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This paper furthers our understanding of consumption communities by emphasizing the importance of contextualizing them in a historical and media environment. We investigate the logic by which a group of young, affluent urbanites – the Stockholm brats – organize their consumption community. By conducting netnographic and ethnographic studies in the brat milieus the particular style of the brats is scrutinized. The concept of subcultural capital is employed to look at how historical roots and current media attention helps in constructing the consumption ethos of this particular group.
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### Rating 3 Sample 1 * Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>neither/nor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rating 3 Sample 1</strong> negative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>no</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>positive</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rating 3 Sample 2 * Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>neither/nor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rating 3 Sample 2</strong> negative</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>no</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>positive</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rating 3 Sample 3 * Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>neither/nor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rating 3 Sample 3</strong> negative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>no</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>positive</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSION (INCLUDING LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS)

In terms of methodological limitations, firstly we presented participants with stimulus material which did not coincide with how people actually process research stimuli (Kreuz and Roberts 1993). Secondly, we did not necessarily capture the whole meaning of our participants’ responses (Mick and Politic 1989); but rather settled for responses to pictorial interpretations that identified and characterised significant concepts and themes. Thirdly, we could not estimate the level of processing opportunity of each participant that ties in with ad repetition. Results from studies of ad repetition have been associated with increased levels of cognitive response (Petty and Cacioppo, 1980), more enduring ad and brand attitudes and stronger purchase intentions (Batra and Ray, 1986; Edell and Keller, 1988). Finally selective ad processing, as occurs in real life, was not accounted for in this study. We don’t seek to mimic real-life exposure but to provide for relevant and spontaneous interpretations (Phillips, 1997).

Future research could explore at greater length the relationships of ad credibility on attitude towards the brand and the

**TABLE 3**
Simple Correlation Matrix ($r$ values)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VE</th>
<th>VAD</th>
<th>VAD1</th>
<th>VAD2</th>
<th>VAD5+6</th>
<th>VB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VAD</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAD1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAD2</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>0.637**</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAD5+6</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.738**</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Model 1) (Model 2)

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed)**

[KEY: VE: Advertising Effectiveness; VAD Attitude to the Ad; VB: Attitude to the Brand; VAD1: Liking; VAD2: Perception; VAD5: Ad credibility; VAD6 Ad claim discrepancy].
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