the situational choice were compared. If the two choices were the same, the new variable was coded 1; if the two choices were different, the new variable was coded 2. With two nominal responses it was possible to perform the Binomial Test of Proportions. In the case of ten brands the two groups had significantly different numbers than the expected fifty percent. The fifty percent test probability allowed for brand loyalty. The Binomial Test specifies the test probability and, in this case, the test probability of fifty percent is the proportion of cases expected to fall in the repeated choice category.

The observed frequency in each category of the dichotomous variable tested (match or nonmatch of the two choices) was compared with the expected frequencies under a binomial distribution and the significance level was very significant (.10 or less). The probability of a respondent choosing the same brand in the unspecified choice and the
situational choice was very high for ten of the sixteen brands tested.

**Hypothesis Two**

In order to determine if situational self-images do vary when the situation changes, the respondents were analyzed based on the four variations of Part Three of the instrument. The respondents were divided into four groups based on the different reference roles contained in the four different versions of Part Three. The situation/reference roles combination contained in Part Three was the only variable which was manipulated.

The mean scores for all variables in all the semantic differential scales for the four groups were calculated. The results were analyzed with an ANOVA test. The ANOVA test was used to determine if there was a significant difference between the mean variable scores in the four treatment groups.

The mean scores for each variable in the semantic differential scales for all four situations are displayed in Table II. The four different treatment groups are specified. The variables with significantly different means scores are also indicated.

Two of the situations produced several variables with significantly different means scores and two situations produced a limited number of significantly different means.
**TABLE II**

**SITUATIONAL VARIABLE MEAN SCORES BY REFERENCE ROLE FOR FOUR SITUATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable*</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Friend</th>
<th>Spouse</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Automobile Situation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reliable-unreliable</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lively-calm</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snobbish-down to earth</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.019**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practical-frivolous</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.015**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lush-austere</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.050**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>youthful-old fashioned</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.005**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expensive-inexpensive</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.064**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distinctive-nondistinct</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impulsive-deliberate</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.005**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naive-sophisticated</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>durable-fragile</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.085**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aggressive-mild mannered</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feminine-masculine</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>innocent-experienced</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.078**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rough-gentle</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active-passive</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complex-simple</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plain-elaborate</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usual-unusual</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nonfashionable-fashionable</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable*</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Employer</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>Significance Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bar Soap Situation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fashionable-nonfashionable</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snobbish-down to earth</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expensive-inexpensive</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.035**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aggressive-mild mannered</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lively-calm</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impulsive-deliberate</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>durable-fragile</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.052**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usual-unusual</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>.012**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reliable-unreliable</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.077**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distinctive-nondistinct</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.005**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rough-gentle</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complex-simple</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.097**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practical-frivolous</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.004**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>youthful-old fashioned</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>innocent-experienced</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>.004**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plain-elaborate</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lush-austere</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naive-sophisticated</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feminine-masculine</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active-passive</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables*</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Employer</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>Significance Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jean Situation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expensive-inexpensive</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feminine-masculine</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usual-unusual</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.044**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plain-elaborate</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complex-simple</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aggressive-mild mannered</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active-passive</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practical-frivolous</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>youthful-old fashioned</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snobbish-down to earth</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lively-calm</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reliable-unreliable</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lush-austere</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distinctive-nondistinct</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.016**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naive-experienced</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>durable-fragile</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impulsive-deliberate</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>innocent-experienced</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rough-gentle</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fashionable-nonfashionable</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables*</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Employer</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>Significance Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facial Tissue Situation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nonfashionable-fashionable</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>innocent-experienced</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plain-elaborate</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lively-calm</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>durable-fragile</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.017**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usual-unusual</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naive-sophisticied</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active-passive</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impulsive-deliberate</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feminine-masculine</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practical-frivolous</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lush-austere</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aggressive-mild mannered</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snobbish-down to earth</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expensive-inexpensive</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complex-simple</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>youthful-old fashioned</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reliable-unreliable</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distinctive-nondistinct</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rough-gentle</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* variables range from 1 to 7
** significantly different mean scores at .10 level or less
scores. A significant difference was found only for two variables in both the jeans and facial tissue situation. In the case of the automobile, nine of the twenty variables produced significantly different mean scores. The bar soap situation produced thirteen significantly different mean scores from the twenty variables measured.

**Hypothesis Three**

Hypothesis three dealt with the situational self-image/brand-image congruency issue. It had been hypothesized that the respondent would choose the brand with the held image that most closely matches his/her image of him/herself in a particular situation. In order to evaluate the similarity of images, congruency scores were calculated, on an item-by-item basis. High levels of congruency were indicated by low congruency scores.

Brand-images for all four brands of the product used in a product specific situation were compared with the evoked situational self-image for that particular situation. The contention was that the congruency score for the brand chosen in the situational context would be lower than the congruency scores for the unchosen brands. The results were analyzed by an ANOVA test.

In the situation involving the automobile, significantly different mean scores were produced for three brands. The three brands which produced the significantly different
scores, indicating the brand chosen was congruent with the situational image, were Ford, Mercedes and Toyota. The congruency score for the Cadillac failed to produce a significant score with the situational choice (Table III).

For the situation involving the facial tissue three brands (Coronet, Kleenex and the store brand) produced significant F values in the ANOVA test when congruency scores were analyzed with situational choice. The only brand failing to provide a significant score was Puffs (Table IV).

Irish Spring and Dial produced significant values when brand-image/self-image congruency scores were analyzed with the bar soap situational choice. The other two brands (Dove and Ivory) failed to produce significant values in the bar soap situation (Table V).

The only situation to produce significant scores for all brands was the jean situation. All four jeans produced highly significant F values when brand-image/situational self-image congruency scores were tested by an ANOVA test with the jean situational choice as the dependent variable (Table VI).

**Hypothesis Four**

The fourth hypothesis tested attempted to address the question of the superiority of the situational self-image over the real and ideal self-images as a possible predictor of brand choice. In order to analyze the results of the data, a number of congruency scores had to be calculated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toyota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>1076.076</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>358.692</td>
<td>4.905</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITCAR</td>
<td>1076.076</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>358.692</td>
<td>4.905</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>1076.076</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>358.692</td>
<td>4.905</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>16088.781</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>73.131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17164.857</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>70.972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercedes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>1108.005</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>369.335</td>
<td>7.715</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITCAR</td>
<td>1108.005</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>369.335</td>
<td>7.715</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>1108.005</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>369.335</td>
<td>7.715</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>10244.270</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>47.870</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11352.275</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>52.315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>2124.867</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>708.289</td>
<td>5.788</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITCAR</td>
<td>2124.867</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>708.289</td>
<td>5.788</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>2124.867</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>708.289</td>
<td>5.788</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>26920.843</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>122.367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29045.710</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>130.250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadillac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>184.701</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61.567</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td>0.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITCAR</td>
<td>184.701</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61.567</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td>0.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>184.701</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61.567</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td>0.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>15319.138</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>69.632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15503.839</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>69.524</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE IV
ANOVA RESULTS FOR SITUATIONAL SELF-IMAGE/CHosen BRAND-IMAGE CONGRUENCY BY BRAND FACIAL TISSUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Puffs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>110.340</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36.780</td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td>0.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITTIS</td>
<td>110.340</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36.780</td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td>0.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>110.340</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36.780</td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td>0.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>12729.208</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>58.660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12839.548</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>58.362</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coronet</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>1024.524</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>341.508</td>
<td>3.193</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITTIS</td>
<td>1024.524</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>341.508</td>
<td>3.193</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>1024.524</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>341.508</td>
<td>3.193</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>22995.649</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>106.957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24020.174</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>110.184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kleenex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>471.880</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>157.293</td>
<td>3.037</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITTIS</td>
<td>471.880</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>157.293</td>
<td>3.037</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>471.880</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>157.293</td>
<td>3.037</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>11237.831</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>51.787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11709.710</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>53.226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>3284.125</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1094.708</td>
<td>8.611</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITTIS</td>
<td>3284.125</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1094.708</td>
<td>8.611</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>3284.125</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1094.708</td>
<td>8.611</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>27586.418</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>127.126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30870.543</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>140.321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Variation</td>
<td>Sum of Squares</td>
<td>DF</td>
<td>Mean Square</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>Significance of F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>408.041</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>136.014</td>
<td>2.125</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITSOAP</td>
<td>408.041</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>136.014</td>
<td>2.125</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>408.041</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>136.014</td>
<td>2.125</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>13954.427</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64.011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14362.468</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>64.989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>482.026</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>160.675</td>
<td>1.636</td>
<td>0.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITSOAP</td>
<td>482.026</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>160.675</td>
<td>1.636</td>
<td>0.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>482.026</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>160.675</td>
<td>1.636</td>
<td>0.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>21410.443</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>98.213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21892.468</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>99.061</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>908.377</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>302.792</td>
<td>4.558</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITSOAP</td>
<td>908.377</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>302.792</td>
<td>4.558</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>908.377</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>302.792</td>
<td>4.558</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>14482.758</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>66.435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15391.135</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>69.643</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>313.496</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>104.499</td>
<td>1.186</td>
<td>0.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITSOAP</td>
<td>313.496</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>104.499</td>
<td>1.186</td>
<td>0.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>313.496</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>104.499</td>
<td>1.186</td>
<td>0.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>19209.783</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>88.118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19523.279</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>88.341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE VI
ANOVA RESULTS FOR SITUATIONAL SELF-IMAGE/CHOSEN BRAND-IMAGE CONGRUENCY BY BRAND JEANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Levi</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>2214.245</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>738.082</td>
<td>10.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITJEAN</td>
<td>2214.245</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>738.082</td>
<td>10.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>2214.245</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>738.082</td>
<td>10.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>15276.864</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>70.726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17491.109</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>79.868</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calvin Klein</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>1280.097</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>426.699</td>
<td>6.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITJEAN</td>
<td>1280.097</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>426.699</td>
<td>6.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>1280.097</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>426.699</td>
<td>6.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>14302.681</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>66.2316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15532.777</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>71.154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jordache</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>927.950</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>309.317</td>
<td>3.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITJEAN</td>
<td>927.950</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>309.317</td>
<td>3.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>927.950</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>309.317</td>
<td>3.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>17094.213</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>78.775</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18022.163</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>81.919</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>1831.096</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>610.365</td>
<td>7.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITJEAN</td>
<td>1831.096</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>610.365</td>
<td>7.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>1831.096</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>610.365</td>
<td>7.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>17153.250</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>79.413</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18984.345</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>86.687</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The same procedure of comparing individual variables and computing absolute summed scores for each scale employed in Hypothesis Three was also used for the analysis in Hypothesis Four.

For Hypothesis Four, however, the respondents were first divided into groups based on their situational brand choice. Congruency scores were calculated for only the situation choice brand and not for the three unchosen brands in the situation. The resulting situational choice's image was compared with the three different self-images measured. As an example, if a respondent chose Ford in the car situational choice, only Ford's image, collected in Part Two of the instrument, would be used to compute congruency scores with the real self-image, ideal self-image (both measured in Part One) and the situation self-image (measured in Part Three).

Once the three congruency scores were determined, their means scores were compared for significance using a t-test. All sixteen brands employed in the study were examined. All three congruency scores for each brand were compared with each other. Therefore, a total of three t-tests per brand was performed. The four situations will be discussed separately so that each brand may be evaluated. (See Table VI for a summary of the results.)

**Automobiles**

The nineteen respondents who chose Ford in the situations choice had virtually identical congruency scores
### TABLE VII

A COMPARISON OF BRAND-IMAGE/SELF-IMAGE MEAN CONGRUENCY SOURCE BETWEEN THE REAL, IDEAL AND SITUATIONAL SELF-IMAGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Automobiles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Ford</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.6316</td>
<td>0.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real/Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.7368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Ford</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.6316</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal/Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.1579</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real/Ford</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.7368</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal/Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.1579</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Cadillac</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19.7436</td>
<td>0.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real/Cadillac</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.1538</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Cadillac</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19.7436</td>
<td>0.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal/Cadillac</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.7436</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real/Cadillac</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21.1538</td>
<td>0.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal/Cadillac</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.7436</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Toyota</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.6970</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real/Toyota</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.0606</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Toyota</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13.0313</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal/Toyota</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.0938</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real/Toyota</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.8125</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal/Toyota</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.0938</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Mercedes</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>18.5794</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real/Mercedes</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.6667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Mercedes</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>18.4800</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal/Mercedes</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.6880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real/Mercedes</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>22.7880</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal/Mercedes</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.6880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Significance Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Dial Real/Dial</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>15.4912</td>
<td>0.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.9825</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Dial Ideal/Dial</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15.1964</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0714</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real/Dial Ideal/Dial</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16.9464</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0714</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Ivory Real/Ivory</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>21.8276</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.1552</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Ivory Ideal/Ivory</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>21.8276</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.9138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real/Ivory Ideal/Ivory</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>25.1552</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.9130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Irish Spring Real/Irish Spring</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15.7255</td>
<td>0.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.4902</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Irish Spring Ideal/Irish Spring</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15.4000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real/Irish Spring Ideal/Irish Spring</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17.6000</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Dove Real/Dove</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19.7308</td>
<td>0.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.8269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Dove Ideal/Dove</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19.7170</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.2330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real/Dove Ideal/Dove</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20.8269</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.4038</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Significance Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jeans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Calvin Klein Real/Calvin Klein</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16.3281</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.8438</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Calvin Klein Ideal/Calvin Klein</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>16.2308</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.7077</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real/Calvin Klein Ideal/Calvin Klein</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22.8438</td>
<td>0.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.7969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Levi Real/Levi</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>15.0770</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.4935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Levi Ideal/Levi</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>16.0779</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.4268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real/Levi Ideal/Levi</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>17.4935</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.4286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Jordache Real/Jordache</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.4706</td>
<td>0.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.8824</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Jordache Ideal/Jordache</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.4706</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.2941</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real/Jordache Ideal/Jordache</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19.8824</td>
<td>0.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.2941</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Lee Real/Lee</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>15.8421</td>
<td>0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.5439</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Lee Ideal/Lee</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>15.8421</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.0526</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real/Lee Ideal/Lee</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17.5439</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.0526</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Significance Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tissue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Generic Real/Generic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.5000</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.3750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Generic Ideal/Generic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.5004</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.3750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real/Generic Ideal/Generic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.3750</td>
<td>0.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.8750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Kleenex Real/Kleenex</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>15.5847</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.5678</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Kleenex Ideal/Kleenex</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>15.4444</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.2564</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real/Kleenex Ideal/Kleenex</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>19.5983</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.2564</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Coronet Real/Coronet</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.2500</td>
<td>0.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.5000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Coronet Ideal/Coronet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24.3333</td>
<td>0.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.3333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real/Coronet Ideal/Coronet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26.0000</td>
<td>0.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.3333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Puff Real/Puff</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>17.1494</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.9386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/Puff Ideal/Puff</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>17.0705</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.0682</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real/Puff Ideal/Puff</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>19.8506</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.1494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for the situational self-image/Ford-image comparison and the real self-image/Ford image comparison. However, both of these congruency scores were significantly lower than the ideal self-image/Ford-image congruency scores.

The results of the analysis involving Mercedes were very interesting. A majority of the respondents (126 of 217) chose Mercedes in the situational choice. The mean situational self-image/Mercedes-image congruency score was significantly lower than both the real and ideal self-image/Mercedes-image mean congruency score.

Although the situational self-image/Cadillac-image congruency score was less than both the real and ideal self-image/Cadillac-image congruency scores, the comparisons did not produce a significant difference (.27 and .16 significant levels, respectively). Thirty-nine respondents chose Cadillac in the situational choice and were analyzed in this group.

The results for Toyota, with thirty-three respondents, were very similar to the results for Mercedes. The situational self-image/Toyota-image mean congruency score was significantly lower than both the real and ideal self-image/Toyota-image mean congruency scores. In addition, the real self-image/brand-image means congruency score was significantly lower than the ideal self-image/brand-image congruency, which is similar to results produced in prior research.
Facial Tissue

For the facial tissue situation, two brands had respondent groups which were deemed to be too small to make analysis possible. Coronet produced only four respondents and the store/brand generic produced only eight respondents. The results from the remaining two tissue brands, Puffs and Kleenex, which incidently represent the major portion of the facial tissue market, will be discussed in more detail.

Eighty-seven respondents chose Puffs in the situational choice. The differences in the congruency scores were significantly different for all comparisons. The situational self-image/Puffs-image congruency score was significantly lower than both the real and ideal self-image/Puffs-image congruency scores. Again, as with Toyota in the car situation, the real-image/Puffs-image congruency score was significantly lower than the ideal-image/Puffs-image congruency score.

Although more respondents chose Kleenex than Puffs (118 to 87), the results were identical. Here again, the situational self-image/Kleenex-image congruency score was significantly lower than the real- and ideal-image/Kleenex-image congruency score, indicating a greater congruency.

Bar Soap

Unlike the facial tissue situation, in the bar soap situation the respondents were fairly evenly divided into the
four brand groups. The lowest number of respondents in a brand category was fifty-one whereas the brand category with the largest number of respondents had fifty-eight respondents.

For two brands (Dove and Dial) the mean situational self-image/brand-image congruency score was lower, but not significantly lower than the real self-image/brand-image congruency score. The situational self-image/brand-image congruency score was, however significantly lower than the ideal self-image/brand-image congruency score for both brands. In addition, for both brands, the real self-image/brand-image score was significantly lower than the ideal self-image/brand-image congruency score.

In the case of Irish Spring, the situational self-image/Irish Spring-image was moderately significantly lower than the real self-image/Irish Spring-image (significance level of = .15). However, the congruency score for the situational self-image/Irish Spring-image was significantly lower than the ideal self-image/Irish Spring-image congruency score.

The congruency scores for Ivory were as predicted in the hypothesis. The situational self-image/Ivory-image congruency score was significantly lower than both the real and ideal self-image/Ivory-image congruency scores. In this case, as with others, the real self-image had a greater congruency with the chosen brand-image than the ideal self-image.
Jeans

Of the four brands in the jeans situation, two brands produced significantly lower situational self-image/brand-image congruency scores than real and ideal self-image/brand-image congruency scores. One produced a moderately significant lower score. The last brand's situational self-image/brand-image congruency score was lower, but not significantly lower than the real and ideal self-image/brand-image congruency scores.

Both Calvin Klein and Levis's situational self-image/brand-image congruency scores were significantly lower than both the real and ideal self-image/brand-image congruency score. The situational self-image/brand-image congruency score for Lee's was only moderately lower (significance level of = .12). The situational self-image/brand-image congruency score for Jordache (with only seventeen respondents) was not significantly lower than the real or ideal congruency scores.

For all the jean brands the congruency scores for the real self-image/brand-image were lower than for the ideal self-image/brand-image comparison. Although, the real was only significantly lower in two cases and moderately lower in the other two cases (significance levels of = .10 and .15, respectively).

Hypothesis Five

Hypothesis Five addressed the question of product involvement as a moderator variable. As in the analysis of
Hypothesis Four, only situational self-image/brand-image congruency scores for the brands chosen in the situation choice were the basis of the analysis. It had been hypothesized that congruency scores would reflect involvement and brands in the high involvement categories would produce significantly lower congruency scores. Lower congruency scores for high involvement products versus low involvement products would indicate a higher degree of congruency between the situational self-image and the image of the chosen brand for high involvement products.

Because of the limited number of respondents, two brands in the high involvement category and two brands in the low involvement category were omitted from the analysis. The brands omitted from the low involvement category were Coronet and Generic. In the high involvement category, Ford and Jordache were excluded from the analysis due to the small number of respondents.

A t-test comparison was made between each high involvement brand included in the analysis and each low involvement brand included in the analysis. Of the resulting thirty-six comparisons made only eleven produced significantly different (significance level of = .10) mean scores. (See Table VIII for summary results.) However, only seven of the eleven comparisons which produced significant scores were in the direction predicted. In other words, only seven of the thirty-six comparisons produced significant
TABLE VIII

INvolvement as a Moderator Variable: A Comparison of High and Low Involvement Product's Brand-Image/Situational Self-Image Mean Congruency Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Puffs</th>
<th>Kleenex</th>
<th>Dove</th>
<th>Irish Spring</th>
<th>Ivory</th>
<th>Dial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cadillac</td>
<td>15.579(^a)</td>
<td>16.947</td>
<td>16.250</td>
<td>13.000</td>
<td>21.846</td>
<td>14.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.947(^b)</td>
<td>20.742</td>
<td>17.875</td>
<td>18.400</td>
<td>18.461</td>
<td>21.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signif. Level</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Puffs</th>
<th>Kleenex</th>
<th>Dove</th>
<th>Irish Spring</th>
<th>Ivory</th>
<th>Dial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toyota</td>
<td>15.154</td>
<td>15.450</td>
<td>21.500</td>
<td>17.100</td>
<td>20.909</td>
<td>13.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.385</td>
<td>14.850</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>15.600</td>
<td>13.090</td>
<td>11.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signif. Level</td>
<td>0.027*</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>0.010*</td>
<td>0.308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Puffs</th>
<th>Kleenex</th>
<th>Dove</th>
<th>Irish Spring</th>
<th>Ivory</th>
<th>Dial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mercedes</td>
<td>18.718</td>
<td>15.789</td>
<td>20.121</td>
<td>15.250</td>
<td>22.857</td>
<td>14.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.717</td>
<td>19.296</td>
<td>20.121</td>
<td>17.806</td>
<td>19.714</td>
<td>17.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signif. Level</td>
<td>0.616</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Puffs</th>
<th>Kleenex</th>
<th>Dove</th>
<th>Irish Spring</th>
<th>Ivory</th>
<th>Dial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signif. Level</td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Puffs</th>
<th>Kleenex</th>
<th>Dove</th>
<th>Irish Spring</th>
<th>Ivory</th>
<th>Dial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.111</td>
<td>16.088</td>
<td>15.600</td>
<td>17.000</td>
<td>16.923</td>
<td>14.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signif. Level</td>
<td>0.637</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>0.053*</td>
<td>0.006*</td>
<td>0.948</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Numbers on this row = Low Involvement Brand-Image/Situational Self-Image Mean Congruency Scores

\(^b\) Numbers on this row = High Involvement Brand-Image/Situational Self-Image Mean Congruency Scores

* Significant comparison
scores with the high involvement mean congruency score lower than the low involvement score. In the remaining four significant comparisons the low involvement brand produced a lower congruency score than the high involvement brand.

Toyota, a high involvement brand, had a significantly lower congruency score than Puffs and Ivory. Cadillac and Mercedes elicited two significant comparisons each, however, all four were comparisons in which the low involvement brands had the lower congruency scores.

For the jeans, the other high involvement product category, the significant comparisons were all in the expected direction. Calvin Klein produced three out of six significantly lower mean scores when compared with the low involvement brands. Levi produced two significantly lower mean scores.

**Hypothesis Six**

In the initial analysis for Hypothesis Six a Chi-Square test was employed. Low and high public self-consciousness was cross tabbed with a score indicating a brand match score for the product category. Matching scores were calculated based on the unspecified brand choice and the situational brand choices. The two resulting groups were those who chose the same brand in both choices and those who chose different brands in the two choices. Of the four resulting Chi-Square
tests none produced significant results. Further analysis involving individual brand comparison was indicated.

In order to more effectively test the effects of public self-consciousness on product choice, with situational influences, a nonparametric technique was employed. The McNemar test for related samples was used. Since this test is used for paired samples which fall into two categories it was applicable for the analysis of the results in Hypothesis Six.

The measures for high and low public self-consciousness were determined first. In order to divide the respondents into two groups based on this variable, the mean scores for the summed values of the seven related questions in the self-consciousness scale were used. Those respondents with summed scores on the seven questions above the mean for the entire sample were labeled "low" in public self-consciousness. The remaining respondents, with summed scores below the mean were labeled "high" in public self-consciousness (Scheier 1980).

For the McNemar test, the paired samples used were the respondent groups divided into those who chose the same brand in the unspecified choice and the situational choice, and those who's brand choice differed in the two measures. The two categories used in the cross tabulation were high and low public self-confidence. It had been hypothesized that those high in public self-confidence would be more sensitive to the situation and would, therefore, be more inclined to change
their brand choices when confronted with a social situation. Therefore, it was expected that those high in public self-consciousness would have significantly higher unmatched choices.

The analysis for Hypothesis Six was done on a brand-by-brand basis. The McNemar test indicated six brands produced a significant difference, at the .10 level of significance. However, after determining significance it was necessary to examine further to see if the difference was in the presupposed direction. Only in the case of Calvin Klein and Mercedes did the respondents high in public self-consciousness show a significant difference in the group who changed brands in the situational choice from a previous choice in the unspecified decision.

Hypothesis Seven

Scores for high and low private self-consciousness were computed in order to test for the effect of private self-consciousness on consumer-held brand-images. Values for the ten appropriate questions were summed and a mean score was calculated for the entire sample. Respondents with summed values less than the mean for the entire sample were designated as "high" in private self-consciousness. Respondents with summed scores, on the ten questions, above the population mean score were designated as "low" in private self-consciousness (Scheier 1980).
In order to calculate a variable to be referred to as "image score" for each brand the variables from each semantic differential scale were recoded. The responses on both extreme ends were recoded with the value 3 (from the original code of 1 or 7). The middle response would indicate a lack of involvement with the variable and was recoded from 4 to 0. Of the remaining responses, the second and the sixth were recoded 2 if they had previously been coded 6. The third and fifth responses were recoded 1. An example of the recoding procedure follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Code</th>
<th>Recoded Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>usual</td>
<td>unusual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was necessary to recode the variables to determine if those high in private self-consciousness do hold more vivid images of brands. It was hypothesized more vivid held images would have prompted a response at either of the extreme ends.

Once the variables were recoded, an image score for each brand was determined by adding the scores for all of the twelve variables in a scale for each brand. To determine if those high in private self-consciousness did hold a more vivid image of a brand than those low in that trait, a T-test
was conducted on each image score for all brands. (See Table IX for a summary of the results.)

For fifteen of the sixteen brands the group high in private self-consciousness held a higher image score. In the case of Toyota, the group low in private self-consciousness held a very significantly higher image score. Nine of the sixteen brands in the study produced significant results in the hypothesized manner. In the case of these nine brands the respondents high in private self-consciousness produced a significantly (at the .10 level) higher image score.

Summary

Of the seven hypotheses included in this study two were not generally supported. Two hypotheses were supported partially and the remaining three hypotheses were basically supported in this study.

Specifically, Hypothesis Three was basically supported. In the case of twelve of the sixteen brands, the situational self-image was more congruent with the image of the brand chosen in that situation than the other brands in the product category.

When compared with the real and ideal self-images in Hypothesis Four, the situational self-image was a better indicator of brand choice in a majority of the significant cases. The situational self-image was more congruent than the real self-image with the brand-image of the situational
### TABLE IX
PRIVATE SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS AND IMAGE MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cadillac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>19.0531</td>
<td>0.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>18.6545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>16.9735</td>
<td>0.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>15.9909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>17.9204</td>
<td>0.040*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>15.6273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercedes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>25.8829</td>
<td>0.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>25.1952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puffs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>16.9204</td>
<td>0.095*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>14.8640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>14.3125</td>
<td>0.050*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>12.2909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kleenex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>17.1621</td>
<td>0.026*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>14.4114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>22.4425</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>20.4144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>16.6543</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>13.0991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>17.0885</td>
<td>0.008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>13.9009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>19.2212</td>
<td>0.051*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>16.5766</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>15.1150</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>11.8378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>16.0266</td>
<td>0.096*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>14.2549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordache</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>19.8571</td>
<td>0.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>18.5586</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin Klein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>22.2411</td>
<td>0.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>20.7207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>18.4288</td>
<td>0.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>17.5405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Variables significant at the .10 level or less.
Group 1 - High in Private Self-Consciousness
Group 2 - Low in Private Self-Consciousness
brand choice in eight cases of sixteen. The situational self-image was overwhelmingly superior to the ideal self-image, in terms of congruency with the image of the situational choice brand. The situational self-image was significantly more congruent in thirteen of sixteen cases. In most comparisons, the real self-images were more congruent with the chosen brand than the ideal, thus contributing the same results as past research.

Also basically supported was Hypothesis Seven. For nine brands the image scores for those high in private self-consciousness were significantly higher than those low in private self-consciousness. For all but one brand, the mean image score was higher for the high in self-consciousness group, than the mean in image score for the low in private self-consciousness group.

Providing partial support, the results from the analysis in Hypothesis One were mixed. In ten cases the respondents would probably purchase the same brand if tested again, while allowing for brand loyalty. This would indicate the respondent would probably not purchase differently if confronted with different situations.

Whether the respondents' self-images vary in different social situations was tested with mixed results. Very few variables produced significant differences in mean scores for the four different jean and facial tissue situations.
However, almost half of the car variables mean scores were significantly different among the different situations and thirteen of the twenty bar soap variable mean scores were significantly different.

In Hypothesis Five only twelve brands were used due to low response rates for four brands. The results generally did not support the hypothesis. However, half of the six comparisons made using Calvin Klein and various low involvement brands were significant and two Levi comparisons, of six, were significant. These five significant jeans comparisons represent the majority of the seven significant comparisons in the analysis for the entire hypothesis, which necessitated thirty-six comparisons.

The moderator variable, public self-consciousness, generally was not shown to contribute to the understanding of situational influences. Of the sixteen brands tested only Calvin Klein and Mercedes produced the expected results.
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CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of this study have been analyzed and were presented in Chapter IV. Many conclusions can be drawn from the results and will be discussed for each hypothesis individually, followed by a general discussion of the research results as a whole. The discussion of conclusions will be followed by recognized limitations of this study and recommendations for further research.

Hypothesis One

Since Hypothesis One produced mixed results it is difficult to draw any conclusions concerning this area. Allowances were made for brand loyalty and yet it is still difficult to state whether brand choice will vary when the situation changes. This could be due to the product categories chosen for the study or because of the situations used in the research. Perhaps, in addition, intent to buy was not the most appropriate dependent variable.

Hypothesis Two

When presented with different social situations the respondents did perceive themselves differently, to some extent.
degree. This was particularly true for the bar soaps situation, and to a lesser degree the automobile situation.

The situational self-image did not vary significantly, on the whole, with different social situations in the jean and facial tissue situations. Perhaps, in the jean situation, the consumers felt that personal apparel brand choice should not be influenced by the social situation. In addition, brand choice in the jean category may not have been perceived as readily recognizable to others. Therefore, if referent others could not recognize brands easily, the consumer may have not felt the need to satisfy the social-self and instead satisfied the personal-self through brand choice.

In the case of the facial tissue, the consumer may have felt that significant others cannot ascertain particular brands of tissues, nor would the significant other care which brand was provided. In addition, the inclusion of varying significant others in the situation may not have influenced the situational self-image due to the peculiarities of the situation itself. Providing facial tissue for a significant other with a cold may not have been perceived as a feasible or important, situation in which to be involved.

The respondents did care to be perceived differently when encountering different social situations involving bar soap, generally. This may partially be explained by the
situation. In the hypothesized situation the respondents were to respond to a situation in which bar soap was being purchased for the guest bathroom for use by the reference role person. The results from the pretest showed, on the average, the respondents could provide more brand names for the bar soap category than any of the other three product categories. In addition, the images elicited, in the pretest, for bar soap were clearer and more distinct than for any other product category tested. Therefore, it seems that marketers have been able to differentiate bar soap brands with past strategies. Since consumers see a clear distinction between bar soap brands, perhaps they also see these brands as a means to differentiate themselves by bar soap choices.

The same principle may be true for automobile use. In the pretests automobiles were the second most prolific product category in terms of number of brands elicited from memory. Image measures were particularly strong, also. Since the hypothetical situation allowed the respondents to engage in a low risk automobile usage situation (renting all brands at the same cost) the respondents were able to employ the automobile as a means to differentiate themselves. In addition, the automobile is a particularly visible product and, therefore, would lend itself to self-image expression.
Hypothesis Three

Twelve of the sixteen brands tested were found to have held images more congruent to the respondents' situational self-image than the other three brands employed in the situation. These findings would seem to support the hypothesis that consumers will choose the brand, given a choice, with the image most like the image of themselves they would like to project in a situation. Consumers would appear to view the brands as props which they can use to enhance their desired situational image. Upon assessing the situation, the respondents determined what image they would like to project and in a majority of cases the respondents chose the brand (prop) which best matched that desired image.

The four brands who's choice did not reflect a similarity between their brand-image and the situational self-image may have been chosen because of the notoriety of the brand name itself and not because of the image of that brand. In other words, these brands (Cadillac, Puffs, Dove and Ivory) may have been chosen because of the prominence in the market the brand itself displays or because of predetermined brand loyalty. They may have been chosen for the situation because they are well-known brands and not because of their held-images.
Hypothesis Four

The results from Hypothesis Four were perhaps the most encouraging and insightful. This hypothesis dealt with the issue of the potential of the situational self-image as a determinant of brand choice over the real and ideal self-images, which have dominated other research in the area.

The situational, real and ideal self-images can be ranked-ordered, with the results of this research, in terms of which self-image held the most image congruency with the situation choice brand, in the majority of the cases. The ranking would have the situational self-image first, with the most congruency followed by the real and ideal, in that order. Consumers do tend to chose the brand whose held-image best matches the image of themselves they would like to display in a social situation. The situational self-image is, therefore, a potentially more viable marketing tool than the previously explored and documented real and ideal self-images.

These findings could be helpful in the design of communication strategies. First, brand-image must be recognized as an important product attribute. Second, self-image must be recognized as an important brand choice determinant. Third, the situational self-image, specifically, should be recognized as a unique marketing tool to address the issue of brand choice. Thus, possible usage
situations should be stressed in marketing communications as well as social situations and the presence of others.

Marketing communications could employ the situational self-image in a number of manners. The product could be shown in use in a variety of specific situations. The consumer could thus be shown how to differentiate their image through the use of the brand in that particular situation. The consumers' different selves need to be addressed. Since the situational self-image incorporates all of the individuals selves, including the real and the ideal, work in this area need only be modified to include situational influences.

Hypothesis Five

Generally, product involvement was not shown, in this research, to be a factor in the situational self-image/brand-image congruency issue. Although it would seem logical that involvement would play a part in the consumer's concern with situational images, this relationship was not supported in this research.

A potential problem encountered with the use of involvement as a moderator variable was that product involvement is partially determined by situational influences. Therefore, confounding of some type may have taken place. Product involvement can be situation-specific
and thus product involvement may not play a part in situational influences on self-image/brand-image congruency.

In addition, the distinction of high and low involvement products was made based on prior research using a similar, but different population. The previous research was conducted several years prior to this particular study, therefore, the results may not have been applicable for this respondent group due to the time elapsed between the studies. Specifically, jean brands may not be as recognizable or distinctive as they were several years ago when the previous research was conducted.

**Hypothesis Six**

Public self-consciousness was also not found to be effective as a moderator variable in this study. It had been hypothesized that those high in public self-consciousness would be more sensitive to situational influences and would be more apt to change brand choice when confronted with a social situation.

The results were disappointing for this hypothesis. Only two brands displayed the expected results, the two brands were "status" brands (Calvin Klein and Mercedes). It is possible that the brands that have more status have more social influence than brands that are not considered status brands.
Hypothesis Seven

Recognizing the importance of brand-images to marketing strategy, private self-consciousness was examined as a possible variable to aid in the understanding of consumer held brand-images. The results of this research supported the hypothesis that consumers high in private self-consciousness do hold more vivid images of brands than those low in private self-consciousness. High private self-consciousness has been shown in research to indicate a more imageful, introspective individual (Fenigstein 1979). This tendency to be imageful may be assumed to include brand-images as well.

The significant results for this hypothesis would be difficult to apply directly to marketing strategy. Brand-images are an important marketing tool; it would be difficult, nonetheless, to target those high in private self-consciousness specifically as a target market. It should be noted, however, that a portion of the market holds more vivid images of themselves.

Perhaps, since those high in private self-consciousness are more attuned to their inner feelings they would also be more aware of their needs as consumers. This variable, private self-consciousness, could be an insightful variable in the study of consumer behavior. This possibility will be discussed later.
Implications

This study focused on the image congruency between the situational self-image and brand-image. Although research has been done on image congruency in the past, it was felt that the situational self-image is a more relevant construct than previous definitions of self. In general, by empirically testing the construct of situational self-image it was felt that this research added to the body of knowledge called marketing.

Several weaknesses of past studies were circumvented in this study. The adjectives used in the semantic differential scales had been pretested and specifically chosen for the products involved in this study. In previous research an arbitrary list of adjectives was often employed. In addition, the respondent's images were measured prior to any purchase. Earlier research tended to examine perception after purchase, and it was felt that the respondent's perceptions would by that time have been manipulated to coincide with the purchase in order to maintain internal consistency.

This research provides the rationales for various marketing communication strategies. These rationales:

a. demonstrated that the advantage of a brand should be shown to the target market in terms of the way in which they perceive the brand. Image and
perception have been demonstrated to be important to marketing strategy;

b. improved understanding of how the symbolic content of the brand should match the self-concept of the consumer segment;

c. helped in using products as props to create an image in an advertisement;

d. aided in differentiating the symbolic content of the brand to better match the self-concept of the target market;

e. helped promotional efforts identify the product with the desired self-concept;

f. helped formulate promotional strategies that emphasize the value of the product in optimizing the performance of social roles.

This research can also aid in the process of product differentiation, especially for parity products. Products can be differentiated in terms of what they say about the consumer since consumers use products to express their situational self-image.

Very little research in the field of marketing explores the effects of self-consciousness on purchasing behavior. This research will aid in the understanding of public and private self-consciousness. This study will provide potential variables for marketers to identify consumers with these qualities and possibly to aid in cross-correlating
these qualities with other buyer behavior. This can help in copywriting, and other aspects in the creation of advertisements.

Particularly relevant to marketers is how a construct can be used in segmentation strategies. This research provides new options for segmentation strategies. Markets can be segmented with a situational approach, wherein each situation gives the product a different meaning. Situational influences and differences should be emphasized.

Brands do have symbolic meanings, particularly to those high in private self-consciousness. The results of this research should facilitate the development of the symbolic meaning of a brand.

Not only can the results of this study be applied to advertising strategy, but strategy involving another communication device, specifically packaging, could be benefitted. Packaging could be designed to imply that the product can be used in specific situations. In addition, since packaging is a highly visible component of the promotional mix in many usage situations, package design and configuration can be designed to convey different images for different situations. By offering package options the consumer is given the opportunity to employ specific props for each situation encounters.
Limitations

In this research, the following limitations were recognized as follows:

1. Probably the most recognizable limitation is the lack of generalizability. The convenience sampling procedure employed will limit the generalizability to a relatively small population. However, this limitation is tolerable due to the nature of the research.

2. The students may have been sensitive to the measurement process because they knew they were being observed. Thus the respondents may have altered their answers due to this influence.

3. The study was dealing with theoretical concepts, such as situational self-image, that lack prior research and substantiation. This particular construct had not been empirically tested prior to this study.

4. Since the instrument was administered in three sittings over the course of four weeks, mortality was a problem. Respondents may have dropped out of the testing environment, or may have become fatigued.

5. The length of the instrument, although administered in three parts, may have caused disinterest on the part of the respondents.
6. As is the case when collecting any personal information, the respondents may not have been truthful and may have revealed only what they chose to reveal, or they may have distorted their responses to reflect what they felt were more socially acceptable answers.

7. Another threat to internal validity might have been history, or the passage of time, since the data collection procedure took four weeks to complete. However, it is not felt this was significant since self-image are not likely to change dramatically in this relatively short period of time.

8. Sample selection procedures employed may have been a problem, as university classes of respondents were used in total. The classes chosen were chosen on a basis of convenience.

9. The various images in the study were measured on the basis of twenty variables chosen for this study. Therefore, congruency of images were based solely on the included variables and not necessarily the true images of either the self or the brands.

**Implications for Further Research**

Although this research answered many questions concerning the situational self-image, self-consciousness and
brand images it also opened many areas to further inquiry. The results and the omission of this research can potentially evolve into many additional research problems.

In this research, image congruency was the primary interest, therefore, the specific image of the various brands was not explored. Additional multi-dimensional scaling on the semantic differential responses would be enlightening. Also, the strength of the various images, either self or brand, would be a possible direction of further exploration.

From the marketing practitioner's point of view an inquiry into the similarity or differences of the respondents' held brand-images and the marketers ideal brand-image would be interesting. In this vein, more suitable adjective for each individual brand, versus the twenty-pairs used in this study, would be developed.

The results of this study involving public self-consciousness were disappointing. However, the construct itself should not be discarded as not applicable to marketing research. Public self-consciousness should be explored in terms of how it may affect the situational self-image and not brand choice, as it was in this study. Investigating further the affects of social influences, a study involving status brands may produce significant results for marketing theory. The results of Hypothesis Six suggested that investigations involving status brands may contribute to the congruency issue.
Private self-consciousness is an interesting variable that produced overwhelming significant results in this study. It may be desirable to investigate this variable further, particularly in regards to specific buyer behavior. Perhaps, as an example, private self-consciousness and buying behavior in different product categories, such as personal grooming products, could be studied.

When measuring situational self-images, and their effects on buying behavior, it would be a natural conclusion from this research to suggest the use of product categories in which brands have been differentiated in the minds of the respondent groups. The bar soap category in this study produced some of the most significant results due perhaps, at least partially, to the fact that the brands demonstrated a different, as well as strong, image in the pretest.
APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE
**Part One**

Please answer the following sets of questions about yourself as honestly and as frankly as possible. There are no right or wrong answers and your answers will be kept confidential. (Check the blank that best indicates your answer.)

### I. The person I am is...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>usual</th>
<th>plain</th>
<th>complex</th>
<th>active</th>
<th>gentle</th>
<th>innocent</th>
<th>feminine</th>
<th>aggressive</th>
<th>durable</th>
<th>lively</th>
<th>sophisticated</th>
<th>impulsive</th>
<th>distinctive</th>
<th>expensive</th>
<th>fashionable</th>
<th>youthful</th>
<th>lush</th>
<th>practical</th>
<th>snobbish</th>
<th>reliable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| unusual    | (10)      | elaborate | simple  | passive | rough    | experienced | masculine | mild mannered | fragile | calm      | naive      | deliberate | nondistinct | inexpensive | nonfashionable | old fashioned | austere | frivolous | down-to-earth | unreliable | (29)     |

### II. The person I would like to be...

| active     | passive   | (30)     | calm     | frivolous | unFashionable | fragile    | simple     | masculine   | nondistinct | austere | unreliable | rough      | elaborate | deliberate | down-to-earth | inexpensive | unusual | experienced | naive      | mild mannered | old fashioned | (49)     |
|------------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|-----------|------------|-------------|------------|---------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|---------|------------|-----------|-------------|----------------|----------|
| lively     |           |          |          |           |             |           |            |             |            |         |             |           |           |            |            |            |         |            |           |            |                |          |
| practical  |           |          |          |           |             |           |            |             |            |         |             |           |           |            |            |            |         |            |           |            |                |          |
| fashionable|           |          |          |           |             |           |            |             |            |         |             |           |           |            |            |            |         |            |           |            |                |          |
| durable    |           |          |          |           |             |           |            |             |            |         |             |           |           |            |            |            |         |            |           |            |                |          |
| complex    |           |          |          |           |             |           |            |             |            |         |             |           |           |            |            |            |         |            |           |            |                |          |
| feminine   |           |          |          |           |             |           |            |             |            |         |             |           |           |            |            |            |         |            |           |            |                |          |
| distinctive|           |          |          |           |             |           |            |             |            |         |             |           |           |            |            |            |         |            |           |            |                |          |
| lush       |           |          |          |           |             |           |            |             |            |         |             |           |           |            |            |            |         |            |           |            |                |          |
| reliable   |           |          |          |           |             |           |            |             |            |         |             |           |           |            |            |            |         |            |           |            |                |          |
| gentle     |           |          |          |           |             |           |            |             |            |         |             |           |           |            |            |            |         |            |           |            |                |          |
| plain      |           |          |          |           |             |           |            |             |            |         |             |           |           |            |            |            |         |            |           |            |                |          |
| impulsive  |           |          |          |           |             |           |            |             |            |         |             |           |           |            |            |            |         |            |           |            |                |          |
| snobbish   |           |          |          |           |             |           |            |             |            |         |             |           |           |            |            |            |         |            |           |            |                |          |
| expensive  |           |          |          |           |             |           |            |             |            |         |             |           |           |            |            |            |         |            |           |            |                |          |
| usual      |           |          |          |           |             |           |            |             |            |         |             |           |           |            |            |            |         |            |           |            |                |          |
| innocent   |           |          |          |           |             |           |            |             |            |         |             |           |           |            |            |            |         |            |           |            |                |          |
| sophisticated|         |          |          |           |             |           |            |             |            |         |             |           |           |            |            |            |         |            |           |            |                |          |
| aggressive |           |          |          |           |             |           |            |             |            |         |             |           |           |            |            |            |         |            |           |            |                |          |
| youthful   |           |          |          |           |             |           |            |             |            |         |             |           |           |            |            |            |         |            |           |            |                |          |
Please respond to the following statements in a manner which best describes you.

1. I'm always trying to figure myself out.
2. I'm concerned about my style of doing things.
3. Generally, I'm not very aware of myself.
4. It takes me time to overcome my shyness in new situations.
5. I reflect about myself a lot.
6. I'm concerned about the way I present myself.
7. I'm often the subject of my own fantasies.
8. I have trouble working when someone is watching me.
9. I never scrutinize myself.
10. I get embarrassed very easily.
11. I'm self-conscious about the way I look.
12. I don't find it hard to talk to strangers.
13. I'm generally attentive to my inner feelings.
14. I usually worry about making a good impression.
15. I'm constantly examining my motives.
16. I feel anxious when I speak in front of a group.
17. One of the last things I do before I leave my house is look in the mirror.
18. I sometimes have the feeling that I'm off somewhere watching myself.
19. I'm concerned about what other people think of me.
20. I'm alert to changes in my mood.
21. I'm usually aware of my appearance.
22. I'm aware of the way my mind works when I work through a problem.
23. Large groups make me nervous.
If given the opportunity, which of the following brands would you most likely purchase. You must choose one brand in each category.

**Facial Tissues:** (Choose One)  
- Kleenex  
- Coronet  
- Puffs  
- Generic/store brand

**Jeans:** (Choose One)  
- Levis  
- Calvin Klein  
- Jordache  
- Lee's

**Bar Soap:** (Choose One)  
- Dial  
- Ivory  
- Irish Springs  
- Dove

**Four-door Sedan Automobiles:** (Choose One)  
- Ford Ltd  
- Mercedes 300D  
- Cadillac Sedan de Ville  
- Toyota Corolla 4-dr Deluxe Sedan

Please include your Social Security number. It will be used only to analyze the data. Your response will remain confidential and anonymous.

Social Security Number _____ - _____ - _____ (1-9)
**QUESTIONNAIRE**

Part Two: Please evaluate the following brands as best as you can. There are no right or wrong answers, just your opinion. Please answer as carefully as possible. (Check the blank that best indicates your answer.)

**FOUR-DOOR SEDAN AUTOMOBILES:**

1. Cadillac

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>usual</th>
<th>elaborate</th>
<th>complex</th>
<th>fragile</th>
<th>nondistinct</th>
<th>inexpensive</th>
<th>fashionable</th>
<th>youthful</th>
<th>austere</th>
<th>practical</th>
<th>down-to-earth</th>
<th>reliable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

unusual: 77
plain: 1
simple: 0
durable: 0
distinctive: 0
expensive: 0
old fashioned: 0
lush: 0
snobbish: 0
unusual: 0
complex: 0
fashionable: 0
youthful: 0
austere: 0
practical: 0
down-to-earth: 0
reliable: 0

2. Toyota

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>distinctive</th>
<th>fashionable</th>
<th>luscious</th>
<th>snobbish</th>
<th>unusual</th>
<th>simple</th>
<th>durable</th>
<th>expensive</th>
<th>old fashioned</th>
<th>frivolous</th>
<th>unreliable</th>
<th>plain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

nondistinct: 89
unfashionable: 0
austere: 0
down-to-earth: 0
usual: 0
complex: 0
fragile: 0
inexpensive: 0
youthful: 0
practical: 0
reliable: 0
elaborate: 0

3. Ford

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>fragile</th>
<th>youthful</th>
<th>elaborate</th>
<th>austere</th>
<th>down-to-earth</th>
<th>unusual</th>
<th>complex</th>
<th>practical</th>
<th>distinctive</th>
<th>inexpensive</th>
<th>expensive</th>
<th>reliable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

durable: 101
old fashioned: 0
plain: 0
lush: 0
snobbish: 0
usual: 0
simple: 0
frivolous: 0
non-distinct: 0
fashionable: 0
inexpensive: 0
unreliable: 0

4. Mercedes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>luscious</th>
<th>usual</th>
<th>youthful</th>
<th>complex</th>
<th>fragile</th>
<th>plain</th>
<th>snobbish</th>
<th>distinctive</th>
<th>inexpensive</th>
<th>unreliable</th>
<th>fashionable</th>
<th>practical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

unusual: 113
old fashioned: 0
simple: 0
durable: 0
elaborate: 0
down-to-earth: 0
non-distinct: 0
expensive: 0
reliable: 0
unfashionable: 0
frivolous: 0
FACIAL TISSUES:

1. **Puffs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>reliable</th>
<th>down-to-earth</th>
<th>practical</th>
<th>fashionable</th>
<th>expensive</th>
<th>nondistinct</th>
<th>dureable</th>
<th>feminine</th>
<th>gentle</th>
<th>simple</th>
<th>plain</th>
<th>usual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

unreliable (125) snobbish
frivolous
unfashionable
inexpensive
distinctive
fragile
masculine
rough
complex
elaborate
usual (136)

2. **Coronet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>elaborate</th>
<th>rough</th>
<th>fragile</th>
<th>inexpensive</th>
<th>frivolous</th>
<th>reliable</th>
<th>down-to-earth</th>
<th>fashionable</th>
<th>nondistinct</th>
<th>feminine</th>
<th>simple</th>
<th>usual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

plain (137) gentle
durable
expensive
practical
unreliable
snobbish
unfashionable
distinctive
masculine
complex
usual (138)

3. **Kleenex**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>unreliable</th>
<th>fashionable</th>
<th>feminine</th>
<th>unusual</th>
<th>plain</th>
<th>fragile</th>
<th>practical</th>
<th>down-to-earth</th>
<th>distinctive</th>
<th>simple</th>
<th>gentle</th>
<th>expensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

reliable (149) masculin
unfashionable
masculine
usual
elaborate
durable
frivolous
snobbish
nondistinct
complex
rough
inexpensive (160)

4. **Generic/store brand**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>unusual</th>
<th>elaborate</th>
<th>complex</th>
<th>rough</th>
<th>masculine</th>
<th>distinctive</th>
<th>inexpensive</th>
<th>frivolous</th>
<th>snobbish</th>
<th>unreliable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

usual (161) plain
simple
gentle
feminine
nondistinct
complex
fashionable
practical
down-to-earth
reliable (172)
BAR SOAP:

1. Dove

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>reliable</th>
<th>frivolous</th>
<th>practical</th>
<th>youthful</th>
<th>naive</th>
<th>fragile</th>
<th>mild mannered</th>
<th>masculine</th>
<th>experienced</th>
<th>rough</th>
<th>passive</th>
<th>usual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Irish Springs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>practical</th>
<th>unusual</th>
<th>reliable</th>
<th>passive</th>
<th>youthful</th>
<th>rough</th>
<th>naive</th>
<th>masculine</th>
<th>calm</th>
<th>aggressive</th>
<th>innocent</th>
<th>durable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. Ivory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>innocent</th>
<th>calm</th>
<th>naive</th>
<th>youthful</th>
<th>reliable</th>
<th>practical</th>
<th>usual</th>
<th>active</th>
<th>gentle</th>
<th>feminine</th>
<th>mild mannered</th>
<th>fragile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. Dial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>usual</th>
<th>active</th>
<th>gentle</th>
<th>innocent</th>
<th>masculine</th>
<th>mild mannered</th>
<th>fragile</th>
<th>calm</th>
<th>sophisticated</th>
<th>youthful</th>
<th>frivolous</th>
<th>reliable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

[Image of a table with cell entries corresponding to the above categories for each bar soap brand]
JEANS:

1. Lee's

- snobbish
- practical
- lush
- youthful
- inexpensive
- distinctive
- impulsive
- sophisticated
- durable
- mild mannered
- innocent
- fashionable

- down-to-earth (221)
- frivolous
- austere
- old fashioned
- expensive
- nondistinct
- deliberate
- naive
- fragile
- aggressive
- experienced
- inexpensive

2. Jordache

- experienced
- fragile
- deliberate
- expensive
- austere
- down-to-earth
- practical
- youthful
- distinctive
- sophisticated
- mild mannered
- fashionable

- innocent (233)
- durable
- impulsive
- inexpensive
- lush
- snobbish
- frivolous
- old fashioned
- nondistinct
- naive
- aggressive
- fashionable (244)

3. Calvin Klein

- austere
- snobbish
- practical
- fashionable
- distinctive
- aggressive
- experienced
- durable
- impulsive
- expensive
- youthful
- naive

- lush (245)
- down-to-earth
- frivolous
- unfashionable
- modest
- mild mannered
- inexperienced
- naive
- fragile
- deliberate
- inexpensiveness
- experienced
- old fashioned
- sophisticated (256)

4. Levis

- fashionable
- innocent
- mild mannered
- naive
- impulsive
- nondistinct
- expensive
- youthful
- lush
- practical
- snobbish

- unfashionable (257)
- experienced
- aggressive
- fragile
- sophisticated
- delinquent
- distinctive
- inexpensive
- old fashioned
- austere
- frivolous
- down-to-earth (268)

Please include your Social Security number. It will be used only to analyze the data. Your responses will remain confidential.

Social Security Number ______ ______ ______ ______ ______
**QUESTIONNAIRE**

**Part Three**

Please respond to the following hypothetical situations in an honest and truthful manner. The situations may not automatically apply to you at this particular time. For some you may have to think into the future, for others you may have to use some imagination. There are no right or wrong answers, simply your own opinion. React as honestly as possible to the hypothetical situations. You must answer all questions as best you can.

**SITUATION ONE**

You have to rent a car to pick up your parents at the airport. When you go to rent the car you discover you can rent 4-door sedan models at the same price, for the same period of time. All of the models are of adequate size for your purpose and the distance to and from the airport is not significant in terms of fuel economy.

Considering this situation, the person I would like to be seen as...

- reliable
- snobbish
- practical
- lush
- youthful
- expensive
- distinctive
- impulsive
- naive
- durable
- aggressive
- feminine
- innocent
- rough
- active
- complex
- plain
- usual
- non-fashionable
- unreliable
- calm
- down-to-earth
- frivolous
- austere
- old fashioned
- inexpensive
- nondistinct
- deliberate
- sophisticated
- fragile
- mild mannered
- masculine
- experienced
- gentle
- passive
- simple
- elaborate
- unusual
- fashionable

Select the model you would rent in this situation. (Check one)

- Cadillac
- Ford
- Mercedes
- Toyota

**SITUATION TWO**

You need to buy some bar soap for the guest bathroom. The following brands are available in the right size and color for your guest bathroom. Your employer will be the only one using this particular bathroom.

Considering this situation, the person I would like to be seen as...

- fashionable
- snobbish
- expensive
- aggressive
- lively
- impulsive
- durable
- usual
- reliable
- distinctive
- rough
- complex
- practical
- youthful
- taciturn
- plain
- lush
- naive
- feminine
- active
- non-fashionable
- down-to-earth
- inexpensive
- mild mannered
- calm
- deliberate
- fragile
- unusual
- unpredictable
- nondistinct
- gentle
- simple
- frivouls
- old fashioned
- experienced
- elaborate
- austere
- sophisticated
- masculine
- passive

Which of the following brands of bar soap would you purchase in this situation. (Choose one)

- Dial
- Ivory
- Irish Spring
- Dove
SITUATION THREE

You have been invited to a party by your friend. Jeans seem to be the most appropriate attire. You have decided to get a new pair of jeans for the party and when you get to the store four brands of jeans are on sale for the same price. In addition, all the brands have a size available that fits you well. You want to make a good impression at the party because of who will be there.

Considering this situation, the person I would like to be seen as is...

- expensive
- masculine
- usual
- unusual
- plain
- elaborate
- complex
- simple
- aggressive
- mild mannered
- active
- passive
- practical
- frivolous
- youthful
- old fashioned
- snobbish
down-to-earth
- lively
calm
- reliable
- austere
- distinctive
- nonconspicuous
- naive
- sophisticated
- durable
- fragile
- impulsive
delicate
- innocent
- passive
- practical
- plentiful
- aggressive
- fashion
- active
- snobbish
- inexpen
- feminine
- luxurious
- complex
- simple
- rough
- nonfashionable

Which of the following brands of jeans would you purchase in this situation?
(Select one)

- Levi's
- Calvin Klein
- Jordache
- Lee's

SITUATION FOUR

Your spouse or boy/girl friend is coming over for lunch and you know he/she has a cold. You will need to get some facial tissues to have handy. When you get to the store you find four brands available for the same price. All four brands have the color and size box you have intended to buy. You know your spouse or boy/girl friend will see and use the tissue.

Considering this situation, the person I would like to be seen as...

- nonfashionable
- experienced
- plain
- elaborate
- lively
- calm
- durable
- unusual
- usual
- sophisticated
- naive
- passive
- impulsive
delicate
- feminine
- masculine
- practical
- frivolous
- aggressive
- austere
- snobbish
- inexpen
- complex
- mild mannered
- youthful
down-to-earth
- snobbish
- expensive
- simple
- complex
- old fashioned
- reliable
- unreliable
- distinctive
- nonconspicuous
- rough
gentle

Which of the following brands would you purchase in this situation?
(Select one)

- Coronet
- Kleenex
- Generic/store brand
- Puffs

Please include your Social Security number for data analysis purposes only. Your answers will remain confidential.

Social Security Number __________
QUESTIONNAIRE

Part Three

Please respond to the following hypothetical situations in an honest and truthful manner. The situations may not automatically apply to you at this particular time. For some you may have to think into the future, for others you may have to use some imagination. There are no right or wrong answers, simply your own opinion. React as honestly as possible to the hypothetical situations. You must answer all questions as best you can.

SITUATION ONE

You have to rent a car to pick up your employer at the airport.

When you go to rent the car you discover you can rent 4-door sedan models at the same price, for the same period of time. All of the models are of adequate size for your purpose and the distance to and from the airport is not significant in terms of fuel economy.

Considering this situation, the person I would like to be seen as is...

- reliable
- practical
- youthful
- aggressive
- distinct
- naive
- durable
- feminine
- innocent
- complex
- plain
- usual
- non-fashionable

Which of the following brands of bar soap would you purchase in this situation? (Choose one)

- Dial
- Ivory
- Irish Spring
- Dove
You have been invited to a party by your spouse or boy/girl friend. Jeans seem to be the most appropriate attire. You have decided to get a new pair of jeans and when you get to the store four brands of jeans are on sale for the same price. In addition, all the brands have a size available that fits you well. You want to make a good impression at the party because of who will be there.

Considering this situation, the person I would like to be seen as is...

- expensive
- feminine
- usual
- plain
- complex
- aggressive
- active
- practical
- youthful
- snobbish
- lively
- reliable
- lush
- distinctive
- naive
- durable
- impulsive
- innocent
- rough
- fashionable
- inexpensive
- masculine
- unusual
- elaborate
- simple
- mild mannered
- passive
- frivolous
- old fashioned
- down-to-earth
- calm
- unreliable
- austere
- nondistinct
- sophisticated
- fragile
- deliberate
- experienced
- gentle
- nonfashionable

Which of the following brands of jeans would you purchase in this situation? (Select one)

- Levi's
- Calvin Klein
- Jordache
- Lee's

Your parents is coming over for lunch and you know he/she has a cold. You will need to get some facial tissues to have handy. When you get to the store you find four brands available for the same price. All four brands have the color and size box you have intended to buy. You know your parents will see and use the tissue.

Considering this situation, the person I would like to be seen as...

- nonfashionable
- innocent
- plain
- lively
- durable
- usual
- naive
- active
- impulsive
- feminine
- practical
- lush
- aggressive
- snobbish
- expensive
- complex
- youthful
- reliable
- distinctive
- rough
- fashionable
- experienced
- elaborate
- calm
- fragile
- unusual
- sophisticated
- passive
- deliberate
- experienced
- gentle
- nonfashionable

Which of the following brands would you purchase in this situation? (Select one)

- Coronet
- Kleenex
- Generic/store brand
- Puffs

Please include your Social Security number for data analysis purposes only. Your answers will remain confidential.

Social Security Number ______-____-____
Part Three

Please respond to the following hypothetical situations in an honest and truthful manner. The situations may not automatically apply to you at this particular time. For some you may have to think into the future, for others you may have to use some imagination. There are no right or wrong answers, simply your own opinion. React as honestly as possible to the hypothetical situations. You must answer all questions as best you can.

SITUATION ONE

You have to rent a car to pick up your friend at the airport. When you go to rent the car you discover you can rent 4-door sedan models at the same price, for the same period of time. All of the models are of adequate size for your purpose and the distance to and from the airport is not significant in terms of fuel economy.

Considering this situation, the person I would like to be seen as . . .

- reliable
- lively
- snobbish
- practical
- lush
- youthful
- expensive
- distinctive
- impulsive
- naive
- durable
- aggressive
- feminine
- innocent
- rough
- active
- complex
- plain
- usual
- non-fashionable
- unreliable
- calm
- down-to-earth
- frivolous
- austere
- old fashioned
- inexpensive
- non-distinct
- deliberate
- sophisticated
- fragile
- mild mannered
- masculine
- experienced
- gentle
- passive
- simple
- elaborate
- unusual
- fashionable

Select the model you would rent in this situation. (Check one)

- Cadillac
- Ford
- Mercedes
- Toyota

SITUATION TWO

Your spouse or boy/girl friend will be staying over at your place for the weekend. You need to buy some bar soap for the guest bathroom. The following brands are available in the right size and color for your guest bathroom. Your spouse or boy/girl friend will be the only one using this particular bathroom.

Considering this situation, the person I would like to be seen as . . .

- fashionable
- snobbish
- expensive
- aggressive
- lively
- impulsive
- durable
- usual
- reliable
- distinctive
- rough
- complex
- practical
- youthful
- innocent
- plain
- lush
- naive
- feminine
- active
- non-fashionable
- down-to-earth
- inexpensive
- mild mannered
- calm
- deliberate
- fragile
- unusual
- unreliable
- non-distinct
- gentle
- simple
- elaborate
- old fashioned
- fresh
- sophisticated
- masculine
- experienced
- austere
- passive

Which of the following brands of bar soap would you purchase in this situation? (Choose one)

- Dial
- Ivory
- Irish Spring
- Dove
You have been invited to a party by your parents. Jeans seem to be the most appropriate attire. You have decided to get a new pair of jeans for the party and when you get to the store four brands of jeans are on sale for the same price. In addition, all the brands have a size available that fits you well. You want to make a good impression at the party because of who will be there.

Considering this situation, the person I would like to be seen as is...

- Inexpensive
- Masculine
- Masculine
- Masculine
- Masculine
- Masculine
- Masculine
- Masculine
- Young
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
- Singer
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Part Three

Please respond to the following hypothetical situations in an honest and truthful manner. The situations may not automatically apply to you at this particular time. For some you may have to think into the future, for others you may have to use some imagination. There are no right or wrong answers, simply your own opinion. React as honestly as possible to the hypothetical situations. You must answer all questions as best you can.

SITUATION ONE

You have to rent a car to pick up your spouse or boy/girl friend at the airport. When you go to rent the car you discover you can rent 4-door sedan models at the same price, for the same period of time. All of the models are of adequate size for your purpose and the distance to and from the airport is not significant in terms of fuel economy.

Considering this situation, the person I would like to be seen as is . . .

reliable ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ unreliable
lively ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ calm
snobbish ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ down-to-earth
practical ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ frivolous
lush ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ austere
youthful ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ inexpensive
expensive ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ old fashioned
distinctive ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________impulsive
impulsive ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ nondistinct
naive ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ deliberate
durable ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ sophisticated
aggressive ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ fragile
feminine ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ mild mannered
innocent ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ masculine
rough ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ experienced
delicate ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ gentle
active ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ passive
complex ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ simple
plain ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ elaborate
usual ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ unusual
non-fashionable ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ fashionable

Select the model you would rent in this situation. (Check one)

Cadillac  Ford  Mercedes  Toyota

SITUATION TWO

Your parents will be staying over at your place for the weekend. You need to buy some bar soap for the guest bathroom. The following brands are available in the right size and color for your guest bathroom. Your parents will be the only one using this particular bathroom.

Considering this situation, the person I would like to be seen as is . . .

fashionable ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ non-fashionable
snobish ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ down-to-earth
expensive ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ inexpensive
aggressive ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ mild mannered
lively ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ calm
impulsive ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ deliberate
aggressive ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ fragiles
naive ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ gentle
durable ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ passive
usual ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ simple
delicate ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ nondistinct
complex ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ old touched
practical ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ extravagant
youthful ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ elaborate
innocent ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ austere
plain ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ masculine
lush ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ sophisticated
naive ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ feminine
active ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ passive

Which of the following brands of bar soap would you purchase in this situation. (Choose one)

Oral  Ivory  Irish Spring  Dove
SITUATION THREE

You have been invited to a party by your employer. Jeans seem to be the most appropriate attire. You have decided to get a new pair of jeans for the party and when you get to the store four brands of jeans are on sale for the same price. In addition, all the brands have a size available that fits you well. You want to make a good impression at the party because of who will be there.

Considering this situation, the person I would like to be seen as is...

- expensive
- feminine
- usual
- plain
- complex
- aggressive
- active
- practical
- youthful
- snobbish
- lively
- reliable
- lush
- distinctive
- naive
- durable
- impulsive
- innocent
- rough
- fashionable
- inexpensive
- masculine
- unusual
- elaborate
- simple
- mild mannered
- passive
- frivolous
- old fashioned
- down-to-earth
- calm
- unreliable
- austere
- nondistinct
- experienced
- gentle
- nonfashionable

Which of the following brands of jeans would you purchase in this situation? (Select one)

- Levis
- Calvin Klein
- Jordache
- Lee's

SITUATION FOUR

Your friend is coming over for lunch and you know he/she has a cold. You will need to get some facial tissues to have handy. When you get to the store you find four brands available for the same price. All four brands have the color and size box you have intended to buy. You know your friend will see and use the tissue.

Considering this situation, the person I would like to be seen as...

- nonfashionable
- innocent
- plain
- lively
- durable
- usual
- naive
- active
- impulsive
- feminine
- practical
- lush
- aggressive
- snobbish
- expensive
- complex
- youthful
- reliable
- distinctive
- rough
- fashionable
- experienced
- elaborate
- calm
- fragile
- usual
- sophisticated
- passive
- deliberate
- masculine
- frivolous
- austere
- nondistinct
- experienced
- gentle
- nonfashionable

Which of the following brands would you purchase in this situation? (Select one)

- Coronet
- Kleenex
- Generic/store brand
- Puffs

Please include your Social Security number for data analysis purposes only. Your answers will remain confidential.

Social Security Number
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