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Consumers are frequently unable to express their opinions due to restrictions imposed by the government and social norms. We show that restricting consumers’ ability to express their opinions on important social and political issues leads to increased need for self-expression and conspicuous consumption, strengthening individuals’ preferences for self-expressive brands.
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SESSION OVERVIEW
The goal of the proposed session is to build on the existing literature to further the understanding how self-identity affects consumers’ brand preferences. Research papers to be presented investigate this topic from multiple theoretical perspectives, offering a broader view of the role of brands in self-expression. Given the relevance of the topic to central issues in consumer behavior, this session is likely to have significant effect on future identity research and, in particular, the role of brands as a means of self-expression. Apart from providing theoretical insights into how identity influences brand preferences, the proposed session will contribute to the understanding of several content areas of great interest to ACR conference attendees, including brand extension, attitudes, self-concept, and compensatory consumption. Specifically, this special session will address the following issues:

Research presented by Ward and Dahl explores the effect of threats to self on brand preferences. They extend past research which has established that when one’s self-concept is threatened, s/he is more likely to acquire objects to reaffirm the self. Ward and Dahl investigate this proposition in a luxury retail context and examine how a rejection from the sales staff impact consumers’ brand perceptions. The authors show that, contrary to conventional wisdom that a welcoming sales staff will attract consumers, rejecting consumers may actually enhance retailers’ appeal to some consumers. Specifically, they conclude that when an individual is rejected by a salesperson from brand that is relevant to his/her ideal (vs. actual) self, s/he is likely to increase (decrease) his/her assessments of the brand and willingness to consume in ways that enable him/her to affiliate (disassociate) with the rejecting brand.

Research by Ma, Hamilton, and Chernev examines how restricting self-expression in the social and political domains (e.g., being forbidden to comment on political leaders; inability to express feelings toward others) impacts consumers’ brand preferences. They show that the unexpressed self in the social domain leads to an increased need for self-expression and conspicuous consumption, strengthening individuals’ preferences for self-expressive brands. They attribute this effect to the compensatory nature of self-expression, whereby restricting self-expressive means in one domain leads to a greater desire to self-express in an unrelated domain.

Adding to the counterintuitive findings that the threatened self and unexpressed self can lead to increased brand preferences, research by Gosline and Lee examines another counterintuitive hypothesis that omnivores (consumers who mix high and low status brands) find interstatus brand collaborations less appealing than univores (owners of only the high or the low status brands). They test this hypothesis using various experiments that feature hypothetical and actual interstatus co-branding collaborations. They find that the greatest damage to brand prestige is actually amongst current owners of both the high and lower status brands. These findings contribute to the longstanding brand extension literature, particularly the literature that addresses symbolic status brands, which suggests that these brands could dilute their image and reputation when engaging in some form of downward extension.

Lastly, Ding, Xu, and Wan examine the impact of identity framing on motivation and self-control. They show that consumers with a broad identity (vs. a narrow identity) perceive themselves as having more social resources, which in turn enhances motivation for social tasks and improves their self-control. They further demonstrate that this effect is apparent in communal relationships but attenuated in exchange relationships. Moreover, the findings confirm that perceived social resource mediate the effect of identity framing on consumers’ motivation and self-control.

Our proposed session can contribute substantively to the theme of ACR 2012—appreciating diversity. The research papers in this session investigate the relationship between self-identity and brand preference in diverse range of contexts, such as in-store purchasing, restricted social and political environment, co-branding collaborations, and social tasks. These research projects involved a wide array of consumers, including those from both East and West, and in the lab and the field. This session will contribute both to basic theory development in the realm of identity and branding, and as well will suggest implications for marketing strategy.

Each presenter will be given 15 minutes to present. This will leave 15 minutes for discussions between the presenters and audience. The discussion will aim at facilitating a broader understanding of the role of brands as a means of self-expression and the implications of this understanding on expanding the field of consumer behavior.

Being Mean to Keep ‘Em Keen: Retail Rejection Increases Aspiring Consumers’ Desire for the Rejecting Brand

EXTENDED ABSTRACT
Consumers often feel intimidated by unfriendly sales staff at luxury retailers and cite this as a reason they avoid shopping in these venues. Indeed, a former employee of Yves Saint Laurent admits that sales people size up a customer by looking at his watch and his shoes and ‘if the accessories are not expensive, the customer is not worth
the effort of even a simple hello’ (Wilson 2009). However, as luxury sales have declined in recent years, retailers endeavor to become approachable in an effort to attract new consumers and increase sales (Odell 2009).

Yet, contrary to conventional wisdom that a welcoming sales staff will attract consumers, we demonstrate that rejecting consumers may actually enhance retailers’ appeal to some consumers. The extant research supports this conjecture: individuals who have been rejected have been found to endeavor to ingratiate themselves with the rejecter (Romero-Caynas et al. 2010). Indeed, when aspects of the self-concept are threatened, people become more materialistic (Chang and Arkin 2002), are subsequently more likely to acquire objects that make a good impression on the rejecting party (Meade et al 2010) and bolster the threatened self (Rucker and Galinsky 2008).

Building on the prior research on social rejection, we contend that people differentially respond to rejection. Individuals’ sense of who they currently are and who they want to be is largely dependent on and reinforced by the groups they belong to. While one’s actual self is fairly stable, one’s ideal self is less certain and thus more vulnerable to threat (Swann 1983). Consequently, our prediction is that when an individual is rejected by a brand that is relevant to his/her ideal (vs. actual) self, s/he is likely to increase (decrease) his/her assessments of the brand and willingness to consume in ways that enable him/her to re-affiliate (disassociate) with the rejecting brand. Luxury brands are a domain that consumers are likely turn to when they are seeking affirmation and self-expression and as such, provide an excellent context to examine our hypotheses.

In the first study we investigate how consumers’ self-concepts affect their brand assessments and desire to purchase from brands to which they aspire but feel rejected by. In a 2 (brand: Gucci vs. Louis Vuitton) x 2 (salesperson behavior: rejecting vs. neutral greeting) experiment, participants first indicate their level of identification with and degree to which they aspire toward the brand. Next, they read a scenario describing a hypothetical shopping experience in which they are directed to some clothing items in a store by a rejecting (vs. neutral) salesperson.

After reading the scenario participants answered a series of questions about their brand perceptions and desire to buy and wear the clothing from the brand.

We examined how the rejecting (vs. control) salesperson affected participants’ assessments of the products from that brand. We observe a self-concept x salesperson behavior interaction (F(1, 100) = 4.78, p < .03) indicating that when consumers who possess ideal (vs. actual) identities relative to the brand, are rejected (vs. control) by the brand representative, they evaluate the products sold by the brand more positively.

The results show that not all rejection causes consumers to ingratiate via consumption but rather these behaviors are most likely when the rejection is threatening to the individual’s tenuous ideal self. In the next study, we further investigate how self-control affects consumers’ responses to rejection by manipulating their self-concept rather than measuring it.

In our second study we controlled self-views by priming participants’ ideal vs. actual identity with a sentence rearranging technique in which participants rearranged words relevant to one’s aspiration (vs. actual) identity. Next, participants completed an ostensibly unrelated study using the same scenario as the prior study. Finally, participants answered the same questions described in study 1.

We replicated the self-concept x salesperson behavior interaction (F(1, 121) = 4.28, p < .05) indicating that when consumers who aspire toward (versus identify with) the brand, are rejected by (vs. have a neutral interaction) with the brand representative, they evaluate the products sold by the brand more positively.

In study 3, we created a situation that mimics the experience of rejection in a retail environment. Participants participated in a 2 (brand: Gucci vs. Louis Vuitton) x 2 (salesperson behavior: rejecting vs. neutral) x 2 (prime self-concept: ideal vs. actual identity) x 2 (pre-experimental self-verification: self-verify vs. control) “product assessment study” in which participants interacted with a brand representative. Prior to the study half of the participants participated in a fashion knowledge tool (vs. neutral questions) enabling participants to express their fashion expertise enabling them to preemptively self-verify their fashion identity. Next, half of the participants were primed with an ideal vs. actual identity prime (see study 2). Finally, participants interacted with brand representatives who followed either a rejecting or neutral script. In rejecting conditions brand representatives appeared skeptical of the participant’s knowledge of the brand, and disapproving of his/her appearance (versus neutral). Participants then rated bags from the brand on how variables from prior studies. Two weeks after the study, participants again rated their views about of the brand.

The data reveal a salesperson behavior x prime self-concept x pre-experimental self-verification interaction (F(2, 172) = 6.61, p < .01) indicating that consumers who aspire towards (vs. feel affiliated with) the brand and have not (vs. have) been allowed to self-verify prior to interacting with a rejecting (vs. control) brand representative evaluate the products sold by the brand more positively.

Finally, we show that participants who had a rejecting (vs. neutral) interaction with the brand representative had significantly less positive perceptions of the brand two weeks after the interaction (M Rejecting= 4.82 vs. M Neutral = 5.60, F(1, 121) = 4.09, p < .04).

The findings from three studies show that retailer rejection may drive consumers to prefer products that enable them to ingratiate themselves to the rejecting group when the group is one which they aspire to belong. However, these effects can be mitigated if they are able to self-verify prior to rejection.
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The Unexpressed Self: The Impact of Restricting Freedom of Self-Expression on Brand Preferences

EXTENDED ABSTRACT

Individuals frequently have a desire to express aspects of the self. This desire to self-express stems from one of the most basic human needs—the need to belong and to be accepted and valued by others (Baumeister and Leary 1995; Fiske 2010; Maslow 1970). Despite the fundamental nature of self-expression, individuals are not always free to express their values, opinions, and beliefs. The limits to self-expression can be caused by a variety of factors. One is the restriction on free expression imposed by various government and regulatory entities. Such suppression of one’s ability to express views typically involves the domains of politics and public policy, often extending to related domains that include religion, communications, the media, and use of the Internet. In addition to being restricted by government, individuals’ self-expression also can be limited by social context, such as an imbalance of power in interpersonal relationships (e.g., an employee arguing with the boss). One’s need for self-expression can further be curbed by social norms, such as restrictions imposed by traditions (e.g., not speaking ill of the dead), as well as by norms of politeness (e.g., not telling a friend how she really looks in skinny jeans). On many occasions, individuals’ ability to express their views can be limited by a variety of factors that physically restrict one’s ability to reach an audience (e.g., when access to one’s social network is temporarily disrupted).

The ubiquity of possible impediments to self-expression raises the question of how restricting one’s ability to express values, opinions, and beliefs influences subsequent behavior. Because of its importance, the topic of restricting self-expression has been the focus of numerous studies that for the most part have focused primarily on the implications of restricting self-expression in social or political domains. In this context, it has been shown that suppressing social or political self-expression is likely to produce perceptions of injustice (Stevens 1992), as well as trigger oppositional social movements (Andersen 2006; Fetner 2008; Polletta 2004).

Building on prior research, we take a different approach and examine whether and how restricting one’s ability to express opinions in socio-political domains influences individuals’ preferences and behaviors in domains unrelated to the views being suppressed, in particular, the domain of product consumption. In this context, we investigate how the impact of restricting individuals’ ability to express their socio-political views influences their brand preferences.

We argue that restricting individuals’ ability to express their socio-political views can have a significant impact on brand preferences and that this impact tends to strengthen their need for self-expression through brands. This proposition builds on previous findings in the goal literature suggesting that when the means of pursuing a goal or fulfilling a need are restricted, people frequently experience a rebound effect, such that the restriction leads to a subsequent increase in need-related behavior (Lewin 1951). For example, suppressing thoughts about colors (Liberman and Förster 2000), stereotypes (Macrae et al. 1994) or white bears (Wegner et al. 1987) leads to increased thoughts of these constructs relative to a condition in which these thoughts were not suppressed. Likewise, when the means to fulfill a goal are removed, the desire to complete the goal becomes stronger (Förster and Liberman 2001; Förster, Liberman, and Higgins 2005). This is consistent with Lewin’s (1926) tension system theory of goals, which states that when a goal has been activated, the person feels a tension until the goal is completed.

Applied to self-expression, these findings imply that restricting the means to self-express can increase people’s motivation to express themselves. Since brands can serve as a non-restricted means of self-expression when other avenues are closed off, we propose that restricting one’s ability to express in social or political domains can strengthen one’s preference for self-expressive brands. Thus, we predict that curbing one’s ability to share their views of a major political or social event—such as opining about the performance of the president, commenting on major world news events, even sharing opinions about celebrities—will strengthen individuals’ preferences for ostensibly unrelated brands such as Nike, Oakley, or Levi’s. We propose that individuals’ need for self-expression is compensatory in nature and that consumers tend to offset their inability to self-express in one domain by seeking opportunities to express in other, unrelated domains.

We test this prediction in a series of five empirical studies. Experiment 1 shows that restricting self-expression in various social domains (opinions about celebrities, countries, universities, pop stars, etc.) strengthens consumer preferences for self-expressive brands. Experiment 2 further shows that restricting freedom of speech (commenting on a newsworthy current event) strengthens consumer preferences for self-expressive brands. Building on the findings of the first two studies, Experiment 3 further documents the compensatory nature of self-expression in cases when the restriction of self-expression is internally imposed (e.g. voluntarily controlling one’s feelings toward others). Experiments 4 and 5 aim to shed more light on the compensatory nature of self-expression. Specifically, Experiment 4 shows that the effects observed in the first three studies are attenuated when consumers have a channel other than brand evaluation in which to express themselves. Experiment 5 provides further support for our account by showing that conspicuous consumption, such as choosing a self-expressive brand, decreases individuals’ need for self-expression in the original, restricted domain (e.g. inability to comment on Obama’s performance).

In sum, this research investigates how curbing one’s ability to express an opinion in non-consumption domains subsequently increases one’s preferences for self-relevant brands. We show that this effect is due to the compensatory nature of self-expression—the unexpressed self in one domain can be expressed by self-expressive means from other domains, such as brands. This research adds to the literature on self-expression by demonstrating the compensatory nature of self-expression. It also adds to the literature on branding by documenting that brands can help consumers express the unexpressed self in non-consumption domains.
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Breaking Status Boundaries: When Interstatus Brand Collaborations Undermine Self-Expression by Omnivorous Consumers

EXTENDED ABSTRACT

Past research has shown that symbolic brands serve as a means for consumers to express their identities and social status, and to differentiate from dissociative outgroups (Chernev, Hamilton, Hal 2011; Berger and Heath 2007; White and Dahl 2006, 2007; Holt 1998; Shavitt 1990; Belk 1981; Veblen 1899). It may be quite surprising then that, recently, fashion brands have witnessed a growing phenomenon: co-branding partnerships between high and lower status brands. High status luxury brands (such as Jimmy Choo, Karl Lagerfeld, Stella McCartney, Roberto Cavalli, and Vera Wang), have entered into collaborations with lower status companies like Target, Kohls, J.C. Penney, Wal-Mart, and Payless Shoes. These status boundary violations (Lamont 1996) support recent research that has shown that many high status persons are not cultural snobs, but in fact eclectic and “omnivorous,” in their tastes (Erickson Peterson and Kern 1996; Erickson 1996; Peterson and Simkus 1992). Prior literature has explained this as a generational shift, due to cohort replacement and changes in social structure, values, and art-world dynamics. We introduce a new perspective on this phenomenon: that omnivorous status boundary-violating behavior is based on a need for self-expression. This leads us to a counterintuitive hypothesis that omnivores (consumers who mix high and low status brands) should find interstatus brand collaborations less appealing than univores (owners of only the high or the low status brands). We test this hypothesis using various experiments that feature hypothetical and actual interstatus co-branding collaborations. We find that the greatest damage to brand prestige is actually amongst current owners of both the high and lower status brands. These findings contribute to the longstanding brand extension literature, particularly the literature that addresses symbolic status brands, which suggests that these brands could dilute their image and reputation when engaging in some form of downward extension.

Our first study focuses on univores, and shows that owners of either the high status brand or the low status brand penalize their brands for collaboration. We recruited undergraduate students at Harvard to complete an online survey on a potential co-branding effort between Harvard and the University of Phoenix, and to browse the beta-website of the Harvard-Phoenix Online University to “get a sense of what the joint initiative would look like.” This collaboration was seen as an affront to owners of the high status brands (Harvard undergraduates), as the Harvard brand was deemed highly symbolic and used as a means of identity expression. We show that these subjects feel that their Harvard brand suffers lowered status (t(29) = -10.770, p < 0.001) and prestige points (t(29) = -7.324, p < 0.001), due to this collaboration. For non-Harvard subjects, who did not use the brands as expressive symbols, we saw no such penalty for the interstatus collaboration. Additionally, our Study 1 shows that Harvard subjects believed that the lower status school’s brand would increase in status and prestige due to the inter-status co-branding initiative with their school (t(29) = 12.245, p < 0.001). This indicates that the high status consumers are not merely trying to dissociate from or punish the lower status consumers.

Study 2 shows that, surprisingly, that the greatest damage to the collaborating brands is amongst consumers who currently own both the high status and lower status brands. These types of consumers, called omnivores, consume high and lower status brands simultaneously – this mixing behavior is a means of self-expression that is undermined by interstatus brand collaborations. Study 2 demonstrates this with an experiment featuring a hypothetical collaboration between the high-status Prada brand and the lower-status Banana Republic brand. We find that actual univore owners of Prada and actual univore owners of Banana Republic are quite similar to non-owners, in that their ratings of the prestige level of their respective brands experience little to no change. However, we find that actual omnivore owners of both Prada and Banana Republic penalize the high status brand (t(83) = -1.73, p = 0.087). These omnivores also rate the prestige of the collaboration significantly lower (t(84) = -2.22, p = 0.029), while univore owners of either the high status or the lower status brand are not significantly different from non-owners in their prestige ratings of the collaboration. We find that omnivores seek to make self-expressive statements with their status boundary violations. Despite the fact that these omnivore consumers currently own both the high and lower status brands simultaneously in their wardrobes, they also have a significantly lower rating of the fit of these same brands for a co-branding collaboration (t(84) = -3.254, p = 0.002). We argue that these consumers are motivated by a need for self-expression, and that omnivore behavior conveys a boundary spanning behavior that speaks to distinctive taste (Bourdieu 1984). As a result, when high and lower-status brands collaborate, they obvi ate the self-expressive nature of omnivore consumption.

In Study 3, we test whether interstatus collaborating brands may escape penalty if self-expression is aided by a “moral alibi” – an alternative explanation provided by the manufactuer that allows omnivore consumers to impute a moral meaning, like a charity or goodwill effort, to their consumption behavior. This moral alibi may create a means for self-expression for the brand owners that could defray the perceived negative consequences of the co-branding on the higher-status brand. However, though we find that it can significantly reduce the prestige or status lost compared to when a moral...
alibi is not proffered, the higher-status brand in the co-branding collaboration still suffers a penalty ($t(32) = -3.922, p < 0.001$).

The results of these three studies indicate the importance of preserving opportunities for self-expression amongst consumers of symbolic products. Interstatus collaborations may seem most appropriate for people who already mix brands of differing status, but pre-fabricated omnivorous brand offerings undermine the ability of consumers to express themselves via omnivorous consumption.
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**Will Broad Identity Make People Feel Stronger: The Impact of Identity Framing on Motivation and Self-Control Behavior**

**EXTENDED ABSTRACT**

Prior research has suggested that identities are situation-sensitive and that a shift in identities can lead to differences in information processing and actual behavior (Oyserman 2009). For example, Mandel (2003) finds that individuals primed with the interdependent (vs. independent) self-identity were more likely to take financial risks. Shih et al. (1999) found that Asian-American women performed better on a mathematics test when their ethnic identity was activated, but worse when their gender identity was made accessible.

Although a sizable research has examined the effect of different types of social identities on judgment and behavior (Aaker and Lee 2001), so far little research has examined the impact of different levels of social identity on behavior. According to self-categorization theory (Turner et al. 1987), people have multiple social identities with multiple levels of inclusiveness: the superordinate level based on similarities among human beings, the intermediate level emphasizing interdependence, and the subordinate level emphasizing independence. Based on this theory, we posit that social identities can be defined either broadly or narrowly. A broad identity defines a member in a superordinate group (e.g., an employee in P&G China), which combines heterogeneous features, and focuses on the similarities among subgroups. Conversely, a narrow identity defines a member in a subgroup (e.g., an employee in the Beijing Center in the R&D Department of P&G China), which constrains individuals to a specific domain, and focuses on the differences among subgroups. We further hypothesize that making the broad or narrow identity accessible to individuals will alter their cognitions and behaviors accordingly. Specifically, we propose that individuals with a more accessible broad identity (vs. narrow identity) will perceive belonging to a bigger group and having more social resources to spare, which in turn increase their motivation in social tasks. Moreover, prior literature has indicated that social support could attenuate job-stress and enhance self-efficacy (Viswesvaran et al. 1999). So we posit that a broad identity will enhance individuals’ perception about their self-regulation strength and improve self-control.

We also examine the boundary condition for the effects of identity framing on motivation and self-control. Building on the differences between communal and exchange interpersonal relationship (Aggarwal 2004), we hypothesize that a broad identity (vs. a narrow identity) will increase individuals’ motivation and self-control in subsequent tasks only when people perceive the interpersonal relationship as communal but not when they perceive it as exchange,
and that this moderation effect would be mediated by the perceived social resources.

To test the proposed hypotheses, we conducted three experiments. In Experiment 1, the identity framing was manipulated by presenting either the whole organization chart of HP (broad condition) or the same chart but with the highlight that they belong to the “Engineering Management” subdivision (narrow condition). Following this task, participants responded to the perceived social resource scale adopted from Zimet et al. (1988). Afterwards, they were instructed to read the description of environmental protection campaign which required them to collect signatures among their friends to support the campaign. Then participants estimated how many signatures they could get, and returned the collected signatures one week later. The results indicated that participants primed with a broad identity (vs. a narrow identity) reported having more social resources, estimated that they could collect more signatures, and actually returned more signatures. These results provided initial evidences for our proposed effect of the identity framing on self-perception and motivation.

Experiment 2 tested the moderation effect of interpersonal relationship on the impact of identity framing. The manipulation of identity framing was similar to that used in experiment 1. The interpersonal relationship was manipulated in the form of an idiom understanding task. In the communal condition, participants read the idiom as “Between friends all is common” which implied that people should care about others and show a genuine concern. Conversely, in the exchange condition, “Even reckoning makes long friends” was presented which emphasized that interpersonal relationship should be quid-pro-quo and that people should try to keep things even with others. We then measured participants’ motivation in social tasks by estimating how many signatures they could get to protect endangered animals. The performance on self-control was measured using a task of processing useful but threatening health message (Agrawal and Wan 2009). The findings demonstrated that among the participants in the communal condition, those primed with broad identity estimated they could get more signatures than those primed with narrow identity. However, for the participants in the exchange condition, the estimation of signature numbers did not differ between participants primed with broad identity and those primed with narrow identity. A similar pattern was found on the amount of time spent on reading the health message which reflected the participants’ self-control.

Experiment 3 explored the process underlying the moderating effect of interpersonal relationship on the impact of identity framing. We also aimed to replicate the results of experiment 2 in a marketing relevant context. Specifically, the identity framing was manipulated by priming participants as members of one parent brand fans club (broad identity) or one sub-brand fans group (narrow identity). Then participants moved on to the idiom task which manipulated the interpersonal relationship. Next, participants read the brochure of one new product trial campaign, and estimated the number of friends they could invite to join the campaign. Afterwards, participants proceeded to a product evaluation survey involving a series of binary choice, a task adopted from Vohs et al. (2008) to assess self-control. They were told to do as many as they could, with the understanding that they could stop anytime when they “want to quit.” The amount of time spent on doing the survey served as the dependent measure of self-control. Consistent with our predictions, the positive effect of broad identity on performance for both social and self-control tasks were only replicated in the communal relationship condition. Furthermore, we found that this moderation effect was mediated by perceived social resource.

This research contributes to the literature of social identity, pro-social behavior, and self-control. In addition, our findings provide insightful implications for marketing practice and organization behavior.
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