

SOCIAL NETWORKS: BRAND FAMILIARITY'S EFFECTS ON BRAND PERSONALITY

By

APRIL SHAPIRO

A THESIS PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ADVERTISING

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2009

© 2009 April Shapiro

To my classmates.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to give thanks to Dr. John Sutherland for being a truly dedicated chair, repeatedly going above and beyond the call of duty to help with this study. I also want to thank my committee members, Dr. Robyn Goodman and Dr. Jorge Villegas for being incredibly helpful and supportive throughout the entire process. I would like to thank my Master of Advertising class, who went from 16 complete strangers to a second family. I could never have done this without all of you and I wish you all the best. Lastly I would like to thank my parents, who in no way directly contributed to this thesis, but have always given me unyielding support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	4
LIST OF TABLES	7
ABSTRACT	9
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	10
Brand Familiarity	10
Brand Image and Personality	11
Social Networks	12
Research Problem	12
2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE	14
Social Networks	14
Brand Equity and Loyalty	17
Brand Personality	18
Congruity Theory	20
Aaker's Instrument	22
Strausbaugh's Instrument	23
The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator	23
The Adjective Checklist	25
Self-Concept and Purchase Motivation	25
Self-Expression Model	26
Brand Familiarity	27
Relationship Basis Model	28
Study Hypothesis	29
3 METHODOLOGY	33
Research Design	33
Selection of Brands	33
Sample	36
Variable Measurement	37
Brand Familiarity	37
Brand Personality	39
Survey Materials	41
Procedure	45
Measuring and Analyzing Data	46

4	FINDINGS.....	47
	Description of Sample	47
	Overall Participants	47
	Group Comparisons.....	49
	Validation of High, Medium, and Low Familiarity.....	51
	Brand Familiarity.....	51
	Brand Usage	52
	Amount of time used.....	52
	Account registration	53
	Satisfaction	53
	Brand Personality Frequency Distributions.....	54
	Hypothesis Testing	59
5	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	62
	Summary of Results.....	62
	Social Network Usage	62
	Brand Personalities of Social Networks.....	64
	Category Comparison.....	65
	Bebo Versus Sportsvite as Low Familiarity Brands.....	66
	Fungibility	67
	Theoretical Implications	68
	Practical Implications	69
	Limitations.....	72
	Suggestions for Future Research	73
 APPENDIX		
A	INFORMED CONSENT	76
B	QUESTIONNAIRES.....	78
LIST OF REFERENCES.....		121
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH		124

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>page</u>
2-1 Aaker Personality Dimensions.....	22
2-2 MBTI Personality Descriptions	31
3-1 Pre-Test Brand Stimuli	34
3-2 Pre-Test Results	35
3-3 Brands Selected for Main Study	35
3-4 Survey Brand Selections	41
3-5 Survey Order.....	42
4-1 Demographic Profile.....	48
4-2 Cross Tabulation of Group with Gender.....	50
4-3 Cross Tabulation of Group with Age.....	50
4-4 Cross Tabulation of Group with Academic Classification	50
4-5 Cross Tabulation of Group with Race/Ethnicity.....	50
4-6 Cross Tabulation of Group with Social Class.....	51
4-7 Cross Tabulation of Group with Computer Ownership.....	51
4-8 Brand Familiarity	54
4-9 Analysis of Variance Test of Familiarity.....	54
4-10 Familiarity Post Hoc Analysis	54
4-11 Brand Usage.....	55
4-12 Usage Time Per Week	55
4-13 Usage Time Descriptives	55
4-14 Registered Accounts	56
4-15 Brand Satisfaction.....	56
4-16 Most Frequently Occurring Personality Type.....	57

4-17	Overall Personality Assignments by Familiarity	58
4-18	MBTI Frequency Distributions by Individual Dimension.....	59
4-19	MBTI Frequency Distributions by Total Personality	59
4-20	Cross Tabulation of Match/No Match with Overall Personality Type.....	60
4-21	Cross Tabulation of Maximum Time with Number of Personalities.....	61

Abstract of Thesis Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Master of Advertising

SOCIAL NETWORKS: BRAND FAMILIARITY'S EFFECTS ON BRAND PERSONALITY

By

April Shapiro

May 2009

Chair: John C. Sutherland

Major: Advertising

Brands are a vital asset to today's marketplace in that they create value for a company and are often the link between company and consumer. Brand personality helps to differentiate brands and foster relationships with consumers. Despite brand personality's importance there is still only a modest level of knowledge on what influences it.

We attempted to discover whether brand familiarity has an effect on brand personality consensus within the new and evolving category of online social networking websites. An online survey was given to a sample of 244 students at the University of Florida to ascertain how their level of familiarity with certain social networks affected their level of consensus regarding the brand personalities of these websites.

Results showed that brand familiarity does have an effect on brand personality consensus. In the social network category, high and low familiarity brands showed strong personality consensus while medium familiarity brands showed weak personality consensus. The study concluded that in new product categories, category leaders will set the tone for the overall category personality, and unfamiliar brands will be presumed to possess the same personality as the category leader. Thus medium familiarity brands have low personality consensus because some consumers would have knowledge of their personality and others would not.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

In a marketplace overwhelmed with an unyielding amount of products and companies fighting for consumers' attention, a commonly used method for distinguishing between options is often the brand, simply defined as "something that is identifiable to the buyer and the seller and creates value for both" (Schultz and Schultz 2004, p. 14). According to Schultz and Schultz (2004), "for most organizations, the brand is the most important asset they own...free and clear" (p. 11). Brands are a vital asset to the marketplace in that they create value for both the company and the consumer, and they are often the relationship linking those two parties together (Schultz and Schultz 2004). The image of each brand, therefore, plays a large role in what that brand is capable of and how it is framed in the minds of consumers. The brand image, and more specifically the personality of a brand, helps to differentiate and make that brand more desirable to the consumer. Thus we can infer that brands play a large role in why consumers buy products, and thus, how companies make money.

Brand Familiarity

Brand familiarity is regarded as "easy recognition of a well-known brand" (Hoyer and MacInnis 2007, p. G-2). Just as people can feel a certain level of familiarity with other people they know, consumers can feel a certain level of familiarity with brands. People who consume certain brands on a regular basis are likely to feel very familiar with and knowledgeable about those brands. Conversely, brands that consumers have never come in contact with or developed a need for are likely to appear as unfamiliar to the consumer, and the consumer may not be knowledgeable about their attributes. The familiarity of a brand in the mind of consumers can lead to stronger preferences for that brand over unfamiliar brands.

Brand Image and Personality

Brand image, according to Plummer (2000), consists of how “a brand presents itself to the world” (p. 80). Brands do this through multiple outputs—packaging, logo, name, the product itself, and where the product is sold. However, the image of a brand perceived by a person is not necessarily equal to the image that is put out by the brand’s creator, because consumers interpret that image in their own way “through experience, through perceptions, misconceptions, the value systems of the individuals out there in the world, and of course, all the noise in the system” (Plummer 2000, p. 80). Brand image is comprised of three parts: physical attributes, functional benefits or characteristics, and the brand’s characterization or personality (Plummer 2000). It is the combination of these elements that helps consumers to decide whether a particular brand is suitable for them (Plummer 2000). Brand personality is thus a major component in how consumers feel about a particular brand and will be of major focus in this study.

According to Aaker (1997) a brand’s personality consists of “the set of human characteristics associated with a brand” (p. 347). The goal of developing brand personalities lies in reflecting “the way consumers actually feel about the brand rather than simply being an expression of the way we would *like* consumers to feel about the brand” (Plummer 2000, p. 81). Shank and Langmeyer (1993) noted that similar to a person’s personality often emerging from their heredity or the environment around them, “a product’s personality is born out of its tangible characteristics and the stimulus-response of consumers in the marketing environment” (p. 162). Just like a person, a brand can be humorous, laid back, serious, elegant, sophisticated, feminine, friendly, warm, old-fashioned, and the list goes on. For example, Aaker states that “the brand personality of Levi’s 501 jeans is American, western, ordinary, common, blue collar, hard working, and traditional” (Aaker and Fournier 1995, p. 394).

Social Networks

A recent phenomenon in media has been the rise of social networks. According to Wikipedia (2008b) a social network service “focuses on building online communities of people who share interests and activities, or who are interested in exploring the interests and activities of others” (p. 1). These networks are typically website-based and offer multiple outlets for user interaction (Wikipedia 2008b). Recently, social networks have become highly dominant ways for people to communicate and share ideas and information, making them part of a daily routine for many people (Wikipedia 2008b).

Research Problem

Branding is logically done in order to communicate one, distinct image of a brand to consumers. But does this really happen? And how easy is it to achieve this solid image across the board? Brand personality consensus refers to the level of agreement by different people in the way they view a particular brand’s personality. A brand with strong or high personality consensus would indicate that most consumers view the brand as having the same personality and they would all describe it in the same way. One personality would likely dominate all others. A brand with weak or low personality consensus would indicate that consumers all have their own views of the brand’s personality, and the number of differing personalities assigned to it would be quite high. There would be no clear dominant personality. Taking brand familiarity into consideration, it would seem logical to say that brands with high familiarity to consumers would have a strong personality consensus, while brands with low familiarity to consumers would have a weak personality consensus. But branding is a complicated concept, and the relationship between consumer and brand is not one sided. It works both ways. It can, therefore, be argued that brand personality is made up of not only what marketers put out, but also what consumers choose to take in. Consumers could completely accept and internalize the personality

conveyed by the brand, or they could misinterpret the brand's personality or adapt their interpretation of the personality to fit their needs and desires. The question is what actually happens? Does it depend? How should branders take this into consideration? And does this change the way we brand products? These questions have obvious implications for the branding efforts of companies everywhere. We need to discover why consumers view brand personalities the way they do. But to do this, we first need to understand what affects brand personality consensus and whether brand familiarity factors into the equation. To find out, the subsequent research will attempt to answer the following research question: Does brand familiarity affect brand personality consensus?

Will high familiarity brands have stronger consensus or is the opposite true? It appears that arguments can be made for both and thus this study will attempt to find the answer. This study will try to discover the link between brand familiarity and personality consensus through a study correlating respondents' levels of familiarity with various brands with the number of differing personality types to which those respondents assign them. Specifically, this study will have a focus on online social networking websites (referred to as "social networks" throughout the study). The use of social network brands creates an added component to the practicality of this research. Not only will the study attempt to find an answer to the research question, but information will also be discovered on college students' use and familiarity with online social networking websites. This information is also of large value to marketers today, as more and more people are spending their free time on the internet instead of in front of the television, and online advertising spending continues to increase.

CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Social networks have become a recent phenomenon in the ways in which people connect and communicate with each other. But as a relatively new and growing category, a solid understanding of how consumers have developed use of and relationships with social networks is still lacking and likely still evolving. From a marketing standpoint, it is beneficial to explore how familiar consumers feel they are with various social networks and how that familiarity ties into the personalities they view these social networks as having.

Social Networks

There are approximately 850 social networking sites today, with that number estimated to rise to 250,000 in the next year (Swartz 2008a). According to Wikipedia (2008b) the most heavily used social networks are “those which contain directories of some categories (such as former classmates), means to connect with friends (usually with self-description pages), and recommender systems linked to trust,” with some of today’s most popular sites combining different elements of each of these categories (p. 1). According to Swartz (2008a) MySpace, one of the social network “Big Three,” has been fairly profitable. The company recently solidified partnerships with Warner Music Group, Sony BMG Music Entertainment, and Vivendi’s Universal Music Group. These partnerships are enabling the site to give its members such things as merchandise and concert tickets (Swartz 2008a). HyperTargeting, launched for MySpace last summer, is software that searches through the content within MySpace user profiles in order to supply advertising content in tune with their hobbies and characteristics (Swartz 2008a). This program has been a huge driver of sales for MySpace, as hundreds of advertisers have become a part of it (Swartz 2008a).

Facebook, the second major player in the Big Three, has been able to acquire revenue through sales of virtual gifts, targeted ads placed by local companies, and banner advertisements (Swartz 2008a). Seth Goldstein, owner of SocialMedia Networks, says “more and more people are spending more and more of their time within the Facebook ecosystem...this is the largest aggregated, engaged audience. Period” (Swartz 2008a, p. 1).

LinkedIn makes up the third component of the Big Three. Unlike Facebook or MySpace, however, LinkedIn is a business contact social networking site. The company’s CEO, Dan Nye, claims “it’s a global, interconnected, world, and we are the one professional network” (Swartz 2008a, p.1). LinkedIn is currently at 21 million members and growing by over 1 million each month (Swartz 2008a). The company has been profiting from banner ads, subscriptions, paid job postings, corporate sales, and new developments such as research services (Swartz 2008a).

While the Big Three may dominate domestically, the international market appears to be open and welcoming newcomers (Swartz 2008a). Friendster was at one time was a hit in the United States. It has since faded here and is now widely popular in Asia touting 50 million users (Swartz 2008a). Bebo, which AOL recently purchased for \$850 million, has become popular with younger consumers, often between 13 and 24 years old (Swartz 2008a). Its recent profitability is due to collaboration with Nike and Apple (Swartz 2008a).

Online video sites such as YouTube.com often don’t appear on lists of typical social network sites; however, they can clearly be categorized as such. Through these sites, users create accounts, post videos, interact with other users, and post their opinions. YouTube, the category giant, was founded in 2005 and claims it is the “premier destination to watch and share original videos worldwide through a Web experience” (Ostrow 2008, p. 1). While YouTube may be the most widely known social network of its kind, the competitors are not shying away. Sites such as

Hulu, Next New Networks, Fora.TV, Metacafe, Brightcove, and DailyMotion are all video sharing sites fighting for consumer attention (Ostrow 2008).

According to Swartz (2008b) social networks are beginning to assume the roles previously filled by TV networks as advertising vehicles. To compare, the size and nature of each social network site helps determine the kind of TV network it hypothetically “replaces” (Swartz 2008b). For example, the highly popular mass-appeal sites such as MySpace and Facebook would take on the advertising function of major TV networks such as NBC, ABC, CBS, and FOX (Swartz 2008b). Less-widely used sites such as Bebo, LinkedIn, and Ning would replace cable networks that have more focused audiences such as MTV or CNN. What Swartz (2008b) refers to as “vertical sites,” such as Global Grind and Xing, would replace niche TV networks such as the Sci-Fi Channel and Food Network in order to reach highly targeted groups. Vertical social networks appeal to highly specialized interests, which is very inviting for marketers looking for easy ways to target specific groups (Swartz 2008a). The main benefit of using social networks as advertising vehicles is the ability to precisely target consumers based on their demographics and interests (Swartz 2008b). The realm of online advertising also offers marketers an abundance of opportunities for different media formats and methods of grabbing consumers’ attention (Swartz 2008b). As younger consumers continue to turn their attention away from the TV screen and onto the computer screen, it is becoming necessary—not just beneficial—to communicate with consumers through social networks (Swartz 2008b).

The main concern surrounding social networks today is how companies are going to make money (Swartz 2008a). Facebook, for example, is worth about \$15 billion but hardly makes a profit (Swartz 2008a). Bill Eager, co-founder of bSocial Networks, said of Facebook and the

other major players “you can’t have a \$15 billion market valuation based on advertising alone” (Swartz 2008a, p. 1).

As a new and developing category, social networks are faced with the challenge of distinguishing themselves to internet users and appealing to their needs in order to grow a customer base. Establishing a strong brand image in order to create brand equity may help foster a strong connection between a consumer and a social network.

Brand Equity and Loyalty

Branding is designed in hopes of establishing a high level of brand equity. According to Keller (1993), brand equity occurs when “certain outcomes result from the marketing of a product or service because of its brand name that would not occur if the same product or service did not have that name” (p. 1). Marketers strive to obtain high levels of brand equity. Dougherty (1996) expresses the benefit of establishing high levels of brand equity in that “short-term sales may provide a product with the fuel to stay alive for a day, but brand equity is the engine that will keep a brand alive, profitable and vital for a lifetime” (p. 16). Brand equity, in the mind of consumers, can lead to strong preferences for particular brands, referred to as brand loyalty. Brand loyalty is said to occur when “consumers make a conscious evaluation that a brand or service satisfies their needs to a greater extent than others do and decide to buy the same brand repeatedly for that reason” (Hoyer and MacInnis 2007, p. 258). Loyalty to a brand is quite different from a simple habit. This differentiation lies in the high amount of commitment to a brand (Hoyer and MacInnis 2007). Since the concepts of brand equity and brand loyalty appear to be increasingly paramount to the goals of the marketing of different products and services, it is important to understand the various measures that can be taken to ensure brand equity is established and that brand loyalty can be exhibited by consumers. Creating a strong brand image, and more specifically, brand personality, is essential for achieving these end-states.

Brand Personality

Aaker and Fournier (1995) view brand personality as part of the consumer-brand relationship, and expresses that “the brand is treated as an active, contributing partner in the dyadic relationship that exists between the person and the brand, a partner whose behaviors and actions generate trait inferences that collectively summarize consumer’s perception of the brand’s personality” (p. 393). Fournier poses a multitude of questions regarding the role of brand personality as an active, contributing relationship member, and questions if “brands in fact reach out to customers on an individual basis, seeking to form one-on-one relationships with them” (Aaker and Fournier 1995, p. 393). Fournier proposes that:

At a broad level of abstraction, all marketing mix activities and brand management decisions (e.g. a change in the brand’s advertising campaign, a coupon drop, alteration of package size) can be construed as “behaviors” enacted on part of the brand—behaviors that trigger attitudinal, cognitive, and/or behavioral responses on the part of the consumer (Aaker and Fournier 1995, p. 393).

Burke (1994) argues that a brand’s personality, along with its positioning, should be central to the message being communicated by the brand. Burke (1994) states that “a sound brand position, properly and consistently communicated, has the ability to impact consumer perceptions in ways that are far more enduring and which provide an impressive array of benefits” (p. 20). Examples of these aforementioned benefits are as follows:

Builds brand equity by generating acceptance of the company's brand position; Creates a recognizable environment for all customer communications; Imparts stronger imagery to all products and product lines; Differentiates the brand from the competition; Increases the impact of individual communications; Increases the impact of the total communications effort; and Enables the company to command a premium for its products (Burke 1994, p.20).

Brands can develop personality traits in one manner through the various people associated with a particular brand, such as endorsers of the product or high-ranked company personnel, such as the CEO or founder (Aaker 1997). Researchers express that brands develop not only

personality characteristics but also their own set of demographics, including age, gender, and social class. This can be exemplified through the portrayal of Virginia Slims as being female versus Marlboro as being male, Apple as being young versus IBM as being old, and Saks Fifth Avenue as being high-class versus Kmart as being blue collar (Aaker 1997).

Strausbaugh (1998) conducted a brand personality study that analyzed the number of dominant personalities of high familiarity brands and low familiarity brands in mature, well-established product categories. Strausbaugh's (1998) results concluded that brands with high equity contained multiple, yet strong, personalities. In Strausbaugh's (1998) pilot study, Coca-Cola exhibited two to four dominant personalities while Diet Coke and Cherry Coke exhibited only two dominant personalities. In Strausbaugh's (1998) main study, McDonald's exhibited two to three personalities. Taco Bell, at the time a relatively new and emerging brand, exhibited one dominant personality. Strausbaugh (1998) noted that "the majority of existing literature would indicate that a brand personality takes a very long time to build, dependent on message consistency, image, tone and so on" (p. 194). Strausbaugh (1998) also explained that brand personality "manuals" state that "this lengthy process should result in an overriding positioning and logically, singular perception of the brand in the mind of the consumer" (pp. 194-195). The results of Strausbaugh's (1998) study, however, challenged this. Strausbaugh (1998) suggested that "the longer the brand has been in existence and the more communications received over time with regard to it, the more identities it is able to take on" (p. 195). Strausbaugh (1998) speculated that the highly familiar product "becomes tightly intertwined with the usage experience for the consumer and thus becomes highly personalized and positive in nature" (p. 195). Because Strausbaugh's study focused on mature categories, the results cannot be projected onto the social

network category. The results of this study, therefore, will be interesting to compare with Strausbaugh's study.

The study of personality is an important concept in branding, not only concerning the personality of the brand but also the personality of the consumer. The study of self-concept is highly important to marketers because consumers' self image often controls their pattern of purchase behavior (Heath and Scott 1998). This is referred to as congruity.

Congruity Theory

The concept of image congruity refers to “the process of consumers purchasing products/brands that they believe possess symbolic images similar and/or complementary to the image they hold of themselves” (Heath and Scott 1998, p. 1110). Congruity Theory suggests that consumers will buy products that are congruent, or fitting, with their self-concept (Heath and Scott 1998). Heath and Scott (1998) propose that “any product information that is inconsistent with the consumer's self-concept is unlikely to gain their attention, acceptance, and retention” (p. 1112). Based on this theory of congruity, it seems likely that consumers will prefer brands that have personalities similar to their own, adapt their view of the personalities for brands they prefer in order to match their own self-concept, or prefer brands consistent with the personality of their ideal self, or what they strive to be.

Grubb and Hupp (1968) pose that self-concept develops not only from the self but from the reactions of others—including peers, significant others, parents, and teachers—and that positive reactions from these references are vital to self-enhancement and growth. It is further stated that a person will use products symbolically in order to convey ideas about himself to his references (Grubb and Hupp 1968). Following successful communication of ideas about self to references, a desired reaction from references will lead to enhancement of self (Grubb and Hupp 1968). A major component of a product's symbolic nature “includes perceptions of the kinds of people

whom they believe use that product” (Grubb and Hupp 1968, p. 59). In their study on various automobiles, Grubb and Hupp (1968) found that respondents held strong stereotypes of the users of different automobile brands. It was further discovered that drivers of various automobiles viewed themselves as similar to all drivers of that same automobile and viewed themselves as quite different from drivers of competing brands (Grubb and Hupp 1968). Based on these findings, Grubb and Hupp (1968) stressed that “promotion of a particular brand requires development of a strong consumer perception of the kind of people who own and use the product” (p. 63). It was further expressed that “if present and potential consumers of a product are to identify with a particular group for a specific self-concept, the promotional efforts must be directed to associate the product with the self-concept desired by the customers” (Grubb and Hupp 1968, p. 63).

Parker (2005) posed that “self-brand congruity, the comparison of self to brand, affects brand attitudes particularly when the social signaling value of a brand is high (i.e. used in a public situation) and when symbolic, self-expressive motivations are involved” (p. 4). Parker (2005) stated that as a consumer’s self-image and brand image become increasingly similar, brand attitudes should become more positive.

With research in place to back up the importance of brand image and personality, one should consider just how brand personalities are measured. Unfortunately, despite this importance, the measure of brand personality is a somewhat new concept that still lacks standardized measures. Different instruments have been created and implemented but an all-encompassing industry standard has not yet been established. But this is not to say that progress hasn’t been made and new methods aren’t being tested. Two different instruments for brand

personality measurement, one developed by Jennifer Aaker and the other by Kirsten Strausbaugh, are subsequently explored.

Aaker’s Instrument

Jennifer Aaker (1997) developed a brand personality measurement instrument based on the “Big Five” dimensions of human personality – Sincerity, Excitement, Competence, Sophistication, and Ruggedness. Aaker (1997) proposed that “by isolating these distinct dimensions versus treating brand personality as a unidimensional construct, the different types of brand personalities can be distinguished, and the multiple ways in which the brand personality construct influences consumer preference may be understood better” (p. 348). Aaker (1997) noted that the scale is generalizable across product categories. This allows researchers “to understand the symbolic use of brands in general versus the symbolic use of brands within a particular category” (Aaker 1997, p. 348). Each of the five dimensions is composed of a total of 15 different “facets” which further establish their meaning (Aaker 1997). A few examples of the various facets appear in Table 2-1.

Table 2-1. Aaker Personality Dimensions

Dimensions	Facets
Sincerity	Down-to-earth; Honest; Wholesome; Cheerful
Excitement	Daring; Spirited; Imaginative; Up-to-date
Competence	Reliable; Intelligent; Successful
Sophistication	Upper class; Charming
Ruggedness	Outdoorsy; Tough

Source: Aaker 1997, p. 352

Aaker (1997) proposed that her research has both “theoretical and practical implications” (p. 353). However, she stated that “the brand personality framework developed in this research suggests that one reason for the weak findings in the self-congruity literature may be due to the asymmetric relationship in the structure of brand versus human personality” (Aaker 1997, p. 353). While Aaker’s measurement tool can be useful for certain areas of brand personality study,

a major downfall is that it does not yield a single personality for an individual respondent thus preventing the capability of the tool to distinguish one specific personality for each brand.

Strausbaugh's Instrument

A University of Florida Ph.D student, Kirsten L. Strausbaugh (1998), combined elements and theory from two measures of human personality, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and the Adjective Checklist (ACL) in order to develop a new instrument to be used in measuring brand personality. This instrument was compared with the previously-designed brand personality measurement instrument created by Jennifer Aaker.

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) is a human personality measurement tool developed by Katherine Briggs and Isabella Myers-Briggs, and is partially based off of the ideas of Carl Jung dealing with “perception, and judgment, and the attitudes in which these are used in different types of people” (CAPT 2007). The MBTI uses a self-reported questionnaire to gauge people’s reactions and preferences to different life situations (CAPT 2007). The MBTI contains questions based along four different indices, including extraversion/introversion (E/I), sensing/intuition (S/N), thinking/feeling (T/F), and judgment/perception (J/P). Based on the answers given to the personality test questions, results will show whether a person tends more toward extroversion or introversion, sensing or intuition, thinking or feeling, and judgment or perception. Once the dominant dimension is discovered for each of the four pairs, a resulting four-part personality will be revealed. These four indices lead to a possible 16 different personality types composed of each of these four parts. After completion of the test, a person will typically end up with one of the 16 possible four-letter personality types, such as “ESTJ” (standing for Extroversion Sensing Thinking Judgment) (CAPT 2007). In some cases, respondents will answer questions along a bipolar dimension equally (for example, answer half

of the questions with extroverted tendencies and the other with introverted tendencies) in which case it cannot be discerned whether the person is one or the other (in this case, an extrovert or introvert). Some people fall in the middle on certain dimensions—this is normal.

The Extraversion/Introversion (E/I) dimension measures a person's tendency toward extraversion or introversion in where they gather their energy:

Extraverts are oriented primarily toward the outer world; thus they tend to focus their perception and judgment on people and objects. Introverts are oriented primarily toward the inner world; thus they tend to focus their perception and judgment upon concepts and ideas (CAPT 2007).

The Sensing/Intuition (S/N) dimension measures one's tendency toward different manners of perceiving:

One may rely primarily upon the process of sensing (S), which reports observable facts or happenings through one or more of the five senses; or one may rely upon the less obvious process of intuition (N), which reports meanings, relationships and/or possibilities that have been worked out beyond the reach of the conscious mind (CAPT 2007).

The Thinking/Feeling (T/F) dimension measures one's tendency toward utilizing two different methods of judgment: "A person may rely primarily through thinking (T) to decide impersonally on the basis of logical consequences, or a person may rely primarily on feelings (F) to decide primarily on the basis of personal or social values" (CAPT 2007). The Judgment/Perception (J/P) dimension measures one's tendency to use a certain process in dealing with the outside world:

A person who prefers judgment (J) has reported a preference for using a judgment process (either thinking or feeling) for dealing with the outer world. A person who prefers perception (P) has reported a preference for using a perceptive process (either S or N) for dealing with the outer world (CAPT 2007).

While each of the four indexes represents a personality distinction in and of itself, the four-letter combinations also represent a solid, distinct personality as a whole. In-depth descriptions are available for each of the 16 personality types. For example, an ESFJ personality description reads:

For ESFJs the dominant quality in their lives is an active and intense caring about people and a strong desire to bring harmony into their relationships. ESFJs bring an aura of warmth to all that they do, and they naturally move into action to help others, to organize the world around them, and to get things done. Sensing orients their feeling to current facts and realities, and thus gives their feeling a hands-on pragmatic quality. ESFJs take their work seriously and believe others should as well (CAPT 2007).

Paladin Associates, a non-profit organization that promotes use of the MBTI personality test, offers descriptions for each of the 16 personality types (see Table 2-2) (Paladin Associates 2008).

The Adjective Checklist

The Adjective Checklist (ACL) originated from the Institute of Personality Assessment and Research (IPAR) and was developed as a means to generate information on third party personalities, which is a differentiation from the MBTI (Strausbaugh 1998). The Adjective Checklist is composed of a multitude of personality trait adjectives. These adjectives are highly related to components of the MBTI personality instrument (Strausbaugh 1998). This measurement tool utilizes 300 adjectives that “may be used to describe oneself, others, or a prototype” (Martin and Alexander 2006, p. 256) Strausbaugh (1998) indicated that the 300 items composing the Adjective Checklist were “substantial enough to account for the primary factors that differentiate between individuals, while accounting for personal nuances and other more narrow distinctions” (p. 59).

Multiple studies have been conducted to correlate personality of consumer to the specific brands or product types they purchase (Grubb and Grathwohl 1967). These studies take a look at how a consumer’s self-concept affects their purchasing decisions.

Self-Concept and Purchase Motivation

In the study of self-concept and purchase motivation, Grubb and Grathwohl (1967) noted that “these researchers advanced the basic hypothesis that individuals who consume in a certain

manner will also manifest certain common personality characteristics, leading to prediction of consumer behavior” (p. 22). In developing consumer behavior theories, an individual’s self-concept is often linked to the symbolic value of the brands and products they purchase (Grubb and Grathwohl 1967). An individual’s self-concept is a more specific notion than personality, focusing on how an individual perceives himself (Grubb and Grathwohl 1967). Grubb and Grathwohl (1967) note that “use of self-theory allows application of the behavioral concept of symbolic interaction” (p. 24). It appears that self-theory plays an important role, as how one individual perceives himself affects that individual’s behaviors, “and thus, the more valued the self, the more organized and consistent becomes his behavior” (Grubb and Grathwohl 1967, p. 24).

Self-Expression Model

Belk (1988) suggested that “we cannot hope to understand consumer behavior without first gaining some understanding of the meanings that consumers attach to possessions” (p. 139). Belk (1988) went on to say that “a key to understanding what possessions mean is recognizing that, knowingly or unknowingly, intentionally or unintentionally, we regard our possessions as parts of ourselves” (p. 139). Our “extended self” consists of not only external objects and personal possessions but also body parts, organs, persons, places, and group possessions (Belk 1988). Belk (1988) explained that “the notion of extended self is a superficially masculine and Western metaphor comprising not only that which is seen as ‘me’ (the self), but also which is seen as ‘mine’” (p. 140). This self-expression model, therefore, establishes the notion that consumers view brands as part of their possessions, and brands, therefore, become a part of the consumer’s extended self. This personal “ownership” of the brand is the point at which consumers may begin to shape and mold their own image of the brand’s personality into how they want to see it, which could alter the personality of the brand as determined by the brander.

An important concept to consider in the point at which consumers take ownership of brands is their level of brand familiarity.

Brand Familiarity

According to Carrillat, Lafferty, and Harris (2005) brand familiarity is “consumers’ level of direct and indirect experience with a product or a brand” (p. 52). The comprehension that consumers have of brands that they are familiar with is often illustrated by “highly structured associations” as compared with brands with which they are less familiar (Carrillat et al. 2005, p. 53). Typically, these associations are the result of previous contact with that brand, such as through prior advertising or brand use (Carrillat et al. 2005). Further research illustrates the differences that exist in the way consumers process advertising or sponsorships for familiar versus unfamiliar brands. In general, exposure to advertisements for familiar brands causes consumers to undergo “less extensive, more confirmatory” processing (Carrillat et al. 2005, p. 53). According to Carrillat et al. (2005) “the more familiar a brand is, the more cognitive capacity is required for processing previous associations linked to that brand, and, as a consequence, fewer cognitive resources are available for processing new information” (p. 53).

According to Ha and Perks (2005) brand familiarity enables consumers to spend less time searching for brand-related information or shopping for a particular brand. A higher level of familiarity leads to a larger number of brand associations that have already been formed and can be called upon to make decisions. A study conducted by Ha and Perks (2005) showed that “a variety of brand experiences increase familiarity with the brand” (p. 447). They discovered that the more positive experiences consumers have with a particular brand, the higher their level of brand familiarity will become. This, in turn, has a large impact on customer satisfaction with that brand (Ha and Perks 2005). Ha and Perks (2005) also found that brand familiarity “affects customers’ perceived performance positively and improves customer impressions with regard to

the purchase situation facing them” (p. 448). The familiarity of a brand in the mind of consumers can lead to strong preferences for that brand, often based on the theory of the mere-exposure effect. The mere-exposure effect states that people often prefer things that are familiar to them over unfamiliar things (Hoyer and MacInnis 2007). Hoyer and MacInnis (2007) stated that “the mere-exposure effect may explain why many of the top 30 brands in the 1930s are still in the top 30 today” (p. 156). A major result of consumer familiarity with a brand is often the development of a relationship with that brand. Just as people can develop strong attachments to close friends, significant others, or family members, consumers can develop strong attachments to brands that they are highly familiar with and purchase or use on a regular basis. The implications of this are evident. The more a consumer becomes familiar with a particular brand, the stronger the relationship they are likely to develop with that brand as long as it continues to meet their expectations and satisfy their needs. This in turn, can lead to brand loyalty and a continual purchase of that brand. Thus, it is important to take a closer look at the way in which a consumer-brand relationship exists.

Relationship Basis Model

The Relationship Basis Model allows brands to connect with their purchasers on a deeper level (Stein 2004). Fournier (1998) discusses the relationships that consumers build with the brands they use and proposes that “(1) brands can and do serve as viable relationship partners; (2) consumer-brand relationships are valid at the level of lived experience; and (3) consumer-brand relationships can be specified in many ways using a rich conceptual vocabulary that is both theoretically and managerially useful” (p. 344). Various dimensions of brand relationship quality were discussed by Fournier. They are as follows: (1) *Love and Passion*: Relates to feelings of “something is missing” during long gaps in brand use. This dimension expresses feelings of a particular brand being “irreplaceable.” (2) *Self-connection*: Relates to how well the

brand performs with regard to identity themes and expression of the self. (3) *Interdependence*: Relates to the concept of enjoining consumer and brand and high levels of interaction with the brand throughout the day. (4) *Commitment*: Relates to a consumer pledge of being loyal to a particular brand and “sticking by it” no matter what. (5) *Intimacy*: Relates to a deeper and more tightly-held bond with a brand exemplifying a deeper level of brand meaning. (6) *Brand Partner Quality*: Relates to satisfaction with the relationship and the consumer’s assessment of the brand’s performance as a partner in a relationship (Fournier 1998).

Fournier (1998) suggested that brand relationship quality transforms based on important actions taken by both the consumer and the brand “as per the reciprocity principle on which all relationships are grounded” (p. 365). Fournier (1998) posed that a deep understanding of the relationship between consumer and brand is vital to marketing theory. Brand personality can be viewed as “a set of trait inferences constructed by the consumer based on repeated observation of behaviors enacted by the brand at the hand of its manager, that cohere into a role perception of the brand as partner in the relationship dyad” (Fournier 1998, p. 368). That said, the give-and-take relationship between brand and consumer can have serious implications on the creation and development of a brand (Fournier 1998). This consumer-brand relationship forces marketers to understand and take into consideration that a brand personality is not solely comprised of the image they put out, but also the image that consumers take in. Therefore, the consumer-brand relationship needs to be considered at each stage of brand personality development.

Study Hypothesis

This study has a singular, direct goal – to discover brand familiarity’s effects on brand personality consensus through a correlation between familiarity level and number of differing perceived brand personalities. Because the topic of this thesis is so narrowly focused, there is a need for only one main hypothesis to be tested. Finding the answer will have large and lasting

implications that can be applied to multiple areas of the branding process. The subsequent research will be used to either support or refute the hypothesis. The hypothesis for this current study is as follows.

Hypothesis 1: Brand personality consensus is positively related to brand familiarity.

It appears that low familiarity brands will have the least amount of personality consensus. Medium familiarity brands will have more personality consensus than low familiarity brands. And high familiarity brands will have the most personality consensus; more consensus than both low and medium familiarity brands.

Table 2-2. MBTI Personality Descriptions

Personality Type	Personality Description
ENFJ	Responsible and responsive, concerned about what others think, like to facilitate others and enable people to achieve potential, responsive to praise and criticism, may ignore tasks for relationship issues.
INFJ	Perseverance and originality, firm principles, clear vision of common good, quietly forceful, concern for others, may keep too much to themselves, win cooperation rather demand it, may operate with single-minded concentration.
ENFP	Enthusiastic, imaginative, will help anyone with a problem, improvise rather than prepare in advance, high spirited, may procrastinate, may overlook relevant details, may overextend, often a spokesperson for values relating to people.
INFP	Idealistic, strong inner values, catalysts for implementing ideas, interested in human potential, little regard for possessions or surroundings, more likely to praise than critique, may delay tasks due to perfectionism.
ENTJ	Frank, decisive, develop and implement systems to solve organizational problems, usually well informed, may decide too quickly, may appear domineering, will run as much of organization as possible.
INTJ	Original, great drive for own ideas, long-range vision, find meaningful patterns in external events, power to organize, independent, high standards of competence, can be tough-minded with others, can be stubborn, may have trouble letting go of impractical ideas.
ENTP	Ingenious, resourceful in solving new problems, may neglect routine assignments, turn to one new interest after another, may not adapt well to standard procedures, may over-extend, may be unappreciative of other's input.
INTP	Enjoy theoretical or scientific pursuits, interested in ideas, sharply defined interests, quiet and reserved, logical and analytical, may over-intellectualize, relate to others based on expertise rather than position.
ESTJ	Practical, realistic, matter-of fact, natural head for business or mechanics, not interested in theory, like to organize and run activities, make good administrators, decisive, take care of routine details, traditional respect for hierarchy, may not see need for change, may decide too quickly.
ISTJ	Practical, responsible, organization is important, success by concentration and thoroughness, realistic and dependable, respect traditional and hierarchical approaches, may neglect interpersonal niceties, may overlook long-range implications in favor of day-to-day operations, rely on standard operating procedures.
ESFJ	Talkative, conscientious, born cooperators, active committee members, need harmony, interested in things that directly affect peoples' lives, work best with encouragement and praise, may miss the bigger picture, may assume they know what is best for the organization.

Table 2-2. Continued

Personality Type	Personality Description
ISFJ	Work toward obligations, stable, loyal, concerned about others feelings, through, painstakingly accurate, non-technical, may avoid leadership but will step in when ask, complies with organizational needs and hierarchy, use personal influence behind the scene, may be pessimistic about the future.
ESTP	On the spot problem solvers, like action and immediate results, adaptable, tolerant, pragmatic and results oriented, dislike long explanations, take charge readily in a crises, appears blunt and insensitive, may rely too much on improvisation and miss wider implications.
ISTP	Interested in cause and effect, quiet an reserved, gets to the core of practical problems, lead by setting example, manages loosely and prefers minimal supervision, may be too expedient and take short cuts, may appear indecisive and undirected.
ESFP	Outgoing, accepting, friendly, like action, enjoy facts more than theory, use sound common sense and practical ability with people, enjoy everything, manage crises well, may over-emphasize subjective data, may spend too much time socializing, lead through promotion of good will and teamwork.
ISFP	Modest about abilities, retiring, shun disagreements, do not care to lead, relaxed about completing tasks, use personal loyalty as a means of motivation, may not see beyond the present reality, may be overly self critical, more apt to praise than criticize.

Source: Paladin Associates 2008

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The method utilized for this study was a survey, specifically a self-administered questionnaire. A survey questionnaire is “an instrument specifically designed to elicit information that will be useful for analysis” (Babbie 2007, p. 245). Surveys are useful for descriptive, exploratory, and explanatory research (Babbie 2007). The researcher developed a document with questions relating to the study and distributed it to a sample of participants for them to answer. The results were then analyzed and applied to the research question.

A self-administered questionnaire was the most appropriate method for multiple reasons. They are often quick and cheap to administer (Babbie 2007). Surveys are also very practical for finding out information about large populations (Babbie 2007). “Surveys—especially self-administered ones—make large samples feasible” (Babbie 2007, p. 276). Because the nature of the study being conducted required a very large number of opinions in order to determine conclusions, it lent itself to the need for a survey questionnaire format. Also, a multitude of previous studies about brand familiarity and brand personality had utilized survey methods. Furthermore, the purpose of the study was to relate the level of familiarity placed on various brands to the level of personality consensus regarding those brands based on survey-takers’ opinions. No variables were being manipulated in this case, but correlations were being made between variables. Therefore, a self-administered survey questionnaire was the most appropriate method for conducting the research.

Selection of Brands

For the study, a singular product category—social networks—was selected. A total of 15 brands were selected from more than 800 active social networks to be used in a brand selection

pre-test. Site rankings and number of registered users per social network were analyzed to select a pool of 15 brands that would likely contain varying degrees of familiarity. The 15 specific brands selected for the pre-test appear in Table 3-1 below.

Table 3-1. Pre-Test Brand Stimuli

Social Network	# of Registered Users	Global Alexa Page Ranking (As of May 2008)
aSmallWorld	270,000	9,306
Bebo	40,000,000	108
Classmates.com	50,000,000	923
Facebook	115,000,000	7
Flickr	Unknown	37
Friendster	65,000,000	35
Gather	465,000	N/A
LinkedIn	22,000,000	211
LiveJournal	15,529,380	56
MySpace	403,000,000	6
PerfSpot	8,000,000	72
Ravelry	80,000	N/A
Sportsvite	22,000	N/A
Twitter	2,200,000	1,970
XING	5,000,000	1,814

The pre-test used a convenience sample of 35 students who reported their familiarity level with the 15 brands using a previously established semantic differential scale for familiarity. The results of the pre-test appear in Table 3-2.

Pre-test results were then analyzed in order to select the best six brands to use for the main study. Six brands needed to be selected that would provide for the largest dispersion of familiarity levels based on the pre-test. The pre-test was very useful in determining the high and low familiarity brands. Facebook (M=6.91) and MySpace (M=6.29) clearly had high familiarity. Bebo (M=1.11) and Sportsvite (M=1.14) clearly had low familiarity. However, the medium familiarity brands were not as clear. The two brands with the closest to medium familiarity levels were LiveJournal (M=3.66) and Classmates.com (M=3.40), however the familiarity levels were slightly lower than an exact medium level, which would be 4.00 out of 7.00. To explore this,

individual responses were then analyzed and modes were taken into consideration. For LiveJournal, 14 out of 35 respondents ranked it in the medium level (between 3.00 and 5.00). Specifically, five respondents ranked it a 3.00, two respondents ranked it a 4.00, and seven respondents ranked it a 5.00. For Classmates.com, 21 out of 35 respondents ranked it in the medium level (between 3.00 and 5.00). Specifically, seven respondents ranked it a 3.00, seven respondents ranked it a 4.00, and seven respondents ranked it a 5.00. Therefore, although mean scores revealed slightly lower than preferred familiarity levels for these two brands, when analyzing individual responses, these two brands appeared to be the best fitting for medium familiarity based on the pre-test. The six brands selected for the main study appear in Table 3-3.

Table 3-2. Pre-Test Results

Social Network	Pre-Test Familiarity Mean Score
aSmallWorld	2.00
Bebo	1.11
Classmates.com	3.40
Facebook	6.91
Flickr	2.83
Friendster	1.89
Gather	1.29
LinkedIn	1.51
LiveJournal	3.66
MySpace	6.29
PerfSpot	1.11
Ravelry	1.06
Sportsvite	1.14
Twitter	1.71
XING	2.34

*Mean scores based on 7-point scale; 1=unfamiliar and 7=familiar

Table 3-3. Brands Selected for Main Study

Familiarity Level Based on Pre-Test	Social Network	Familiarity Score Based on Pre-Test
Low	Bebo	1.11
	Sportsvite	1.14
Medium	Classmates.com	3.40
	LiveJournal	3.66
High	Facebook	6.91
	MySpace	6.29

Social networks are commonly used by university students as a means of communication. Thus the sample selected for the study was a large group of undergraduate students at the University of Florida.

Sample

Both male and female participants were recruited from two sections of an undergraduate course in the College of Journalism and Communications at the University of Florida. Despite these students being enrolled in a class in this specific college, students in base-level communications classes represent a wide variety of majors and classifications at the University of Florida. Participants were drawn from the large, lecture-style Elements of Advertising (ADV3008) course. Students were offered two points of extra credit in the course, as coordinated with the professor, as an incentive to participate.

Approximately 450 participants (the total number of students in the two ADV3008 classes) were invited to participate in the study, allowing a cushion for those who would choose not to participate. A high number of participants was necessary to enable multiple survey versions to be used with different brand stimuli in varying orders on each. A large number of participants per brand was necessary due to the high number of personality options available to respondents. Since a correlation needed to be made between the familiarity of a brand and personality consensus, a large sample was necessary to establish a clear enough consensus level.

Sampling, in general, is done in order to save time and money. But actually, sampling is regarded as being *more* accurate than interviewing each person within a given population (Babbie 1973). This is true simply due to the amount of staff, time, and managerial requirements necessary to interview every single person. In that case the data collected would be largely affected by decreased quality of staff and any changes that occur in the outside world over time, which could all negatively impact the reliability and validity of responses (Babbie 1973). The

sampling procedure utilized in this study was a convenience sample, which is a form of nonprobability sampling. Nonprobability sampling consists of any sampling process not based on probability theory (Babbie 2007). Convenience sampling, also known as *reliance on available subjects*, is often used by university students. It consists of using groups of people readily available in order to conduct a study, for example, stopping people on the street or in a mall, and in this case, large classes of students. This method is popular and widely used in university settings due to its ease and frugality (Babbie 2007). A true random sample, in this setting, was not feasible due to lack of time and funding. Despite the fact that a convenience sample cannot be generalized to the larger population, because it is not based on probability theory and true random samples, it still offers a way of acquiring a large amount of opinions on a given topic. This study did not require generalizability to a larger population. It simply called for a sample large enough to acquire a sufficient number of opinions from which to analyze.

Variable Measurement

Brand Familiarity

The independent variable in a study is “a variable with values that are not problematical in an analysis but are taken as simply given. An independent variable is presumed to cause or determine a dependent variable” (Babbie 2007, p. 18). The researcher stated that the independent variable in this study was the level of brand familiarity.

In order to measure variables, the researcher established the operational definitions of each. The operational definition is “the concrete and specific definition of something in terms of the operations by which observations are to be categorized” (Babbie 2007, p. 45). Without a specific operational definition, it is unclear what exactly is meant by a concept being measured. The operationalization of variables provided “precision in observation, measurement, and communication” (Babbie 2007, p. 45). In its most simple definition, brand familiarity refers to

“easy recognition of a well-known brand” (Hoyer and MacInnis 2007, p. G-2). While consumers often have the ability to state whether they are “familiar” or “unfamiliar” with a particular brand, meaning basically whether they are aware that particular brand exists, familiarity can more specifically be measured with a degree of intensity. Consumers often have varying levels of familiarity with different brands. They may feel they are “very familiar” with a certain brand they consume on a regular basis, or may feel “somewhat familiar” with a brand they come into contact with once in a while. The level to which a consumer feels “familiar” or “unfamiliar” with a specific brand is a completely subjective measure based alone on that consumer’s perceptions.

Brand familiarity is an often studied concept, thus standardized measurement systems have already been created and employed. In this study, the measurement of respondents’ familiarity with selected brands was based on a previously established semantic differential scale that is the current standard for the measurement of the familiarity concept. To gauge the respondents’ familiarity level, the scale asks respondents to select a specific point along a continuum spanning from *unfamiliar* to *familiar* with the particular brand or product (Bruner, James, and Hensel 2001).

The use of this scale provided a standardized measure that is widely used and therefore has the ability to be compared with similar studies. The scale used a seven-point continuum “measuring the degree of awareness a consumer has of some specified product or brand” (Bruner et al. 2001, p. 119). The concepts being measured in the scale included feeling *unfamiliar* (one) versus *familiar* (seven) with the particular brand (Bruner et al. 2001). Semantic differentials operate at the interval level, where “the logical distance between attributes can be expressed in meaningful standard intervals” (Babbie 2007, p. 137). Unlike lower levels of measurement, interval measures to apply meaning to the distance separating attributes (Babbie 2007).

The reliability of the familiarity scale being utilized stated that in a pre-test, its alpha “exceeded .85” in a sample of 32 students, which means high reliability (Bruner et al. 2001, p.119). The brand familiarity scale contained no previous examination of the scale’s validity, however some aspects of a previous study testing this scale did offer some standing as to the scale’s predictive validity (meaning that one set of measures can accurately predict another set of measures) (Bruner et al. 2001). A study presented by Kent and Allen (1994) suggested that the familiarity scale provided a manipulation check. The study noted that “subjects who received the high familiarity treatment scored a much higher mean on brand familiarity than those in the unfamiliar condition” (Bruner et al. 2001, p. 119).

Brand Personality

The dependent variable in a study is “a variable assumed to depend on or be caused by another (called the independent variable)” (Babbie 2007, p.18) The researcher stated that the dependent variable in this study was the degree of brand personality consensus. The number of differing personalities should be caused by the level of familiarity. In its most simple definition, brand personality refers to “how the consumer would describe the brand if it were a person” (Hoyer and MacInnis 2007, p. 99). Just like a person, a brand can be humorous, laid back, serious, elegant, sophisticated, feminine, friendly, warm, old-fashioned, and the list goes on.

Brand personality was measured using the Strausbaugh Instrument. As mentioned earlier, Strausbaugh developed her instrument based on concepts from both the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and the Adjective Checklist (ACL). Stein (2004) indicated that while Strausbaugh felt that the MBTI alone could be a very beneficial tool for marketers, its self-report nature did not fit well into the need for studying brand personality, which is considered a “third party.” Therefore, by combining elements from the Adjective Checklist, which was already

highly correlated with the MBTI, Strausbaugh developed a tool that could gather data on third parties (Stein 2004).

Strausbaugh's instrument uses 24 pairs of adjectives to measure brand personality. Each pair contains two adjectives that are considered polar opposites and places them along a semantic differential-type continuum, asking respondents to select where they feel the brand lies with regard to the two adjectives. Each adjective corresponds with a dimension from the MBTI instrument (extraversion/introversion, sensing/intuition, thinking/feeling, and judgment/perception). Once the adjectives selected are coded with the dimension they correspond with, a brand can be placed into one of the 16 MBTI personality types.

Previous studies have been done regarding the reliability and familiarity of the Strausbaugh Instrument for measuring brand personality (Stein 2004). Internal consistency results concluded by Stein (2004) stated that three of the four dimensions could be deemed reliable. Results showed that the highest Chronbach's alpha scores were produced for the EI dimension, followed by the JP dimension. The SN index was found to be "somewhat reliable" (Stein 2004, p. 57). However, the alphas produced for the TF dimension were found to be too weak to be regarded as "reliable" (Stein 2004, p. 57). Stein's (2004) test of the validity of Strausbaugh's Instrument, based on "correlations between the scaled dimensions and written descriptions," yielded results similar to that of the reliability of the instrument (p. 57). The EI dimension proved to be the most valid, followed next by the JP dimension (Stein 2004). However, Stein (2004) stated that "the instrument can only be validated for the EI and JP dimensions due to the lack of significant findings for the SN and TF dimensions" (p. 58).

Strausbaugh's original instrument places the adjective pairs along a semantic differential-type continuum and asks respondents to select where they feel the brand lies on the continuum.

However, for this study, the semantic-differential/continuum nature of the instrument was eliminated. It was deemed unnecessary as it could likely confuse participants and require a much longer amount of time for survey completion. Further, the basis of the study did not require that a degree of distinction between adjective pairs be obtained. Because scaled personality questions were not necessary for this exact study, the continuum was eliminated. Respondents were simply asked to select which of the two adjectives of the pair best describe the brand in question—one or the other. The 24 adjectives selected for a brand would then be used in order to determine the total personality of a brand.

Survey Materials

Due to the high number of questions being asked of survey participants, the survey was divided into two versions, each containing three of the six brands being studied. This was done in order to prevent participant exhaustion and apathy after a certain point. Both of the survey versions were completely identical in format and questions; the only differing point was the brand stimuli present in each survey.

The six brands were grouped according to familiarity level, placing one high, one medium, and one low familiarity social network on each version. The brand groupings appear in Table 3-4 below.

Table 3-4. Survey Brand Selections

Survey Version	Brands Selected
	1 Facebook
	1 LiveJournal
	1 Bebo
	2 MySpace
	2 Classmates.com
	2 Sportsvite

Additionally, to prevent bias, each of the two survey versions was further divided into three sub-versions which placed the brands in differing orders. This allowed each social network brand to

have a turn at being placed first, middle, and last in the realm of survey questions. This was done to prevent any sort of bias that could affect results in the case of high familiarity brands always being placed first, low familiarity brands being placed last, etc. This was also done to account for any bias due to moderate participant exhaustion toward the end of the questionnaire. Table 3-5 below shows the breakdown of the survey sub-versions.

Table 3-5. Survey Order

Survey	First	Middle	Last
1a	Facebook	LiveJournal	Bebo
1b	LiveJournal	Bebo	Facebook
1c	Bebo	Facebook	LiveJournal
2a	MySpace	Classmates.com	Sportsvite
2b	Classmates.com	Sportsvite	MySpace
2c	Sportsvite	MySpace	Classmates.com

The survey consisted of different subsections, including an informed consent form, directions, the questions themselves, a page to prove completion for extra credit, and the closing/thank you (see Appendix for survey instrumentation).

The survey was conducted online (this process to be described more explicitly later in the “Procedure” section). At the very front of the survey was an “informed consent” form. This form assured that subjects were aware of the purpose of the study and that there were no risks or benefits to participation in the study. It also explained what they would be asked to do in the study, the approximate amount of time it would take, their confidentiality, whom to contact regarding the study, and that they had the right to withdraw at any point without consequence. At the end of the informed consent form, it asked participants to agree that based on the given information, they were willing to voluntarily participate (Babbie 2007). If participants did not agree, they were able to withdraw from the study immediately without moving further and without consequence.

After the informed consent page, the questionnaire began. Each section of the survey started with explicit directions guiding them in how to answer the questions that followed. In a self-administered questionnaire, directions are necessary in order to ensure proper answers (Babbie 1973). Because this survey contained different sections, it was necessary to precede each section with a set of directions explicitly stating that section's purpose and the correct process for answering those particular sets of questions (Babbie 1973). It was important to prevent survey participants from becoming confused or overwhelmed while participating in the questionnaire, therefore, clear, organized directions and page breaks between sections aided in the successful completion of the survey.

For each social network brand, participants were asked to answer a question regarding their level of familiarity with that social network. They were then asked whether they could recall ever having used that social network before (with options of "yes," "no," or "unsure"). Respondents who selected "no" or "unsure" were automatically directed to the next section. If a respondent selected "yes," they were then automatically taken to a series of three additional questions regarding that particular social network. These questions could only be answered by people who had used the social network at least once, thus respondents whom had never used the social network in question did not see these questions at all (this "skip-logic" technology is a benefit of using the online questionnaire format). The first of these three questions inquired about the average amount of time they spend using that social network. The second of these questions asked whether they currently have a registered account for that social network. And the third of these questions asked respondents to rate their level of satisfaction with that social network. This process was repeated for the other two social networks present on the survey.

Following the section on familiarity and usage, the brand personality section of the questionnaire began. Participants were asked to rank the social network in question among the 24 pairs of adjective choices developed from the Strausbaugh Instrument. This process was then repeated for the other two social networks present on the survey.

Following the brand personality section, the demographic section began. Participants were asked to respond to a few basic questions in order to gauge basic information about the sample. The demographic questions included gender, age, academic classification, race/ethnicity, social class, computer type, and current major.

After the demographic section, respondents were taken to the “extra credit proof” page. This asked respondents to enter their name and UFID number for use in providing the ADV3008 professor with a listing of all students who completed the survey for extra credit points. The names and UFID numbers provided by students remained separated from their question responses and were not tied to the students’ individual question responses in any way.

At the very end of the survey was a closing page which thanked participants for their time and provided the researcher’s contact information in the event that they had any questions regarding the study.

The questionnaire format was comprised of several characteristics important to survey questionnaire research. All attempts were made to ensure items were as clear as possible, as the participants may have no previous knowledge of the information they are being asked about (Babbie 1973). Also, double-barreled questions were avoided. Questions did not require one response to a combination of questions (Babbie 1973). Furthermore, questions asked were relevant and kept as short as possible, as to not confuse or frustrate respondents (Babbie 1973).

Lastly, all negative or biased items or terms were avoided (Babbie 1973). The questions asked made every attempt not to lead or coerce a respondent to answer in a certain way.

Procedure

The survey was conducted from September 15, 2008 to September 19, 2008, online. Students in both sections of Dr. Weigold's ADV3008 (Elements of Advertising) course were visited in their classrooms and provided with information about the proper Web site to access the online questionnaire. Prior to visiting the students in class, the researcher printed out slips of paper explaining how to access the online questionnaire. Due to the nature of having six survey versions, six different versions of the papers were created with each of the various website URL addresses. An equal number of paper slips were printed for each of the six versions. In order to guarantee random assignment, the paper slips were numbered and then a random numbers table was used to place the slips into a random order. Therefore, when the paper slips were handed out to students, the order of papers had already been randomized.

Once inside the classroom, the researcher introduced herself and briefly explained the nature of the study. The researcher informed participants that they were in no way required to participate, but participation would earn them two points of extra credit in the class.

SurveyMonkey.com, a popular online survey conduction website, was utilized for the design, creation, participant completion, and data collection phases. The survey versions were preliminarily designed in a Microsoft Word document by the researcher. The questions were then transferred into a survey template on the SurveyMonkey.com website. Conducting the survey online provided many benefits. The students were able to complete the surveys at their own leisure without feeling rushed or pressured to complete it as fast as the students surrounding them in a classroom. Also, many students feel more comfortable answering questions online. Further, online data collection offered more ease and less chance for data entry error in analysis

of survey results. SurveyMonkey.com automatically downloaded the results into six separate Microsoft Excel files, which were then able to be automatically imported into SPSS Statistics 17.0 for analysis. The need for entering data into SPSS by hand was not necessary and therefore the chance for data entry human error was completely eliminated.

Measuring and Analyzing Data

The data was analyzed using SPSS Statistics 17.0. The majority of the data was analyzed and measured using basic frequency distributions. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) tests and cross tabulations were conducted, as well as chi-square tests for significance. Testing of reliability and validity was not necessary for the current study because none of the brand personality questions were scaled. Data was analyzed both in terms of individual brand stimuli (differences between the six social networks individually) and in terms of combined familiarity groupings (the two high, two medium, and two low familiarity social network brands).

CHAPTER 4 FINDINGS

This chapter presents an overview of the results of the current study including descriptive analyses and testing of the hypothesis. The SPSS Statistics 17.0 program was used to analyze all of the data.

Description of Sample

Overall Participants

A total of 450 students were invited to participate in the study with an incentive of two extra credit points. Of those invited, 244 students participated. Only the 244 study participants will be subsequently discussed. The group consisted of 56 males (23% of the total sample) and 188 females (77% of the total sample) (see Table 4-1). A majority of the participants (82%) were between 19 and 21 years of age with a mean age of 20.2 years. Eight respondents (3.3%) were freshman, 77 respondents (31.6%) were sophomores, 97 respondents (39.8%) were juniors, and 59 respondents (24.2%) were seniors. Three remaining respondents fell into the “other” category, providing answers as an “exchange student,” a “fifth year,” and a “post-bachelors.” One hundred sixty-eight respondents (68.9%) described themselves as “White/Caucasian,” with 29 respondents (11.9%) describing themselves as “Hispanic/Latino” 24 respondents (9.8%) as “Black/African-American,” 10 respondents (4.1%) as “Asian,” one respondent (0.4%) as “Native American,” and 11 respondents (4.5%) falling into the “other” category providing descriptions such as “bi-racial” and “multi-racial.” The majority classified themselves as in the upper middle or middle social classes. Of the total respondents, 12 respondents (4.9%) selected “upper;” 101 respondents (41.4%) selected “upper middle;” 96 respondents (39.3%) selected “middle;” 29 respondents (11.9%) selected “lower middle;” three respondents (1.2%) selected “lower;” and three respondents (1.2%) reported that they were unsure in which category they fell. One

hundred ninety-nine respondents (81.6%) reported they were PC users and 44 respondents (18%) reported they were Mac/Apple users. Participants represented a wide range of students in more than 30 different majors in several colleges throughout the University of Florida. The most frequently occurring majors were Advertising (56 respondents, 22.9%), Public Relations (34 respondents, 13.9%), and Marketing (27 respondents, 11%).

Table 4-1. Demographic Profile

	Overall Participants		Group 1 Participants		Group 2 Participants	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Gender						
Males	56	23	23	19.8	33	25.8
Females	188	77	93	80.2	95	74.2
Total	244	100	116	100	128	100
Age						
18	17	7	5	4.3	12	9.4
19	77	31.6	35	30.2	42	32.8
20	79	32.4	39	33.6	40	31.3
21	44	18.0	20	17.2	24	18.8
22	12	4.9	7	6	5	3.9
23-25	9	3.6	6	5.1	3	2.4
27+	5	2	3	2.6	2	1.6
Missing	1	0.4	1	0.9	0	0
Total	243	99.6	115	99.1	128	100
Academic Classification						
Freshman	8	3.3	2	1.7	6	4.7
Sophomore	77	31.6	34	29.3	43	33.6
Junior	97	39.8	47	40.5	50	39.1
Senior	59	24.2	31	26.7	28	21.9
Other	3	1.2	2	1.7	1	0.8
Total	244	100	116	100	128	100
Race/Ethnicity						
Asian	10	4.1	6	5.2	4	3.1
Black/African-American	24	9.8	12	10.3	12	9.4
Hispanic/Latino	29	11.9	17	14.7	12	9.4
Native American	1	0.4	0	0	1	0.8
White/Caucasian	168	68.9	73	62.9	95	74.2
Other	11	4.5	8	6.9	3	2.3
Missing	1	0.4	0	0	1	0.8

Table 4-1. Continued

	Overall Participants		Group 1 Participants		Group 2 Participants	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Total	243	99.6	116	100	127	99.2
Social Class						
Upper	12	4.9	7	6	5	3.9
Upper middle	101	41.4	45	38.8	56	43.8
Middle	96	39.3	47	40.5	49	38.3
Lower middle	29	11.9	14	12.1	15	11.7
Lower	3	1.2	1	0.9	2	1.6
Unsure	3	1.2	2	1.7	1	0.8
Total	244	100	116	100	128	100
Computer ownership						
Mac/Apple	44	18	25	21.6	19	14.8
PC	199	81.6	91	78.4	108	84.4
Missing	1	0.4	0	0	1	0.8
Total	243	99.6	116	100	127	99.2
Major						
Advertising	56	22.9				
Business	16	6.5				
Finance	16	6.6				
Marketing	27	11				
Public Relations	34	13.9				
All others	95	39.1				
Total	244	100				

Group Comparisons

Group 1 was comprised of respondents who were randomly assigned survey versions 1a, 1b, or 1c, which included questions regarding the social networks Facebook, LiveJournal, and Bebo. Group 2 was comprised of respondents who were randomly assigned survey versions 2a, 2b, or 2c, which included questions regarding the social networks MySpace, Classmates.com, and Sportsvite.

Cross tabulations of Group 1 and Group 2 by demographics revealed no significant differences between the two groups (Tables 4-2 through 4-7). Chi-square significance tests ($X^2=1.22$, d.f.=1) ($X^2=12.84$, d.f.=13) ($X^2=3.05$, d.f.=4) ($X^2=6.93$, d.f.=5) ($X^2=1.69$, d.f.=5) ($X^2=1.78$, d.f.=1) provided evidence that Group 1 and Group 2 were similar enough in nature to

allow for comparison between groups because none of the resulting chi-squares were statistically significant ($p > .05$).

Table 4-2. Cross Tabulation of Group with Gender

Gender	Group 1	Group 2	Total	
Male		23	33	56
Female		93	95	188
Total		116	128	244

$X^2=1.22$, d.f.=1, $p=0.27$

Table 4-3. Cross Tabulation of Group with Age

Age	Group 1	Group 2	Total	
18		5	12	17
19		35	42	77
20		39	40	79
21		20	24	44
22		7	5	12
23-25		6	3	9
27+		3	2	5
Missing		1	0	1
Total		116	128	244

$X^2=12.84$, d.f.=13, $p=0.46$

Table 4-4. Cross Tabulation of Group with Academic Classification

Academic Classification	Group 1	Group 2	Total	
Freshman		2	6	8
Sophomore		34	43	77
Junior		47	50	97
Senior		31	28	59
Other		2	1	3
Total		116	128	244

$X^2=3.05$, d.f.=4, $p=0.55$

Table 4-5. Cross Tabulation of Group with Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Group 1	Group 2	Total	
Asian		6	4	10
Black/African-American		12	12	24
Hispanic/Latino		17	12	29
Native American		0	1	1
White/Caucasian		73	95	168
Other		8	3	11
Total		116	127	243

$X^2=6.93$, d.f.=5, $p=0.23$

Table 4-6. Cross Tabulation of Group with Social Class

Social Class	Group 1	Group 2	Total
Upper	7	5	12
Upper middle	45	56	101
Middle	47	49	96
Lower middle	14	15	29
Lower	1	2	3
Unsure	2	1	3
Total	116	128	244

$X^2=1.69$, d.f.=5, $p=0.89$

Table 4-7. Cross Tabulation of Group with Computer Ownership

Computer	Group 1	Group 2	Total
Mac/Apple	25	19	44
PC	91	108	199
Total	116	127	243

$X^2=1.78$, d.f.=1, $p=0.18$

Validation of High, Medium, and Low Familiarity

One-way frequency distributions were conducted on central variables from the survey questionnaires. In the following section, descriptive statistics will be presented illustrating the study's findings regarding social networks—specifically familiarity, usage, time spent using, ownership of a registered account, and satisfaction levels.

Brand Familiarity

Familiarity levels (Table 4-8) fell in line with what was expected for the low, medium, and high familiarity brands. Facebook ($M=6.72$) and MySpace ($M=5.63$) scored the highest familiarity levels. Bebo ($M=1.20$) and Sportsvite ($M=1.08$) scored the lowest familiarity levels. Though LiveJournal ($M=2.41$) and Classmates.com ($M=2.01$) had slightly low familiarity means, they still fell in the middle ground of the social networks tested, and can therefore be considered the medium familiarity brands.

An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test with a Post-Hoc analysis was used to examine the variability of familiarity by examining the significant mean differences in familiarity by each

social network (Table 4-9 and 4-10). The ANOVA test compared the mean score of each social network with the mean score of every other social network. Significant differences in mean scores were found in the majority of comparisons except between LiveJournal and Classmates.com and between Bebo and Sportsvite. These results indicate that LiveJournal and Classmates.com have the same familiarity level and that Bebo and Sportsvite have the same familiarity level. However, the familiarity level comparisons between all other social networks were significantly different.

Brand Usage

Brand usage was consistent with familiarity rating (Table 4-11). More respondents indicated use of the highest familiarity brands, and very few indicated use of the lowest familiarity brands.

Respondents who answered “yes” to having previously used any of the given social networks were then directed to a series of three more questions asking them to give more specific information about their usage. For any social network in which a respondent selected “no” or they were “unsure” if they had used it, they were not directed to these contingency questions. The tables presented provide further information on the usage habits of those respondents who indicated they had used the social network being questioned at least once.

A series of further questions concerning usage time, registration, and satisfaction level were contingent upon participants having used the social network in question at least once. Thus the following results are not inclusive of all survey participants.

Amount of time used

Tables 4-12 and 4-13 indicate the average amount of time respondents reported having used the social networks. This data offered more in depth information about how much time college-aged students actually spend on various social networks. Facebook (average time spent

using per week=3 to 6 hours) was the social network in which survey participants reported dedicating the most of their leisure time to. The highly unfamiliar social networks had completely opposing usage statistics. For example, Bebo had only three respondents reporting they've used the social network before, and all three users indicated they only use Bebo "less than once per month," which fell into the "less than one hour per week" overall category.

Account registration

Table 4-14 indicates the number of participants who reported having a "registered account" for the social networks which they had reported having used at least once before. Asking about the presence of a registered account was intended to gauge the level of dedication to the social network, in which a personal account might indicate more specific use of a social network rather than just visiting the website. One hundred fifteen of 116 Facebook users indicated having a registered account. MySpace, however, showed that 73 users had an account while 47 did not. Bebo and Sportsvite were the only social networks in which none of the participants indicated they had a registered account with the site.

Satisfaction

Satisfaction levels were also tested for the various social networks based on the respondents whom had used the social networks before. This was done in order to see if any relationship existed between familiarity level and satisfaction level. Table 4-15 indicates user satisfaction levels with the various social networks. Facebook (M=5.51) and LiveJournal (M=4.24) reported the highest satisfaction levels. Sportsvite (M=2.00), Bebo (M=2.67), and Classmates.com (M=2.63) reported the lowest satisfaction levels. MySpace (M=3.48) had a satisfaction level somewhat in the middle. Even though familiarity results had shown that respondents were more familiar with MySpace than LiveJournal, they feel LiveJournal more heavily satisfies their needs than MySpace does.

Table 4-8. Brand Familiarity

	Mean	Median	Mode	Range	Standard Deviation	Missing	Percent
Facebook	6.72	7.00	7	4	0.708	--	100
LiveJournal	2.41	1.50	1	6	1.893	--	100
Bebo	1.20	1.00	1	5	0.701	--	100
Myspace	5.63	6.00	7	6	1.622	1	99.2
Classmates.com	2.01	1.00	1	6	1.524	--	100
Sportsvite	1.08	1.00	1	3	0.435	--	100

*Mean scores based on 7-point scale; 1=unfamiliar and 7=familiar

Table 4-9. Analysis of Variance Test of Familiarity

	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3385.61	5	677.12	406.95	.00
Within Groups	1173.04	705	1.66		
Total	4558.65	710			

Table 4-10. Familiarity Post Hoc Analysis

Website	Website	Mean Diff.	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Facebook	LiveJournal	4.30*	0.17	.00	3.74	4.87
	Bebo	5.52*	0.17	.00	4.95	6.08
	MySpace	1.09*	0.17	.00	.53	1.64
	Classmates.com	4.71*	0.17	.00	4.16	5.26
	Sportsvite	5.63*	0.17	.00	5.06	6.21
LiveJournal	Facebook	-4.30*	0.17	.00	-4.87	-3.74
	Bebo	1.22*	0.17	.00	.65	1.78
	MySpace	-3.22*	0.17	.00	-3.77	-2.66
	Classmates.com	0.41	0.17	.31	-.15	.96
	Sportsvite	1.33*	0.17	.00	.75	1.91
Bebo	Facebook	-5.52*	0.17	.00	-6.08	-4.95
	LiveJournal	-1.22*	0.17	.00	-1.78	-.65
	MySpace	-4.43*	0.17	.00	-4.98	-3.88
	Classmates.com	-0.81*	0.17	.00	-1.36	-.26
	Sportsvite	0.12	0.17	.99	-.46	.69
MySpace	Facebook	-1.09*	0.17	.00	-1.64	-.53
	LiveJournal	3.22*	0.17	.00	2.66	3.77
	Bebo	4.43*	0.17	.00	3.88	4.98
	Classmates.com	3.62*	0.16	.00	3.08	4.16
	Sportsvite	4.55*	0.17	.00	3.98	5.11
Classmates.com	Facebook	-4.71*	0.17	.00	-5.26	-4.16
	LiveJournal	-0.41	0.17	.31	-.96	.15
	Bebo	0.81*	0.17	.00	.26	1.36

Table 4-10. Continued

Website	Website	Mean Diff.	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Sportsvite	MySpace	-3.62*	0.16	.00	-4.16	-3.08
	Sportsvite	0.92*	0.17	.00	.36	1.49
	Facebook	-5.63*	0.17	.00	-6.21	-5.06
	LiveJournal	-1.33*	0.17	.00	-1.91	-.75
	Bebo	-0.12	0.17	.99	-.69	.46
	MySpace	-4.55*	0.17	.00	-5.11	-3.98
	Classmates.com	-0.92*	0.17	.00	-1.49	-.36

*p<.05

Table 4-11. Brand Usage

	Have Used	Not Used	Unsure	Missing	Total	Total %
Facebook	116	0	0	0	116	100
LiveJournal	25	90	1	0	116	100
Bebo	3	112	1	0	116	100
Myspace	120	8	0	0	128	100
Classmates.com	8	117	3	0	128	100
Sportsvite	1	106	1	0	128	100

Table 4-12. Usage Time Per Week

	Less than one hour		1-4 hours		More than 5 hours	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Facebook	11	9.4	47	40.5	58	50
LiveJournal	21	18.1	4	3.4	0	0
Bebo	3	2.6	0	0	0	0
Myspace	98	76.5	16	12.5	6	4.8
Classmates.com	8	6.3	0	0	0	0
Sportsvite	1	0.9	0	0	0	0

Table 4-13. Usage Time Descriptives

	Mean	Median	Mode	Range	Std. Dev.	Missing	Total	%
Facebook	5.76	5.50	5	8	1.963	0	116	100
LiveJournal	1.76	1.00	1	4	1.363	91	25	21.6
Bebo	1.00	1.00	1	0	.000	113	3	2.6
Myspace	2.31	2.00	1	8	1.689	8	120	93.8
Classmates.com	1.00	1.00	1	0	.000	120	8	6.3
Sportsvite	3.00	3.00	3	0	---	107	1	0.9

Table 4-14. Registered Accounts

	Yes		No		Total	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Facebook	115	99.1	1	0.9	116	100
LiveJournal	13	11.2	103	88.7	116	100
Bebo	0	0	116	100	116	100
Myspace	73	57	55	43	128	100
Classmates.com	6	0.05	122	0.95	128	100
Sportsvite	0	0	128	100	128	100

Table 4-15. Brand Satisfaction

	Mean	Median	Mode	Range	Standard Deviation	Missing	Total
Facebook	5.51	6.00	6	6	1.248	0	116
LiveJournal	4.24	4.00	3*	6	1.786	91	25
Bebo	2.67	3.00	1*	3	1.528	113	3
Myspace	3.48	3.00	4	6	1.609	8	120
Classmates.com	2.63	2.50	2	2	.744	120	8
Sportsvite	2.00	2.00	2	0	---	107	1

*= Multiple modes exist. Smallest value is shown.

Mean scores based on 7-point scale; 1=dissatisfied and 7=satisfied.

Brand Personality Frequency Distributions

Tables 4-16 through 4-21 indicate the results of the brand personality portion of the study.

Participants' answers to the personality typology questions for each social network were calculated to discern the various personalities assigned to each social network.

The results of the study indicated that the most frequently occurring personality type for Facebook, LiveJournal, Bebo, and MySpace was "ENFP." As stated previously, an ENFP personality can be described as "Enthusiastic, imaginative, will help anyone with a problem, improvise rather than prepare in advance, high spirited, may procrastinate, may overlook relevant details, may overextend, often a spokesperson for values relating to people" (Paladin Associates 2008). The most frequently occurring personality type for Classmates.com was "ISTJ." As stated previously, an ISTJ personality can be described as:

Practical, responsible, organization is important, success by concentration and thoroughness, realistic and dependable, respect traditional and hierarchical approaches, may neglect interpersonal niceties, may overlook long-range implications in favor of day-to-day operations, rely on standard operating procedures (Paladin Associates 2008).

The most frequently occurring personality type for Sportsvite was "INFP." As stated previously, an INFP personality can be described as "Idealistic, strong inner values, catalysts for implementing ideas, interested in human potential, little regard for possessions or surroundings, more likely to praise than critique, may delay tasks due to perfectionism" (Paladin Associates 2008). Table 4-16 below indicates the most frequently occurring personality types for each of the social networks, along with the percentage of respondents who classified it as such.

Table 4-16. Most Frequently Occurring Personality Type

	Type	Percentage
Facebook	ENFP	51.7
LiveJournal	ENFP	34.5
Bebo	ENFP	28.4
Myspace	ENFP	77.3
Classmates.com	ISTJ	21.1
Sportsvite	INFP	84.3

Table 4-17 indicates the overall results of personality assignments based on familiarity level for each of the 16 personality types. Based on these findings, medium familiarity brands appeared to have the maximum number of personalities (16 out of 16). High familiarity brands only had 14 out of 16 personalities represented and low familiarity brands had 15 out of 16 personalities represented.

Table 4-17. Overall Personality Assignments by Familiarity

	High Familiarity (Facebook and MySpace)	Medium Familiarity (LiveJournal and Classmates.com)	Low Familiarity (Bebo and Sportsvite)
ENFP	159	51	34
ENTP	16	6	3
ESTJ	10	11	2
ESFP	12	15	3
ISTJ	8	35	7
ESFJ	7	14	2
ENTJ	5	2	1
ESTP	4	3	0
INFP	6	47	118
ENFJ	7	2	6
ISFP	3	6	6
INFJ	2	9	4
ISTP	2	9	5
INTP	2	1	5
INTJ	0	3	3
ISFJ	0	17	1
Total Personalities	14	16	15

Table 4-18 illustrates the breakdown of personality assignments for each social network dissected by each of the 16 individual dimensions. The number of respondents whom classified it as such is indicated by frequency and percent.

The overall results of personality assignments for each social network are indicated in Table 4-19. The number of respondents whom classified it as such is indicated by frequency and percent. Classmates.com was the only social network which respondents classified as having all 16 personality types.

Table 4-18. MBTI Frequency Distributions by Individual Dimension

	Facebook Count (%)	LiveJournal Count (%)	Bebo Count (%)	MySpace Count (%)	Classmates.com Count (%)	Sportsvite Count (%)
E	101 (87.1)	56 (48.3)	50 (43.1)	119 (93.0)	48 (37.5)	1 (0.9)
I	14 (12.1)	56 (48.3)	56 (48.3)	9 (7.0)	70 (54.7)	93 (86.1)
Total	115 (99.1)	112 (96.6)	106 (91.4)	128 (100)	118 (92.2)	94 (87.0)
S	34 (29.3)	27 (23.3)	26 (22.4)	12 (9.4)	83 (64.8)	0 (0)
N	81 (69.8)	85 (73.3)	80 (69.0)	116 (90.6)	35 (27.3)	94 (87.0)
Total	115 (99.1)	112 (96.6)	106 (91.4)	128 (100)	118 (92.2)	94 (87.0)
T	34 (29.3)	19 (16.4)	25 (21.6)	13 (10.2)	50 (39.1)	1 (0.9)
F	81 (69.8)	93 (80.2)	81 (69.8)	115 (89.8)	68 (53.1)	93 (86.1)
Total	115 (99.1)	112 (96.6)	106 (91.4)	128 (100)	118 (92.2)	94 (87.0)
J	29 (25.0)	22 (19.0)	25 (21.6)	10 (7.8)	70 (54.7)	1 (0.9)
P	86 (74.1)	90 (77.6)	81 (69.8)	118 (92.2)	48 (37.5)	93 (86.1)
Total	115 (99.1)	112 (96.6)	106 (91.4)	128 (100)	118 (92.2)	94 (87.0)

Table 4-19. MBTI Frequency Distributions by Total Personality

	Facebook Count (%)	LiveJournal Count (%)	Bebo Count (%)	MySpace Count (%)	Classmates.com Count (%)	Sportsvite Count (%)
ENFP	60 (51.7)	40 (34.5)	33 (28.4)	99 (77.3)	11 (8.6)	1 (0.9)
ENTP	10 (8.6)	4 (3.4)	3 (2.6)	6 (4.7)	2 (1.6)	--
ESTJ	8 (6.9)	1 (0.9)	2 (1.7)	2 (1.6)	10 (7.8)	--
ESFP	7 (6.0)	6 (5.2)	3 (2.6)	5 (3.9)	9 (7.0)	--
ISTJ	7 (6.0)	8 (6.9)	7 (6.0)	1 (0.8)	27 (21.1)	--
ESFJ	6 (5.2)	3 (2.6)	2 (1.7)	1 (0.8)	11 (8.6)	--
ENTJ	5 (4.3)	1 (0.9)	1 (0.9)	--	1 (0.8)	--
ESTP	3 (2.6)	--	--	1 (0.8)	3 (2.3)	--
INFP	3 (2.6)	32 (27.6)	27 (23.3)	3 (2.3)	15 (11.7)	91 (84.3)
ENFJ	2 (1.7)	1 (0.9)	6 (5.2)	5 (3.9)	1 (0.8)	--
ISFP	2 (1.7)	4 (3.4)	6 (5.2)	1 (0.8)	2 (1.6)	--
INFJ	1 (0.9)	6 (5.2)	3 (2.6)	1 (0.8)	3 (2.3)	1 (0.9)
ISTP	1 (0.9)	4 (3.4)	5 (4.3)	1 (0.8)	5 (3.9)	--
INTJ	--	1 (0.9)	3 (2.6)	--	1 (0.8)	--
ISFJ	--	1 (0.9)	1 (0.9)	--	16 (12.5)	--
INTP	--	--	4 (3.4)	2 (1.6)	1 (0.8)	1 (0.9)
Total	116 (100)	116 (100)	116 (100)	128 (100)	128 (100)	108 (100)

Hypothesis Testing

To discover the consensus level (number of personalities), a cross tabulation was run between each respondent's individual assignment of social network personality type and the most frequently occurring personality type for each social network. This was done by designating each respondent's personality assignment as either a "match" (agreement) or "no

match” (disagreement) to the overall most frequently occurring personality type along each of the six social networks (Table 4-20). The chi-square analysis was conducted from Richard Lowry’s VassarStats contingency table website that calculates chi-square from cross tabulations (Lowry 2008). A chi-square ($X^2=73.77$, d.f.=2) showed that there is a significant relationship between consensus and overall personality type where $p<.0001$. Standardized residuals show that matches were higher than expected for low and high familiarity brands and lower than expected for medium familiarity brands and vice versa.

Table 4-20. Cross Tabulation of Match/No Match with Overall Personality Type

	Low Familiarity			Medium Familiarity			High Familiarity			Total
	N	%	Std. Resid.	N	%	Std. Resid.	N	%	Std. Resid.	
Match	124	62%	+1.96	67	29.1%	-4.81	159	65.4%	+2.9	350
No Match	76	38%	-2.04	163	70.9%	+5.01	84	34.6%	-3.02	323
Total	200	100%		230	100%		243	100%		673

$X^2=73.77$, d.f.=2, $p<.0001$

The results of the cross tabulation fall in line with the total number of personality types generated for each of the familiarity levels. Medium familiarity brands had the highest number of total personality types and had the lowest level of consensus (29.1% match) among overall personality type. Low and high familiarity brands had less total personality types and had a higher level of consensus (62% match and 65.4% match, respectively) among overall personality type.

Hypothesis 1: Brand personality consensus is positively related to brand familiarity.

The results show that a significant relationship exists between familiarity and consensus (number of personalities), but the hypothesis was only partially supported. At low and high brand familiarity levels, there is a greater consensus among overall personality type. At the medium brand familiarity level, there is less consensus among overall personality type. High familiarity brands had more personality consensus than medium familiarity brands, but medium familiarity

brands did not have more personality consensus than low familiarity brands. Thus, the hypothesis was only partially supported, as the relationship is not linear.

To further explore, an analysis of how usage levels affect personality consensus was conducted. A cross tabulation and chi-square analysis revealed that there is no significant relationship between the amount of time spent using social networks and the consensus on personality type (Table 4-21). Therefore, it can be suggested that the amount of time spent using social networks is not necessarily an indicator of personality consensus. This indicated that usage levels are not a factor in brand personality consensus, therefore, familiarity level was sufficient to test the hypothesis.

Table 4-21. Cross Tabulation of Maximum Time with Number of Personalities

	Number of Personalities					
	High Familiarity		Medium Familiarity		Low Familiarity	
	Facebook	MySpace	LiveJournal	Classmates.com	Bebo	Sportsvite
Low Users (Less than 1 hour/week)	5	11	5	6	3	1
Medium Users (1-4 hours/week)	11	5	4	0	0	0
High Users (5+ hours/week)	11	2	0	0	0	0

Facebook: $X^2=31.29$, d.f.=26, $p=0.22$; MySpace: $X^2=30.24$, d.f.=24, $p=0.18$; LiveJournal: $X^2=11.73$, d.f.=7, $p=0.11$; Classmates.com: No statistics computed-Max Time is constant ; Bebo: No statistics computed-Max Time is constant ; Sportsvite: No statistics computed-Max Time is constant

CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

As today's market becomes progressively saturated with products, branding has become an increasingly important means for distinguishing between products. The creation of a brand personality is not only what helps make these distinctions but also what enables consumers to develop and nurture relationships with brands that will lead to loyalty. However, there is still a wide gap in the knowledge of just how consumers view, absorb, and contribute to these brand personalities. This study was conducted to discover the way in which consumers view the personalities of brands based on their perceived level of familiarity with said brands. The use of online social networking websites as brand stimuli contoured the study toward a look at this new and growing category and the ways in which consumers are responding to it.

Summary of Results

Social Network Usage

Brand usage results coincided with familiarity levels, as expected. The greatest number of participants reported having used the high familiarity brands, while only a few respondents indicated they had ever used the low familiarity brands. This indicates that the low familiarity brands are likely deemed as such because they have typically not ever been used by many college students. The medium familiarity brands have likely been tried out or used by a select niche group of people. The high familiarity brands had been used by nearly all respondents.

Another component of this is the amount of time spent using each social network. The only social network in which high usage was the most frequently occurring response was Facebook, with 50% of respondents indicating they dedicate a minimum of five hours per week to the website. An interesting case was MySpace, the other high-familiarity brand. Seventy-six point five percent of respondents indicated using MySpace less than one hour per week, with

only 4.8% assigning it to the “more than five hours per week” category. This indicates that while college students tend to be highly familiar with MySpace as a social network and have used it before, they prefer Facebook over MySpace. Further, a higher percentage of respondents (99.1%) indicated having a registered Facebook account, while only 57% of respondents indicated having a registered MySpace account. While 93.8% of respondents indicated they have used MySpace before, only 57% hold a registered account for it. This gives further support that college students prefer Facebook to MySpace. Satisfaction levels support this as well. Respondents tended to be much more satisfied with Facebook (M=5.51) than MySpace (M=3.48).

All use of the medium and low familiarity brands appears to be within a niche group of people who are aware of these social networks. While some respondents were aware of the medium familiarity social networks (LiveJournal and Classmates.com), it appears that the low usage rates (21.6% and 6.3% respectively) could be the result of the absence of a need for these social networks. Classmates.com, in particular, is useful for reconnecting with your classmates of the past. While many respondents seemed to be aware of this social network, college students likely don't yet have a need for this service. It is likely something that adults would find more use for. LiveJournal lets users post a diary/blog, and many college students may not have a need for this sort of service. The low familiarity social networks (Bebo and Sportsvite) appear to have only been used by a few of respondents (three respondents and one respondent, respectively). Therefore, these brands are highly unfamiliar to the majority of college students. Their extremely low familiarity levels (1.20 and 1.08, respectively) indicate that not only have most college students never used these social networks, they have likely never even heard of them.

Social network age does not appear to have had effect on familiarity level. Facebook and MySpace (high familiarity) were introduced in 2004 and 2003 respectively, LiveJournal and

Classmates.com (medium familiarity) were introduced in 1999 and 1995 respectively, and Bebo and Sportsvite (low familiarity) were introduced in 2005 and 2006 respectively. This may indicate that even though LiveJournal and Classmates.com have been in use the longest, they may appeal more to a select group of individuals. Facebook and MySpace, on the other hand, while much newer, are more general in applicability and appeal to a very wide range of people. This issue may also have had a general effect on the outcome of the study. Facebook and MySpace, as stated previously, are very general types of social networks mainly used for communication with others. Some of the others used in the study, such as Sportsvite, Classmates.com, and LiveJournal, appear to be more of a niche type of social network that provide a specific type of service as opposed to a general means of communication. This could be a factor in why the more specific types of social networks had lower familiarity levels because not as many general consumers would necessarily have a need for them.

Brand Personalities of Social Networks

Results from the hypothesis testing illustrate that there is greater personality consensus among high familiarity brands and low familiarity brands, while medium familiarity brands have a much lower personality consensus. In partial support of the hypothesis, the study concluded that familiarity level does have an effect on the total number of personalities that will be assigned to a brand (consensus) but not in linear fashion.

In the case of this study, it must be taken into consideration that the social network overall category is fairly new and growing. This aspect of the category will have a definite impact on the ways in which personalities are viewed and classified.

The results of the study indicate that in a category such as this, where the category itself and many of the brands are relatively new, the high familiarity brands (the category leaders) will set the tone of the personality of the category. The extremely unfamiliar brands will be

influenced by the overall category personality and by the category leaders (high familiarity brands). This is a possible explanation for the high level of personality consensus among high familiarity brands and low familiarity brands but not medium familiarity brands. In this category, medium familiarity brands are perhaps trying to distinguish and differentiate themselves as they are becoming more well-known. They may be fighting for a distinct personality. Consumers may be trying out these medium familiarity brands to see what they're like. They may have some knowledge of them (more so than low familiarity brands) but not as much knowledge as they do of the high familiarity brands. Thus, medium familiarity brands will be assigned the widest range of personalities, and there will be the lowest level of personality consensus. Low familiarity brands in this case have a very undistinguished personality of their own; therefore, consumers will likely judge those brand personalities based off their knowledge of the personality of the category itself and the category leaders (high familiarity brands). This indicates why low familiarity brands will have a very high personality consensus even though consumers have very little knowledge of them.

Past logic would assume that a low familiarity brand would have very low personality consensus because consumers would have very little knowledge of the brand and personalities would likely end up all over the board. However, in this case of this study, people will likely assume that any new social network is probably similar to the popular category leaders, and they will be judged accordingly.

Category Comparison

The results of this study provided evidence that in new product categories, such as social networks, the highest and lowest familiarity brands will have more personality consensus. But it is important to compare this with well-established and mature product categories. Strausbaugh (1998) tested the number of resulting dominant personalities of brands in mature, well-

established product categories. The Strausbaugh study showed that Coca-Cola (high familiarity) had two to four dominant personalities while Diet Coke and Cherry Coke (lower familiarity than Coca-Cola) had only one to two dominant personality types (Strausbaugh 1998). The study also showed that McDonalds (high familiarity) had two to three dominant personality types (Strausbaugh 1998). Strausbaugh (1998) theorized that “the longer the brand has been in existence and the more communications received over time with regard to it, the more identities it is able to take on” (p. 195). Strausbaugh (1998) suggested that this could happen because “the product becomes tightly intertwined with the usage experience for the consumer and thus becomes highly personalized and positive in nature” (p. 195).

Thus it appears that in new product categories, high familiarity brands have strong personality consensus, but in mature product categories, high familiarity brands have weaker personality consensus. This would indicate that more time spent with the brand leads to more personalized brand personality perception, and therefore new products (in this case, social networks) would not have yet developed a strong enough relationship with the consumer for this to occur.

Bebo Versus Sportsvite as Low Familiarity Brands

Bebo and Sportsvite were both highly unfamiliar to respondents, and as a combined unit of “low familiarity” brands, their overall personality consensus is very high. However, when analyzed individually, Sportsvite has a much higher personality consensus than does Bebo even though both have extremely low familiarity and usage among respondents. While the exact cause for this discrepancy between the two is not known, suggestions can be made.

Sportsvite is a much more specifically-focused social network. It allows athletes to connect with other athletes in their local region to “manage their games or teams, recruit players, join a team, find a playing field or even post sports classifieds on [the] listings board” (Sportsvite

2008). Bebo, on the other hand, appears to be a much more generalized social network where users simply create profiles to interact with other users. Beyond this aspect, the most likely cause for the differentiation between the two is likely based on the name. Both social networks were highly unfamiliar to respondents, however, Sportsvite is a word that respondents are likely to understand and draw conclusions about. They will probably assume it has something to do with sports. Bebo, on the other hand, sounds much more obscure and might not be a word that respondents can associate with anything. Bebo stands for “Blog Early, Blog Often” but that is not likely common knowledge. When respondents were faced with a social network for which they had little or zero familiarity with or knowledge of, it is likely that they gauged the personality of the social network based on any associations they could make with the name [a logo was not presented in the survey, simply the name in normal font consistent with the rest of the survey]. If this occurred, it would make sense that respondents assumed Sportsvite had something to do with sports and answered the personality questions as such. This could explain why the consensus level for Sportsvite (96.8%) was so high. This issue will later be presented as a suggestion for future research.

Fungibility

The results of the study indicate that the social network category can be viewed as “fungible,” meaning “something that is exchangeable or substitutable” (Dictionary.com 2008). For example, a barrel of oil can be viewed as fungible because “it can be used in the same way as any other barrel of oil” (Clifford 2008). Fungibility of a product category leads to the notion that products within the category can easily replace each other or are interchangeable. This study’s findings show that the identities of social networks are in a very fungible stage right now because the category is so new. Fungibility exists in the fact that people can apply the brand personality of a well-known social network to that of a completely unknown social network and view them

interchangeably. This suggests that any new product category can be viewed as fungible and thus brand personalities within the new and unfamiliar category will be interchangeable. Early on, in new categories, the personality of a brand will be the same as the overall category, and thus each of the brands within the category will be fungible. The importance of fungibility is that it offers the opportunity to advertise and differentiate oneself. This is where brand personality becomes important.

Theoretical Implications

From a theoretical standpoint, the results of this study have many implications. First of all, as stated in the Literature Review, brand personality is still a relatively new concept that lacks standardized measures. While different personality measurement instruments have been created and utilized, an all-encompassing industry standard is still unclear. This study's findings present a rationale for the use of the Strausbaugh Instrument (encompassing the 16 MBTI personality typologies) in measuring brand personality. While Aaker's Big Five is a commonly used method for distinguishing personalities of brands, it does not yield a single personality for an individual respondent and thus establishing a level of consensus is not as meaningful. Strausbaugh's 16 personality typologies allow for a very clear view of dominant personality types and the ability to see if there truly is a strong and significant consensus.

The partial support of the hypothesis offers the opportunity to create a new theory on the link between brand personality and brand familiarity contingent on the type of category in question. Since we have provided evidence that in new product categories, high and low brand familiarity leads to high personality consensus while medium brand familiarity leads to low personality consensus, then future studies testing the same hypothesis in other product categories might establish a more well-rounded view of the concept. If the different links between familiarity and personality consensus could be discovered for each type of product category, then

a specific model could be proposed that encompasses all three elements: brand familiarity, personality consensus, and product category.

Practical Implications

First and foremost, this study presents large implications for the practice of branding and creation of a brand personality for marketers and advertisers. This study has provided evidence that in new categories, the category leader will set the tone of the category's personality. Brands in this position will have an easier time creating and portraying a brand personality. While there is likely to be a higher learning cost if a brand is the first one to arrive in a category, return on investment will likely be greater. For other brands entering a new category after the overall category personality has been distinguished, expectations are already going to be in existence. New brands will have the challenge of meeting those expectations while also trying to differentiate themselves. If new brands meet expectations but don't offer anything new or different from the category leader, they are unlikely to succeed because consumers will likely remain loyal to the category leader. The mere-exposure effect showed us that people tend to prefer things that are more familiar to them. Therefore, new brands will have to offer something different in order to shift consumers in their direction.

The results of this study have implications for the social network category itself as well. Because the study has deemed the overall category as "fungible" social networks need to take this into consideration when establishing themselves as brands. Fungibility leads to the opportunity to advertise in order to differentiate. This is what social networks need to be aware of. It appears that high familiarity brands already have well-established consumer bases. Therefore, these brands need to focus on continuing to satisfy customer demands and meet expectations. As interactive technology continues to innovate and progress, consumers will expect social networks to follow suit. Continual improvements and innovations will be expected.

And because social networks are part of the fast-paced online interactive industry, any that does not keep up with the rest of the pack risks becoming obsolete and abandoned. Because consumers appear to have strong relationships with the high familiarity social networks, they will expect small improvements over time, but any drastic changes will run the risk of alienating, confusing, or frustrating loyal consumers.

The medium familiarity brands are focusing on differentiating themselves. The two medium familiarity brands in this study, LiveJournal and Classmates.com, have both been in existence since the 1990s and are thus older than all of the other social networks in this study. However, length of existence is not translating into familiarity level in this case. It is possible then, that these social networks appeal to very specific interests or desires. The consumers who have those specific interests are likely the current users, and this niche group is likely content.

The low familiarity social networks were completely unknown to respondents, thus, respondents assumed them to be similar to the well-known social networks. Therefore, low familiarity brands should focus on differentiating themselves and making themselves more well-known in order to advance into medium or high familiarity positions. As was seen in the case of MySpace, just because many consumers are highly familiar with your offering, that doesn't mean they prefer it. Many people are highly familiar with Coca-Cola but prefer Pepsi and vice versa. Therefore, in the category of social networks, just being well-known is not enough to drive usage.

It was stated earlier that there are approximately 850 social networking sites today with that number estimated to rise to 250,000 in the next year (Swartz 2008a). Thus, in a category where consumers have countless options, appealing to customer needs and demands could be the future key to success in addition to achieving high familiarity.

The results of this study provide insight into the ways in which social networks should market themselves. In this study, different kinds of people viewed a singular social network in different ways, but the social network is what it is. The only thing that is different is the manner in which consumers viewed its personality. Perhaps different segments of consumers are viewing a social network in a specific way. This is an area that could be explored by social networks in order to see if there is any method of segmenting social network users into distinct target market segments.

As mentioned at the beginning of this study, the social network category was selected for a very specific reason. As more and more people are spending their free time on the internet instead of in front of the television, and online advertising spending continues to increase, knowledge about social network usage is of extreme value to marketers today. Despite representing only a small sample of college students, the information discovered about the usage of social networks by college students is of extreme significance to marketers in helping them understand the best places in which to advertise and connect with young adults. It seems very clear that the best place to reach college students online is through Facebook. Ninety-nine point one percent of respondents indicated that they own a personal, registered Facebook account. Further, respondents indicated that they are typically satisfied with Facebook, with a mean satisfaction score of 5.51 out of a possible seven. Fifty percent of respondents revealed that they dedicate at least five hours every week to spending time on Facebook. And social networks operate quite differently from other media. If a person claims they spend five hours per week watching television, that doesn't necessarily mean that they are engaged and engrossed in the television for the entire five hours, and they may even change the channel or leave during commercials. A social network is very different. While using a social network, a person is

typically completely engaged. They are focused on what they are doing and they are choosing to be there. Thus marketing executed through a social network is harder to ignore. Many marketers have caught onto this. Beyond the placement of banner ads, which do have the potential to be ignored, marketers have begun to advertise through interactive means. Sponsorships and advertising has become so advanced and intertwined at the social network level that social network users often don't even realize they are being advertised to. If interactivity is what fuels relationships between consumers and brands then the most interactive of media (the internet) would seem the best logical place to foster these relationships.

As stated earlier in the comparison between young and mature product categories, more time spent with a brand might not lead to salience of the personality as established by marketers but actually might lead to a more personalized one-on-one personality as adapted by the consumer. This personality may be quite different from the personality created for the brand by marketers. If consumers are going to adapt their own view of a brand personality over time, it would seem logical that marketers should initially focus on creating a strong personality for a new brand and then later, when the brand has matured, focus more on establishing interactive relationships with consumers.

Limitations

This study has several limitations. The first limitation is present in the sample utilized. A convenience sample of University of Florida students enrolled in ADV3008 was used, as opposed to a true random sample. Therefore the results of the study can only be applied to these types of college-aged students. The results cannot necessarily be projected onto a greater population of all consumers. Although the college students represented a diverse group of University of Florida students, it still is not representative of people of all ages, education levels and backgrounds. The sample was not evenly distributed between males and females, with males

accounting for only 23% of the sample. Further, since all respondents were students at the University of Florida, it is implied that they are fairly intelligent, competent, and already possess high school diplomas, therefore being well educated. All respondents took the survey online, meaning they all had computer access. This is not true of all consumers. Because these respondents all have computer access, they are more likely to be familiar with social network websites than people who do not have computer access.

A second limitation lies in the specificity of the study. Only the category of social networks was utilized, and thus the results cannot be projected onto all brand types or all category types and maturity levels.

A third limitation lies in the small number of brand stimuli used. Due to the length of survey questioning, each respondent only answered questions covering three of the six brands. And due to sample size, in order to obtain a large enough sample to respond on each brand, a total of only six brands were studied. This may skew results to not necessarily be representative of all social networks. In order to truly understand this category, a larger number of social networks should be studied.

Suggestions for Future Research

It has been expressed multiple times throughout this study that brand personality is still a relatively new concept and the possibilities for future research are endless. Specifically in this case, a few interesting extensions of this study appear to be concepts this industry would benefit from understanding more completely.

First of all, it would seem logical to replicate this study with different product categories. This study looked at one product category exclusively, the results of which cannot necessarily be generalized onto other product categories. This study has made conjectures about mature product categories (such as soft drinks and fast food) but concrete data is still lacking. And beyond that,

there are a multitude of product categories which have likely never been studied or theorized about. It would also be beneficial to replicate this study with a larger sample of brand stimuli. This study focused on only six social networks, yet we have previously stated that hundreds of social networks currently exist and hundreds of thousands are likely to exist within the next year. A similar study encompassing a larger pool of social network brands might allow for a clearer and well-rounded analysis. Furthermore, it would be beneficial to replicate this study with a more generalized sample that represented a wider range of people, as opposed to just college students at the University of Florida.

It was discussed prior that one possible reason for the stronger personality consensus on low familiarity brand Sportsvite over Bebo could be due to the actual name of the social network. It was suggested that even in zero-familiarity situations, respondents might make the same assumptions about Sportsvite because they are likely to assume it is something sports-related. Bebo, however, is a more obscure name and respondents might have made completely scattered assumptions about what it could encompass. Therefore, an interesting study to conduct would be a look at the names of unfamiliar brands to see how the names of these brands affect consumers' perceptions of them. While logos were not used in this study, logo use could add a further dimension to that research. A comparative study could examine the name versus the logo design of unfamiliar brands to see which of the two dominated overall perception of its personality.

Another suggestion for future research would be a qualitative study of the same concepts presented in this study. A focus group approach that allowed consumers to engage in conversation about a specific product category and the way they view certain brands could give a different view of brand familiarity's effects on personality. In this respect, the qualitative nature

would allow for the added element of discerning the level of passion and involvement participants expressed while talking about brands at various familiarity levels. Also, in this case, participants could have the ability to describe the personality of brands in their own way using whatever words they desire as opposed to selecting one of two options on a survey questionnaire (in which case they may not agree with either option but be forced to choose one).

An additional area for future research would include adding a component of testing respondents' personalities to see if their own personalities had an effect on the personality they selected for a brand. This would provide more research for the study of congruity theory. Also, it would be interesting to create a study that looked at whether the personality which respondents claim they view of the social network is actually of the social network website itself or of the people they presume to be users of the social network in question.

Another area to explore is how gender differences affect the way respondents view the brand personality. Specifically, with a social network such as Sportsvite. The sample in this study was heavily skewed toward female respondents. A more evenly dispersed sample in terms of gender might provide interesting insights into the way different genders perceive personalities. This could be further expanded to include differences among all demographics.

As mentioned previously, the area of brand personality and the ways in which consumers develop relationships with brands is a highly complicated, modestly understood, and largely desired area of knowledge when it comes to marketing and advertising. While the few suggestions above do span areas that would be extremely beneficial to the industry to comprehend, the possibilities of areas for future research are virtually endless.

APPENDIX A INFORMED CONSENT

Hello and thank you for taking the time to participate in this questionnaire. I am interested in finding out your opinions regarding different websites that you may or may not be familiar with. There are no right or wrong answers. I highly value your most honest and truthful opinions. I assure you that this information will be kept confidential and that this questionnaire is intended for real, legitimate research purposes.

Your participation in this survey is completely voluntary, and you may cancel your participation at any time. Those students who choose to complete the survey will receive extra credit as assigned by your instructor.

Informed Consent Protocol

Title: The effects of brand familiarity on brand personality

Please read this consent document carefully before you decide to participate in this study.

Purpose of the research study:

The purpose of this study is to examine the effects of brand familiarity on brand personality.

What you will be asked to do in the study:

You will be asked to complete a questionnaire containing questions on your knowledge of certain websites. You will be asked to report your level of use and familiarity with certain websites. You will then be asked to assign descriptive adjectives to those websites based on your own opinion of the personalities of those websites.

Time required: Approximately 20 minutes

Risks and Benefits: There are no risks or benefits associated with this study.

Compensation: You will receive extra credit as established by your instructor for participating in this research.

Confidentiality:

Your identity will be kept confidential to the extent provided by law. Your name will be kept separate from your completed survey and will be used only to provide proof of completion to your professor for extra credit purposes.

Voluntary participation:

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. There is no penalty for not participating.

Right to withdraw from the study:

You have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without consequence.

Whom to contact if you have questions about the study:

April Shapiro, Graduate Student, College of Journalism and Communications
AprShaps@ufl.edu, 954-695-1911

Whom to contact about your rights as a research participant in the study:

IRB02 Office, Box 112250, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611-2250; phone 392-0433.

1. Please acknowledge that you have read the informed consent above and agree to participate in this study by checking the appropriate box below:

- I agree
- I do not agree. I will not participate in this study

APPENDIX B
QUESTIONNAIRES

Survey Version 1a: FLB

I am interested in finding out your personal level of familiarity with the websites presented below.

Facebook

1. Think about Facebook. How familiar are you with this website? Please rate your familiarity level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=unfamiliar and 7=familiar.

Regarding the website Facebook, you feel:

- 1 (Unfamiliar)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 (Familiar)

2. Have you ever used Facebook before?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

1. Select the amount of time, on average, that you spend using Facebook:

- Less than once a month
- Once a month
- Less than 1 hour per week
- 1-2 hours per week
- 3-4 hours per week
- 5-6 hours per week
- 7-8 hours per week
- 9-10 hours per week
- More than 10 hours per week

2. Do you currently have a registered Facebook account?

- Yes
- No

3. How satisfied are you with your experience with Facebook? Please rate your satisfaction level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=Dissatisfied and 7=Satisfied.

- 1 (Dissatisfied)

- 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
 - 6
 - 7 (Satisfied)
-

LiveJournal

1. Think about LiveJournal. How familiar are you with this website? Please rate your familiarity level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=unfamiliar and 7=familiar.

Regarding the website LiveJournal, you feel:

- 1 (Unfamiliar)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 (Familiar)

2. Have you ever used LiveJournal before?

- Yes
 - No
 - Unsure
-

1. Select the amount of time, on average, that you spend using LiveJournal:

- Less than once a month
- Once a month
- Less than 1 hour per week
- 1-2 hours per week
- 3-4 hours per week
- 5-6 hours per week
- 7-8 hours per week
- 9-10 hours per week
- More than 10 hours per week

2. Do you currently have a registered LiveJournal account?

- Yes
- No

3. How satisfied are you with your experience with LiveJournal? Please rate your satisfaction level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=Dissatisfied and 7=Satisfied.

- 1 (Dissatisfied)

- 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
 - 6
 - 7 (Satisfied)
-

Bebo

1. Think about Bebo. How familiar are you with this website? Please rate your familiarity level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=unfamiliar and 7=familiar.

Regarding the website Bebo, you feel:

- 1 (Unfamiliar)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 (Familiar)

2. Have you ever used Bebo before?

- Yes
 - No
 - Unsure
-

1. Select the amount of time, on average, that you spend using Bebo:

- Less than once a month
- Once a month
- Less than 1 hour per week
- 1-2 hours per week
- 3-4 hours per week
- 5-6 hours per week
- 7-8 hours per week
- 9-10 hours per week
- More than 10 hours per week

2. Do you currently have a registered Bebo account?

- Yes
- No

3. How satisfied are you with your experience with Bebo? Please rate your satisfaction level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=Dissatisfied and 7=Satisfied.

- 1 (Dissatisfied)

- 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
 - 6
 - 7 (Satisfied)
-

In this section, I am interested in finding out your opinions of these websites based on the characteristics and attributes that comprise the personality and/or image they give off. This is entirely based on your opinion, and no opinion is wrong. I am aware that you may or may not be familiar with the following websites however please answer to the best of your knowledge and ability for each item.

Facebook

Directions: Think about Facebook as if it were a person with a distinct personality. What kind of person would it be? For each of the items below, please indicate how you would describe Facebook's personality by selecting the adjective from each pair that best describes Facebook.

- | | | |
|------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Facebook is: | ○ Assertive | ○ Mild |
| 2. Facebook is: | ○ Systematic | ○ Imaginative |
| 3. Facebook is: | ○ Logical | ○ Emotional |
| 4. Facebook is: | ○ Clear-cut, definite | ○ Undecided, variable |
| 5. Facebook is: | ○ Idealistic, visionary | ○ Realistic, down-to-earth |
| 6. Facebook is: | ○ Soft-hearted | ○ Firm |
| 7. Facebook is: | ○ Adaptable | ○ Deliberate |
| 8. Facebook is: | ○ Reserved | ○ Active |
| 9. Facebook is: | ○ Cold | ○ Warm |
| 10. Facebook is: | ○ Dependable | ○ Changeable |
| 11. Facebook is: | ○ Moderate | ○ Dynamic |
| 12. Facebook is: | ○ Creative, theoretical | ○ Practical, functional |
| 13. Facebook is: | ○ Innovative | ○ Steadfast |
| 14. Facebook is: | ○ Sociable | ○ Shy |
| 15. Facebook is: | ○ Sensible, factual | ○ Instinctual |
| 16. Facebook is: | ○ Sympathetic | ○ Indifferent |
| 17. Facebook is: | ○ Quiet | ○ Outspoken |
| 18. Facebook is: | ○ Wide-interests | ○ Precise |
| 19. Facebook is: | ○ Rational, reasonable | ○ Passionate, perceptive |
| 20. Facebook is: | ○ Indistinct | ○ Well-defined |
| 21. Facebook is: | ○ Energetic | ○ Calm |
| 22. Facebook is: | ○ Conservative | ○ Unconventional |
| 23. Facebook is: | ○ Excitable | ○ Stoic |
| 24. Facebook is: | ○ Decided | ○ Flexible |
-

LiveJournal

Now think about LiveJournal as if it were a person with a distinct personality. What kind of person would it be? For each of the items below, please indicate how you would describe LiveJournal's personality by selecting the adjective from each pair that best describes LiveJournal.

- | | | |
|---------------------|---|--|
| 1. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Assertive | <input type="radio"/> Mild |
| 2. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Systematic | <input type="radio"/> Imaginative |
| 3. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Logical | <input type="radio"/> Emotional |
| 4. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Clear-cut, definite | <input type="radio"/> Undecided, variable |
| 5. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Idealistic, visionary | <input type="radio"/> Realistic, down-to-earth |
| 6. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Soft-hearted | <input type="radio"/> Firm |
| 7. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Adaptable | <input type="radio"/> Deliberate |
| 8. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Reserved | <input type="radio"/> Active |
| 9. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Cold | <input type="radio"/> Warm |
| 10. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Dependable | <input type="radio"/> Changeable |
| 11. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Moderate | <input type="radio"/> Dynamic |
| 12. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Creative, theoretical | <input type="radio"/> Practical, functional |
| 13. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Innovative | <input type="radio"/> Steadfast |
| 14. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Sociable | <input type="radio"/> Shy |
| 15. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Sensible, factual | <input type="radio"/> Instinctual |
| 16. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Sympathetic | <input type="radio"/> Indifferent |
| 17. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Quiet | <input type="radio"/> Outspoken |
| 18. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Wide-interests | <input type="radio"/> Precise |
| 19. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Rational, reasonable | <input type="radio"/> Passionate, perceptive |
| 20. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Indistinct | <input type="radio"/> Well-defined |
| 21. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Energetic | <input type="radio"/> Calm |
| 22. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Conservative | <input type="radio"/> Unconventional |
| 23. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Excitable | <input type="radio"/> Stoic |
| 24. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Decided | <input type="radio"/> Flexible |
-

Bebo

Now think about Bebo as if it were a person with a distinct personality. What kind of person would it be? For each of the items below, please indicate how you would describe Bebo 's personality by selecting the adjective from each pair that best describes Bebo.

- | | | |
|-------------|---|--|
| 1. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Assertive | <input type="radio"/> Mild |
| 2. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Systematic | <input type="radio"/> Imaginative |
| 3. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Logical | <input type="radio"/> Emotional |
| 4. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Clear-cut, definite | <input type="radio"/> Undecided, variable |
| 5. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Idealistic, visionary | <input type="radio"/> Realistic, down-to-earth |

- | | | |
|--------------|---|--|
| 6. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Soft-hearted | <input type="radio"/> Firm |
| 7. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Adaptable | <input type="radio"/> Deliberate |
| 8. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Reserved | <input type="radio"/> Active |
| 9. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Cold | <input type="radio"/> Warm |
| 10. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Dependable | <input type="radio"/> Changeable |
| 11. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Moderate | <input type="radio"/> Dynamic |
| 12. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Creative, theoretical | <input type="radio"/> Practical, functional |
| 13. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Innovative | <input type="radio"/> Steadfast |
| 14. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Sociable | <input type="radio"/> Shy |
| 15. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Sensible, factual | <input type="radio"/> Instinctual |
| 16. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Sympathetic | <input type="radio"/> Indifferent |
| 17. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Quiet | <input type="radio"/> Outspoken |
| 18. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Wide-interests | <input type="radio"/> Precise |
| 19. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Rational, reasonable | <input type="radio"/> Passionate, perceptive |
| 20. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Indistinct | <input type="radio"/> Well-defined |
| 21. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Energetic | <input type="radio"/> Calm |
| 22. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Conservative | <input type="radio"/> Unconventional |
| 23. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Excitable | <input type="radio"/> Stoic |
| 24. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Decided | <input type="radio"/> Flexible |

The following questions serve to provide a basic overview of all survey participants in this study. This information will not in any way be connected to your personal responses to this questionnaire, but rather serve as part of an overall description of all respondents. Please select the answer that best applies to you. Should the “other” category best apply to you on any particular question, please select “other” and write in your response.

1. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

2. What is your age?

3. What is your academic classification?

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- Other

If selecting “other” please specify: _____

4. What is your race/ethnicity?

- Arabic
- Asian

- Black/African-American
- Hispanic/Latino
- Native American
- Pacific Islander
- White/Caucasian
- Other

If selecting “other” please specify: _____

5. What social class best exemplifies you?

- Upper class
- Upper middle class
- Middle class
- Lower middle class
- Lower class
- Unsure

6. What kind of computer do you use?

- Mac/Apple
- PC

7. What is your current major?

In order to receive extra credit for participating in this survey, you will need to state your name and UFID number. Your name/UFID will not be associated with, or connected to, your responses in this survey.

It will only be placed on a list of students who have completed the survey and will thus receive extra credit.

Please state your name below as it appears on UF records. Do not use nicknames.

Last name:

First name:

Middle initial:

UF ID number:

Please create a 4-digit code for yourself that you can easily remember. Should it occur that you do not receive your extra credit points, you will report this number to your professor as proof of your completion.

Code: _ _ _ _

Thank you so much for taking the time to participate in this study. Your opinions will greatly help in my research efforts. Should you have any questions regarding today's study, feel free to contact me at Aprshaps@ufl.edu. Have a great day!

Survey Version 1b: LBF

I am interested in finding out your personal level of familiarity with the websites presented below.

LiveJournal

1. Think about LiveJournal. How familiar are you with this website? Please rate your familiarity level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=unfamiliar and 7=familiar.

Regarding the website LiveJournal, you feel:

- 1 (Unfamiliar)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 (Familiar)

2. Have you ever used LiveJournal before?

- Yes
 - No
 - Unsure
-

1. Select the amount of time, on average, that you spend using LiveJournal:

- Less than once a month
- Once a month
- Less than 1 hour per week
- 1-2 hours per week
- 3-4 hours per week
- 5-6 hours per week
- 7-8 hours per week
- 9-10 hours per week
- More than 10 hours per week

2. Do you currently have a registered LiveJournal account?

- Yes
- No

3. How satisfied are you with your experience with LiveJournal? Please rate your satisfaction level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=Dissatisfied and 7=Satisfied.

- 1 (Dissatisfied)
- 2
- 3
- 4

- 5
 - 6
 - 7 (Satisfied)
-

Bebo

1. Think about Bebo. How familiar are you with this website? Please rate your familiarity level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=unfamiliar and 7=familiar.

Regarding the website Bebo, you feel:

- 1 (Unfamiliar)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 (Familiar)

2. Have you ever used Bebo before?

- Yes
 - No
 - Unsure
-

1. Select the amount of time, on average, that you spend using Bebo:

- Less than once a month
- Once a month
- Less than 1 hour per week
- 1-2 hours per week
- 3-4 hours per week
- 5-6 hours per week
- 7-8 hours per week
- 9-10 hours per week
- More than 10 hours per week

2. Do you currently have a registered Bebo account?

- Yes
- No

3. How satisfied are you with your experience with Bebo? Please rate your satisfaction level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=Dissatisfied and 7=Satisfied.

- 1 (Dissatisfied)
- 2
- 3
- 4

- 5
 - 6
 - 7 (Satisfied)
-

Facebook

1. Think about Facebook. How familiar are you with this website? Please rate your familiarity level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=unfamiliar and 7=familiar.

Regarding the website Facebook, you feel:

- 1 (Unfamiliar)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 (Familiar)

2. Have you ever used Facebook before?

- Yes
 - No
 - Unsure
-

1. Select the amount of time, on average, that you spend using Facebook:

- Less than once a month
- Once a month
- Less than 1 hour per week
- 1-2 hours per week
- 3-4 hours per week
- 5-6 hours per week
- 7-8 hours per week
- 9-10 hours per week
- More than 10 hours per week

2. Do you currently have a registered Facebook account?

- Yes
- No

3. How satisfied are you with your experience with Facebook? Please rate your satisfaction level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=Dissatisfied and 7=Satisfied.

- 1 (Dissatisfied)
- 2
- 3
- 4

- 5
- 6
- 7

In this section, I am interested in finding out your opinions of these websites based on the characteristics and attributes that comprise the personality and/or image they give off. This is entirely based on your opinion, and no opinion is wrong. I am aware that you may or may not be familiar with the following websites however please answer to the best of your knowledge and ability for each item.

LiveJournal

Directions: Think about LiveJournal as if it were a person with a distinct personality. What kind of person would it be? For each of the items below, please indicate how you would describe LiveJournal's personality by selecting the adjective from each pair that best describes LiveJournal.

- | | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. LiveJournal is: | ○ Assertive | ○ Mild |
| 2. LiveJournal is: | ○ Systematic | ○ Imaginative |
| 3. LiveJournal is: | ○ Logical | ○ Emotional |
| 4. LiveJournal is: | ○ Clear-cut, definite | ○ Undecided, variable |
| 5. LiveJournal is: | ○ Idealistic, visionary | ○ Realistic, down-to-earth |
| 6. LiveJournal is: | ○ Soft-hearted | ○ Firm |
| 7. LiveJournal is: | ○ Adaptable | ○ Deliberate |
| 8. LiveJournal is: | ○ Reserved | ○ Active |
| 9. LiveJournal is: | ○ Cold | ○ Warm |
| 10. LiveJournal is: | ○ Dependable | ○ Changeable |
| 11. LiveJournal is: | ○ Moderate | ○ Dynamic |
| 12. LiveJournal is: | ○ Creative, theoretical | ○ Practical, functional |
| 13. LiveJournal is: | ○ Innovative | ○ Steadfast |
| 14. LiveJournal is: | ○ Sociable | ○ Shy |
| 15. LiveJournal is: | ○ Sensible, factual | ○ Instinctual |
| 16. LiveJournal is: | ○ Sympathetic | ○ Indifferent |
| 17. LiveJournal is: | ○ Quiet | ○ Outspoken |
| 18. LiveJournal is: | ○ Wide-interests | ○ Precise |
| 19. LiveJournal is: | ○ Rational, reasonable | ○ Passionate, perceptive |
| 20. LiveJournal is: | ○ Indistinct | ○ Well-defined |
| 21. LiveJournal is: | ○ Energetic | ○ Calm |
| 22. LiveJournal is: | ○ Conservative | ○ Unconventional |
| 23. LiveJournal is: | ○ Excitable | ○ Stoic |
| 24. LiveJournal is: | ○ Decided | ○ Flexible |

Bebo

Now think about Bebo as if it were a person with a distinct personality. What kind of person would it be? For each of the items below, please indicate how you would describe Bebo 's personality by selecting the adjective from each pair that best describes Bebo.

- | | | |
|--------------|---|--|
| 1. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Assertive | <input type="radio"/> Mild |
| 2. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Systematic | <input type="radio"/> Imaginative |
| 3. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Logical | <input type="radio"/> Emotional |
| 4. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Clear-cut, definite | <input type="radio"/> Undecided, variable |
| 5. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Idealistic, visionary | <input type="radio"/> Realistic, down-to-earth |
| 6. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Soft-hearted | <input type="radio"/> Firm |
| 7. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Adaptable | <input type="radio"/> Deliberate |
| 8. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Reserved | <input type="radio"/> Active |
| 9. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Cold | <input type="radio"/> Warm |
| 10. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Dependable | <input type="radio"/> Changeable |
| 11. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Moderate | <input type="radio"/> Dynamic |
| 12. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Creative, theoretical | <input type="radio"/> Practical, functional |
| 13. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Innovative | <input type="radio"/> Steadfast |
| 14. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Sociable | <input type="radio"/> Shy |
| 15. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Sensible, factual | <input type="radio"/> Instinctual |
| 16. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Sympathetic | <input type="radio"/> Indifferent |
| 17. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Quiet | <input type="radio"/> Outspoken |
| 18. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Wide-interests | <input type="radio"/> Precise |
| 19. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Rational, reasonable | <input type="radio"/> Passionate, perceptive |
| 20. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Indistinct | <input type="radio"/> Well-defined |
| 21. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Energetic | <input type="radio"/> Calm |
| 22. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Conservative | <input type="radio"/> Unconventional |
| 23. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Excitable | <input type="radio"/> Stoic |
| 24. Bebo is: | <input type="radio"/> Decided | <input type="radio"/> Flexible |

Facebook

Now think about Facebook as if it were a person with a distinct personality. What kind of person would it be? For each of the items below, please indicate how you would describe Facebook's personality by selecting the adjective from each pair that best describes Facebook.

- | | | |
|-----------------|---|--|
| 1. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Assertive | <input type="radio"/> Mild |
| 2. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Systematic | <input type="radio"/> Imaginative |
| 3. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Logical | <input type="radio"/> Emotional |
| 4. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Clear-cut, definite | <input type="radio"/> Undecided, variable |
| 5. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Idealistic, visionary | <input type="radio"/> Realistic, down-to-earth |
| 6. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Soft-hearted | <input type="radio"/> Firm |
| 7. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Adaptable | <input type="radio"/> Deliberate |
| 8. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Reserved | <input type="radio"/> Active |
| 9. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Cold | <input type="radio"/> Warm |

- | | | |
|------------------|---|--|
| 10. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Dependable | <input type="radio"/> Changeable |
| 11. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Moderate | <input type="radio"/> Dynamic |
| 12. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Creative, theoretical | <input type="radio"/> Practical, functional |
| 13. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Innovative | <input type="radio"/> Steadfast |
| 14. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Sociable | <input type="radio"/> Shy |
| 15. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Sensible, factual | <input type="radio"/> Instinctual |
| 16. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Sympathetic | <input type="radio"/> Indifferent |
| 17. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Quiet | <input type="radio"/> Outspoken |
| 18. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Wide-interests | <input type="radio"/> Precise |
| 19. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Rational, reasonable | <input type="radio"/> Passionate, perceptive |
| 20. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Indistinct | <input type="radio"/> Well-defined |
| 21. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Energetic | <input type="radio"/> Calm |
| 22. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Conservative | <input type="radio"/> Unconventional |
| 23. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Excitable | <input type="radio"/> Stoic |
| 24. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Decided | <input type="radio"/> Flexible |
-

The following questions serve to provide a basic overview of all survey participants in this study. This information will not in any way be connected to your personal responses to this questionnaire, but rather serve as part of an overall description of all respondents. Please select the answer that best applies to you. Should the “other” category best apply to you on any particular question, please select “other” and write in your response.

1. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

2. What is your age?

3. What is your academic classification?

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- Other

If selecting “other” please specify: _____

4. What is your race/ethnicity?

- Arabic
- Asian
- Black/African-American
- Hispanic/Latino
- Native American
- Pacific Islander
- White/Caucasian

- Other

If selecting “other” please specify: _____

5. What social class best exemplifies you?

- Upper class
- Upper middle class
- Middle class
- Lower middle class
- Lower class
- Unsure

6. What kind of computer do you use?

- Mac/Apple
- PC

7. What is your current major?

In order to receive extra credit for participating in this survey, you will need to state your name and UFID number. Your name/UFID will not be associated with, or connected to, your responses in this survey.

It will only be placed on a list of students who have completed the survey and will thus receive extra credit.

Please state your name below as it appears on UF records. Do not use nicknames.

Last name:

First name:

Middle initial:

UF ID number:

Please create a 4-digit code for yourself that you can easily remember. Should it occur that you do not receive your extra credit points, you will report this number to your professor as proof of your completion.

Code: ____

Thank you so much for taking the time to participate in this study. Your opinions will greatly help in my research efforts. Should you have any questions regarding today’s study, feel free to contact me at Aprshaps@ufl.edu. Have a great day!

Survey Version 1c: BFL

I am interested in finding out your personal level of familiarity with the websites presented below.

Bebo

1. Think about Bebo. How familiar are you with this website? Please rate your familiarity level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=unfamiliar and 7=familiar.

Regarding the website Bebo, you feel:

- 1 (Unfamiliar)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 (Familiar)

2. Have you ever used Bebo before?

- Yes
 - No
 - Unsure
-

1. Select the amount of time, on average, that you spend using Bebo:

- Less than once a month
- Once a month
- Less than 1 hour per week
- 1-2 hours per week
- 3-4 hours per week
- 5-6 hours per week
- 7-8 hours per week
- 9-10 hours per week
- More than 10 hours per week

2. Do you currently have a registered Bebo account?

- Yes
- No

3. How satisfied are you with your experience with Bebo? Please rate your satisfaction level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=Dissatisfied and 7=Satisfied.

- 1 (Dissatisfied)
- 2
- 3
- 4

- 5
 - 6
 - 7 (Satisfied)
-

Facebook

1. Think about Facebook. How familiar are you with this website? Please rate your familiarity level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=unfamiliar and 7=familiar.

Regarding the website Facebook, you feel:

- 1 (Unfamiliar)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 (Familiar)

2. Have you ever used Facebook before?

- Yes
 - No
 - Unsure
-

1. Select the amount of time, on average, that you spend using Facebook:

- Less than once a month
- Once a month
- Less than 1 hour per week
- 1-2 hours per week
- 3-4 hours per week
- 5-6 hours per week
- 7-8 hours per week
- 9-10 hours per week
- More than 10 hours per week

2. Do you currently have a registered Facebook account?

- Yes
- No

3. How satisfied are you with your experience with Facebook? Please rate your satisfaction level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=Dissatisfied and 7=Satisfied.

- 1 (Dissatisfied)
- 2
- 3
- 4

- 5
 - 6
 - 7
-

LiveJournal

1. Think about LiveJournal. How familiar are you with this website? Please rate your familiarity level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=unfamiliar and 7=familiar.

Regarding the website LiveJournal, you feel:

- 1 (Unfamiliar)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 (Familiar)

2. Have you ever used LiveJournal before?

- Yes
 - No
 - Unsure
-

1. Select the amount of time, on average, that you spend using LiveJournal:

- Less than once a month
- Once a month
- Less than 1 hour per week
- 1-2 hours per week
- 3-4 hours per week
- 5-6 hours per week
- 7-8 hours per week
- 9-10 hours per week
- More than 10 hours per week

2. Do you currently have a registered LiveJournal account?

- Yes
- No

3. How satisfied are you with your experience with LiveJournal? Please rate your satisfaction level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=Dissatisfied and 7=Satisfied.

- 1 (Dissatisfied)
- 2
- 3
- 4

- 5
- 6
- 7 (Satisfied)

In this section, I am interested in finding out your opinions of these websites based on the characteristics and attributes that comprise the personality and/or image they give off. This is entirely based on your opinion, and no opinion is wrong. I am aware that you may or may not be familiar with the following websites however please answer to the best of your knowledge and ability for each item.

Bebo

Directions: Think about Bebo as if it were a person with a distinct personality. What kind of person would it be? For each of the items below, please indicate how you would describe Bebo 's personality by selecting the adjective from each pair that best describes Bebo.

- | | | |
|--------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Bebo is: | ○ Assertive | ○ Mild |
| 2. Bebo is: | ○ Systematic | ○ Imaginative |
| 3. Bebo is: | ○ Logical | ○ Emotional |
| 4. Bebo is: | ○ Clear-cut, definite | ○ Undecided, variable |
| 5. Bebo is: | ○ Idealistic, visionary | ○ Realistic, down-to-earth |
| 6. Bebo is: | ○ Soft-hearted | ○ Firm |
| 7. Bebo is: | ○ Adaptable | ○ Deliberate |
| 8. Bebo is: | ○ Reserved | ○ Active |
| 9. Bebo is: | ○ Cold | ○ Warm |
| 10. Bebo is: | ○ Dependable | ○ Changeable |
| 11. Bebo is: | ○ Moderate | ○ Dynamic |
| 12. Bebo is: | ○ Creative, theoretical | ○ Practical, functional |
| 13. Bebo is: | ○ Innovative | ○ Steadfast |
| 14. Bebo is: | ○ Sociable | ○ Shy |
| 15. Bebo is: | ○ Sensible, factual | ○ Instinctual |
| 16. Bebo is: | ○ Sympathetic | ○ Indifferent |
| 17. Bebo is: | ○ Quiet | ○ Outspoken |
| 18. Bebo is: | ○ Wide-interests | ○ Precise |
| 19. Bebo is: | ○ Rational, reasonable | ○ Passionate, perceptive |
| 20. Bebo is: | ○ Indistinct | ○ Well-defined |
| 21. Bebo is: | ○ Energetic | ○ Calm |
| 22. Bebo is: | ○ Conservative | ○ Unconventional |
| 23. Bebo is: | ○ Excitable | ○ Stoic |
| 24. Bebo is: | ○ Decided | ○ Flexible |

Facebook

Now think about Facebook as if it were a person with a distinct personality. What kind of person would it be? For each of the items below, please indicate how you would describe Facebook's personality by selecting the adjective from each pair that best describes Facebook.

- | | | |
|------------------|---|--|
| 1. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Assertive | <input type="radio"/> Mild |
| 2. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Systematic | <input type="radio"/> Imaginative |
| 3. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Logical | <input type="radio"/> Emotional |
| 4. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Clear-cut, definite | <input type="radio"/> Undecided, variable |
| 5. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Idealistic, visionary | <input type="radio"/> Realistic, down-to-earth |
| 6. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Soft-hearted | <input type="radio"/> Firm |
| 7. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Adaptable | <input type="radio"/> Deliberate |
| 8. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Reserved | <input type="radio"/> Active |
| 9. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Cold | <input type="radio"/> Warm |
| 10. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Dependable | <input type="radio"/> Changeable |
| 11. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Moderate | <input type="radio"/> Dynamic |
| 12. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Creative, theoretical | <input type="radio"/> Practical, functional |
| 13. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Innovative | <input type="radio"/> Steadfast |
| 14. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Sociable | <input type="radio"/> Shy |
| 15. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Sensible, factual | <input type="radio"/> Instinctual |
| 16. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Sympathetic | <input type="radio"/> Indifferent |
| 17. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Quiet | <input type="radio"/> Outspoken |
| 18. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Wide-interests | <input type="radio"/> Precise |
| 19. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Rational, reasonable | <input type="radio"/> Passionate, perceptive |
| 20. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Indistinct | <input type="radio"/> Well-defined |
| 21. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Energetic | <input type="radio"/> Calm |
| 22. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Conservative | <input type="radio"/> Unconventional |
| 23. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Excitable | <input type="radio"/> Stoic |
| 24. Facebook is: | <input type="radio"/> Decided | <input type="radio"/> Flexible |

LiveJournal

Now think about LiveJournal as if it were a person with a distinct personality. What kind of person would it be? For each of the items below, please indicate how you would describe LiveJournal's personality by selecting the adjective from each pair that best describes LiveJournal.

- | | | |
|--------------------|---|--|
| 1. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Assertive | <input type="radio"/> Mild |
| 2. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Systematic | <input type="radio"/> Imaginative |
| 3. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Logical | <input type="radio"/> Emotional |
| 4. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Clear-cut, definite | <input type="radio"/> Undecided, variable |
| 5. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Idealistic, visionary | <input type="radio"/> Realistic, down-to-earth |
| 6. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Soft-hearted | <input type="radio"/> Firm |
| 7. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Adaptable | <input type="radio"/> Deliberate |
| 8. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Reserved | <input type="radio"/> Active |
| 9. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Cold | <input type="radio"/> Warm |

- | | | |
|---------------------|---|--|
| 10. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Dependable | <input type="radio"/> Changeable |
| 11. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Moderate | <input type="radio"/> Dynamic |
| 12. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Creative, theoretical | <input type="radio"/> Practical, functional |
| 13. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Innovative | <input type="radio"/> Steadfast |
| 14. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Sociable | <input type="radio"/> Shy |
| 15. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Sensible, factual | <input type="radio"/> Instinctual |
| 16. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Sympathetic | <input type="radio"/> Indifferent |
| 17. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Quiet | <input type="radio"/> Outspoken |
| 18. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Wide-interests | <input type="radio"/> Precise |
| 19. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Rational, reasonable | <input type="radio"/> Passionate, perceptive |
| 20. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Indistinct | <input type="radio"/> Well-defined |
| 21. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Energetic | <input type="radio"/> Calm |
| 22. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Conservative | <input type="radio"/> Unconventional |
| 23. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Excitable | <input type="radio"/> Stoic |
| 24. LiveJournal is: | <input type="radio"/> Decided | <input type="radio"/> Flexible |
-

The following questions serve to provide a basic overview of all survey participants in this study. This information will not in any way be connected to your personal responses to this questionnaire, but rather serve as part of an overall description of all respondents. Please select the answer that best applies to you. Should the “other” category best apply to you on any particular question, please select “other” and write in your response.

1. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

2. What is your age?

3. What is your academic classification?

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- Other

If selecting “other” please specify: _____

4. What is your race/ethnicity?

- Arabic
- Asian
- Black/African-American
- Hispanic/Latino
- Native American
- Pacific Islander
- White/Caucasian

- Other

If selecting “other” please specify: _____

5. What social class best exemplifies you?

- Upper class
- Upper middle class
- Middle class
- Lower middle class
- Lower class
- Unsure

6. What kind of computer do you use?

- Mac/Apple
- PC

7. What is your current major?

In order to receive extra credit for participating in this survey, you will need to state your name and UFID number. Your name/UFID will not be associated with, or connected to, your responses in this survey.

It will only be placed on a list of students who have completed the survey and will thus receive extra credit.

Please state your name below as it appears on UF records. Do not use nicknames.

Last name:

First name:

Middle initial:

UF ID number:

Please create a 4-digit code for yourself that you can easily remember. Should it occur that you do not receive your extra credit points, you will report this number to your professor as proof of your completion.

Code: ____

Thank you so much for taking the time to participate in this study. Your opinions will greatly help in my research efforts. Should you have any questions regarding today’s study, feel free to contact me at Aprshaps@ufl.edu. Have a great day!

Survey Version 2a: MCS

I am interested in finding out your personal level of familiarity with the websites presented below.

MySpace

1. Think about MySpace. How familiar are you with this website? Please rate your familiarity level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=unfamiliar and 7=familiar.

Regarding the website MySpace, you feel:

- 1 (Unfamiliar)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 (Familiar)

2. Have you ever used MySpace before?

- Yes
 - No
 - Unsure
-

1. Select the amount of time, on average, that you spend using MySpace:

- Less than once a month
- Once a month
- Less than 1 hour per week
- 1-2 hours per week
- 3-4 hours per week
- 5-6 hours per week
- 7-8 hours per week
- 9-10 hours per week
- More than 10 hours per week

2. Do you currently have a registered MySpace account?

- Yes
- No

3. How satisfied are you with your experience with MySpace? Please rate your satisfaction level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=Dissatisfied and 7=Satisfied.

- 1 (Dissatisfied)
- 2
- 3
- 4

- 5
 - 6
 - 7 (Satisfied)
-

Classmates.com

1. Think about Classmates.com. How familiar are you with this website? Please rate your familiarity level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=unfamiliar and 7=familiar.

Regarding the website Classmates.com, you feel:

- 1 (Unfamiliar)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 (Familiar)

2. Have you ever used Classmates.com before?

- Yes
 - No
 - Unsure
-

1. Select the amount of time, on average, that you spend using Classmates.com:

- Less than once a month
- Once a month
- Less than 1 hour per week
- 1-2 hours per week
- 3-4 hours per week
- 5-6 hours per week
- 7-8 hours per week
- 9-10 hours per week
- More than 10 hours per week

2. Do you currently have a registered Classmates.com account?

- Yes
- No

3. How satisfied are you with your experience with Classmates.com? Please rate your satisfaction level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=Dissatisfied and 7=Satisfied.

- 1 (Dissatisfied)
- 2
- 3
- 4

- 5
 - 6
 - 7 (Satisfied)
-

Sportsvite

1. Think about Sportsvite. How familiar are you with this website? Please rate your familiarity level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=unfamiliar and 7=familiar.

Regarding the website Sportsvite, you feel:

- 1 (Unfamiliar)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 (Familiar)

2. Have you ever used Sportsvite before?

- Yes
 - No
 - Unsure
-

1. Select the amount of time, on average, that you spend using Sportsvite:

- Less than once a month
- Once a month
- Less than 1 hour per week
- 1-2 hours per week
- 3-4 hours per week
- 5-6 hours per week
- 7-8 hours per week
- 9-10 hours per week
- More than 10 hours per week

2. Do you currently have a registered Sportsvite account?

- Yes
- No

3. How satisfied are you with your experience with Sportsvite? Please rate your satisfaction level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=Dissatisfied and 7=Satisfied.

- 1 (Dissatisfied)
- 2
- 3
- 4

- 5
 - 6
 - 7 (Satisfied)
-

In this section, I am interested in finding out your opinions of these websites based on the characteristics and attributes that comprise the personality and/or image they give off. This is entirely based on your opinion, and no opinion is wrong. I am aware that you may or may not be familiar with the following websites however please answer to the best of your knowledge and ability for each item.

MySpace

Directions: Think about MySpace as if it were a person with a distinct personality. What kind of person would it be? For each of the items below, please indicate how you would describe MySpace's personality by selecting the adjective from each pair that best describes MySpace.

- | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. MySpace is: | ○ Assertive | ○ Mild |
| 2. MySpace is: | ○ Systematic | ○ Imaginative |
| 3. MySpace is: | ○ Logical | ○ Emotional |
| 4. MySpace is: | ○ Clear-cut, definite | ○ Undecided, variable |
| 5. MySpace is: | ○ Idealistic, visionary | ○ Realistic, down-to-earth |
| 6. MySpace is: | ○ Soft-hearted | ○ Firm |
| 7. MySpace is: | ○ Adaptable | ○ Deliberate |
| 8. MySpace is: | ○ Reserved | ○ Active |
| 9. MySpace is: | ○ Cold | ○ Warm |
| 10. MySpace is: | ○ Dependable | ○ Changeable |
| 11. MySpace is: | ○ Moderate | ○ Dynamic |
| 12. MySpace is: | ○ Creative, theoretical | ○ Practical, functional |
| 13. MySpace is: | ○ Innovative | ○ Steadfast |
| 14. MySpace is: | ○ Sociable | ○ Shy |
| 15. MySpace is: | ○ Sensible, factual | ○ Instinctual |
| 16. MySpace is: | ○ Sympathetic | ○ Indifferent |
| 17. MySpace is: | ○ Quiet | ○ Outspoken |
| 18. MySpace is: | ○ Wide-interests | ○ Precise |
| 19. MySpace is: | ○ Rational, reasonable | ○ Passionate, perceptive |
| 20. MySpace is: | ○ Indistinct | ○ Well-defined |
| 21. MySpace is: | ○ Energetic | ○ Calm |
| 22. MySpace is: | ○ Conservative | ○ Unconventional |
| 23. MySpace is: | ○ Excitable | ○ Stoic |
| 24. MySpace is: | ○ Decided | ○ Flexible |
-

Now think about Classmates.com as if it were a person with a distinct personality. What kind of person would it be? For each of the items below, please indicate how you would describe Classmates.com's personality by selecting the adjective from each pair that best describes Classmates.com.

- | | | |
|------------------------|---|--|
| 1. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Assertive | <input type="radio"/> Mild |
| 2. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Systematic | <input type="radio"/> Imaginative |
| 3. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Logical | <input type="radio"/> Emotional |
| 4. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Clear-cut, definite | <input type="radio"/> Undecided, variable |
| 5. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Idealistic, visionary | <input type="radio"/> Realistic, down-to-earth |
| 6. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Soft-hearted | <input type="radio"/> Firm |
| 7. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Adaptable | <input type="radio"/> Deliberate |
| 8. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Reserved | <input type="radio"/> Active |
| 9. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Cold | <input type="radio"/> Warm |
| 10. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Dependable | <input type="radio"/> Changeable |
| 11. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Moderate | <input type="radio"/> Dynamic |
| 12. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Creative, theoretical | <input type="radio"/> Practical, functional |
| 13. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Innovative | <input type="radio"/> Steadfast |
| 14. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Sociable | <input type="radio"/> Shy |
| 15. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Sensible, factual | <input type="radio"/> Instinctual |
| 16. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Sympathetic | <input type="radio"/> Indifferent |
| 17. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Quiet | <input type="radio"/> Outspoken |
| 18. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Wide-interests | <input type="radio"/> Precise |
| 19. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Rational, reasonable | <input type="radio"/> Passionate, perceptive |
| 20. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Indistinct | <input type="radio"/> Well-defined |
| 21. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Energetic | <input type="radio"/> Calm |
| 22. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Conservative | <input type="radio"/> Unconventional |
| 23. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Excitable | <input type="radio"/> Stoic |
| 24. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Decided | <input type="radio"/> Flexible |

Sportsvite

Now think about Sportsvite as if it were a person with a distinct personality. What kind of person would it be? For each of the items below, please indicate how you would describe Sportsvite's personality by selecting the adjective from each pair that best describes Sportsvite.

- | | | |
|-------------------|---|--|
| 1. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Assertive | <input type="radio"/> Mild |
| 2. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Systematic | <input type="radio"/> Imaginative |
| 3. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Logical | <input type="radio"/> Emotional |
| 4. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Clear-cut, definite | <input type="radio"/> Undecided, variable |
| 5. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Idealistic, visionary | <input type="radio"/> Realistic, down-to-earth |
| 6. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Soft-hearted | <input type="radio"/> Firm |
| 7. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Adaptable | <input type="radio"/> Deliberate |
| 8. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Reserved | <input type="radio"/> Active |
| 9. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Cold | <input type="radio"/> Warm |

- | | | |
|--------------------|---|--|
| 10. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Dependable | <input type="radio"/> Changeable |
| 11. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Moderate | <input type="radio"/> Dynamic |
| 12. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Creative, theoretical | <input type="radio"/> Practical, functional |
| 13. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Innovative | <input type="radio"/> Steadfast |
| 14. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Sociable | <input type="radio"/> Shy |
| 15. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Sensible, factual | <input type="radio"/> Instinctual |
| 16. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Sympathetic | <input type="radio"/> Indifferent |
| 17. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Quiet | <input type="radio"/> Outspoken |
| 18. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Wide-interests | <input type="radio"/> Precise |
| 19. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Rational, reasonable | <input type="radio"/> Passionate, perceptive |
| 20. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Indistinct | <input type="radio"/> Well-defined |
| 21. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Energetic | <input type="radio"/> Calm |
| 22. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Conservative | <input type="radio"/> Unconventional |
| 23. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Excitable | <input type="radio"/> Stoic |
| 24. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Decided | <input type="radio"/> Flexible |
-

The following questions serve to provide a basic overview of all survey participants in this study. This information will not in any way be connected to your personal responses to this questionnaire, but rather serve as part of an overall description of all respondents. Please select the answer that best applies to you. Should the “other” category best apply to you on any particular question, please select “other” and write in your response.

1. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

2. What is your age?

3. What is your academic classification?

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- Other

If selecting “other” please specify: _____

4. What is your race/ethnicity?

- Arabic
- Asian
- Black/African-American
- Hispanic/Latino
- Native American
- Pacific Islander
- White/Caucasian

- Other

If selecting “other” please specify: _____

5. What social class best exemplifies you?

- Upper class
- Upper middle class
- Middle class
- Lower middle class
- Lower class
- Unsure

6. What kind of computer do you use?

- Mac/Apple
- PC

7. What is your current major?

In order to receive extra credit for participating in this survey, you will need to state your name and UFID number. Your name/UFID will not be associated with, or connected to, your responses in this survey.

It will only be placed on a list of students who have completed the survey and will thus receive extra credit.

Please state your name below as it appears on UF records. Do not use nicknames.

Last name:

First name:

Middle initial:

UF ID number:

Please create a 4-digit code for yourself that you can easily remember. Should it occur that you do not receive your extra credit points, you will report this number to your professor as proof of your completion.

Code: ____

Thank you so much for taking the time to participate in this study. Your opinions will greatly help in my research efforts. Should you have any questions regarding today’s study, feel free to contact me at Aprshaps@ufl.edu. Have a great day!

Survey Version 2b: CSM

I am interested in finding out your personal level of familiarity with the websites presented below.

Classmates.com

1. Think about Classmates.com. How familiar are you with this website? Please rate your familiarity level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=unfamiliar and 7=familiar.

Regarding the website Classmates.com, you feel:

- 1 (Unfamiliar)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 (Familiar)

2. Have you ever used Classmates.com before?

- Yes
 - No
 - Unsure
-

1. Select the amount of time, on average, that you spend using Classmates.com:

- Less than once a month
- Once a month
- Less than 1 hour per week
- 1-2 hours per week
- 3-4 hours per week
- 5-6 hours per week
- 7-8 hours per week
- 9-10 hours per week
- More than 10 hours per week

2. Do you currently have a registered Classmates.com account?

- Yes
- No

3. How satisfied are you with your experience with Classmates.com? Please rate your satisfaction level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=Dissatisfied and 7=Satisfied.

- 1 (Dissatisfied)
- 2
- 3
- 4

- 5
 - 6
 - 7 (Satisfied)
-

Sportsvite

1. Think about Sportsvite. How familiar are you with this website? Please rate your familiarity level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=unfamiliar and 7=familiar.

Regarding the website Sportsvite, you feel:

- 1 (Unfamiliar)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 (Familiar)

2. Have you ever used Sportsvite before?

- Yes
 - No
 - Unsure
-

1. Select the amount of time, on average, that you spend using Sportsvite:

- Less than once a month
- Once a month
- Less than 1 hour per week
- 1-2 hours per week
- 3-4 hours per week
- 5-6 hours per week
- 7-8 hours per week
- 9-10 hours per week
- More than 10 hours per week

2. Do you currently have a registered Sportsvite account?

- Yes
- No

3. How satisfied are you with your experience with Sportsvite? Please rate your satisfaction level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=Dissatisfied and 7=Satisfied.

- 1 (Dissatisfied)
- 2
- 3
- 4

- 5
 - 6
 - 7 (Satisfied)
-

MySpace

1. Think about MySpace. How familiar are you with this website? Please rate your familiarity level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=unfamiliar and 7=familiar.

Regarding the website MySpace, you feel:

- 1 (Unfamiliar)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 (Familiar)

2. Have you ever used MySpace before?

- Yes
 - No
 - Unsure
-

1. Select the amount of time, on average, that you spend using MySpace:

- Less than once a month
- Once a month
- Less than 1 hour per week
- 1-2 hours per week
- 3-4 hours per week
- 5-6 hours per week
- 7-8 hours per week
- 9-10 hours per week
- More than 10 hours per week

2. Do you currently have a registered MySpace account?

- Yes
- No

3. How satisfied are you with your experience with MySpace? Please rate your satisfaction level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=Dissatisfied and 7=Satisfied.

- 1 (Dissatisfied)
- 2
- 3
- 4

- 5
- 6
- 7 (Satisfied)

In this section, I am interested in finding out your opinions of these websites based on the characteristics and attributes that comprise the personality and/or image they give off. This is entirely based on your opinion, and no opinion is wrong. I am aware that you may or may not be familiar with the following websites however please answer to the best of your knowledge and ability for each item.

Classmates.com

Directions: Think about Classmates.com as if it were a person with a distinct personality. What kind of person would it be? For each of the items below, please indicate how you would describe Classmates.com's personality by selecting the adjective from each pair that best describes Classmates.com.

- | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Classmates.com is: | ○ Assertive | ○ Mild |
| 2. Classmates.com is: | ○ Systematic | ○ Imaginative |
| 3. Classmates.com is: | ○ Logical | ○ Emotional |
| 4. Classmates.com is: | ○ Clear-cut, definite | ○ Undecided, variable |
| 5. Classmates.com is: | ○ Idealistic, visionary | ○ Realistic, down-to-earth |
| 6. Classmates.com is: | ○ Soft-hearted | ○ Firm |
| 7. Classmates.com is: | ○ Adaptable | ○ Deliberate |
| 8. Classmates.com is: | ○ Reserved | ○ Active |
| 9. Classmates.com is: | ○ Cold | ○ Warm |
| 10. Classmates.com is: | ○ Dependable | ○ Changeable |
| 11. Classmates.com is: | ○ Moderate | ○ Dynamic |
| 12. Classmates.com is: | ○ Creative, theoretical | ○ Practical, functional |
| 13. Classmates.com is: | ○ Innovative | ○ Steadfast |
| 14. Classmates.com is: | ○ Sociable | ○ Shy |
| 15. Classmates.com is: | ○ Sensible, factual | ○ Instinctual |
| 16. Classmates.com is: | ○ Sympathetic | ○ Indifferent |
| 17. Classmates.com is: | ○ Quiet | ○ Outspoken |
| 18. Classmates.com is: | ○ Wide-interests | ○ Precise |
| 19. Classmates.com is: | ○ Rational, reasonable | ○ Passionate, perceptive |
| 20. Classmates.com is: | ○ Indistinct | ○ Well-defined |
| 21. Classmates.com is: | ○ Energetic | ○ Calm |
| 22. Classmates.com is: | ○ Conservative | ○ Unconventional |
| 23. Classmates.com is: | ○ Excitable | ○ Stoic |
| 24. Classmates.com is: | ○ Decided | ○ Flexible |

Sportsvite

Now think about Sportsvite as if it were a person with a distinct personality. What kind of person would it be? For each of the items below, please indicate how you would describe Sportsvite's personality by selecting the adjective from each pair that best describes Sportsvite.

- | | | |
|--------------------|---|--|
| 1. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Assertive | <input type="radio"/> Mild |
| 2. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Systematic | <input type="radio"/> Imaginative |
| 3. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Logical | <input type="radio"/> Emotional |
| 4. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Clear-cut, definite | <input type="radio"/> Undecided, variable |
| 5. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Idealistic, visionary | <input type="radio"/> Realistic, down-to-earth |
| 6. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Soft-hearted | <input type="radio"/> Firm |
| 7. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Adaptable | <input type="radio"/> Deliberate |
| 8. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Reserved | <input type="radio"/> Active |
| 9. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Cold | <input type="radio"/> Warm |
| 10. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Dependable | <input type="radio"/> Changeable |
| 11. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Moderate | <input type="radio"/> Dynamic |
| 12. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Creative, theoretical | <input type="radio"/> Practical, functional |
| 13. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Innovative | <input type="radio"/> Steadfast |
| 14. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Sociable | <input type="radio"/> Shy |
| 15. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Sensible, factual | <input type="radio"/> Instinctual |
| 16. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Sympathetic | <input type="radio"/> Indifferent |
| 17. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Quiet | <input type="radio"/> Outspoken |
| 18. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Wide-interests | <input type="radio"/> Precise |
| 19. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Rational, reasonable | <input type="radio"/> Passionate, perceptive |
| 20. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Indistinct | <input type="radio"/> Well-defined |
| 21. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Energetic | <input type="radio"/> Calm |
| 22. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Conservative | <input type="radio"/> Unconventional |
| 23. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Excitable | <input type="radio"/> Stoic |
| 24. Sportsvite is: | <input type="radio"/> Decided | <input type="radio"/> Flexible |

MySpace

Now think about MySpace as if it were a person with a distinct personality. What kind of person would it be? For each of the items below, please indicate how you would describe MySpace's personality by selecting the adjective from each pair that best describes MySpace.

- | | | |
|-----------------|---|--|
| 1. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Assertive | <input type="radio"/> Mild |
| 2. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Systematic | <input type="radio"/> Imaginative |
| 3. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Logical | <input type="radio"/> Emotional |
| 4. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Clear-cut, definite | <input type="radio"/> Undecided, variable |
| 5. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Idealistic, visionary | <input type="radio"/> Realistic, down-to-earth |
| 6. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Soft-hearted | <input type="radio"/> Firm |
| 7. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Adaptable | <input type="radio"/> Deliberate |
| 8. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Reserved | <input type="radio"/> Active |
| 9. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Cold | <input type="radio"/> Warm |
| 10. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Dependable | <input type="radio"/> Changeable |

- | | | |
|-----------------|---|--|
| 11. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Moderate | <input type="radio"/> Dynamic |
| 12. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Creative, theoretical | <input type="radio"/> Practical, functional |
| 13. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Innovative | <input type="radio"/> Steadfast |
| 14. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Sociable | <input type="radio"/> Shy |
| 15. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Sensible, factual | <input type="radio"/> Instinctual |
| 16. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Sympathetic | <input type="radio"/> Indifferent |
| 17. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Quiet | <input type="radio"/> Outspoken |
| 18. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Wide-interests | <input type="radio"/> Precise |
| 19. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Rational, reasonable | <input type="radio"/> Passionate, perceptive |
| 20. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Indistinct | <input type="radio"/> Well-defined |
| 21. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Energetic | <input type="radio"/> Calm |
| 22. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Conservative | <input type="radio"/> Unconventional |
| 23. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Excitable | <input type="radio"/> Stoic |
| 24. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Decided | <input type="radio"/> Flexible |

The following questions serve to provide a basic overview of all survey participants in this study. This information will not in any way be connected to your personal responses to this questionnaire, but rather serve as part of an overall description of all respondents. Please select the answer that best applies to you. Should the “other” category best apply to you on any particular question, please select “other” and write in your response.

1. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

2. What is your age?

3. What is your academic classification?

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- Other

If selecting “other” please specify: _____

4. What is your race/ethnicity?

- Arabic
- Asian
- Black/African-American
- Hispanic/Latino
- Native American
- Pacific Islander
- White/Caucasian
- Other

If selecting “other” please specify: _____

5. What social class best exemplifies you?

- Upper class
- Upper middle class
- Middle class
- Lower middle class
- Lower class
- Unsure

6. What kind of computer do you use?

- Mac/Apple
- PC

7. What is your current major?

In order to receive extra credit for participating in this survey, you will need to state your name and UFID number. Your name/UFID will not be associated with, or connected to, your responses in this survey.

It will only be placed on a list of students who have completed the survey and will thus receive extra credit.

Please state your name below as it appears on UF records. Do not use nicknames.

Last name:

First name:

Middle initial:

UF ID number:

Please create a 4-digit code for yourself that you can easily remember. Should it occur that you do not receive your extra credit points, you will report this number to your professor as proof of your completion.

Code: _ _ _ _

Thank you so much for taking the time to participate in this study. Your opinions will greatly help in my research efforts. Should you have any questions regarding today’s study, feel free to contact me at Aprshaps@ufl.edu. Have a great day!

Survey Version 2c: SMC

I am interested in finding out your personal level of familiarity with the websites presented below.

Sportsvite

1. Think about Sportsvite. How familiar are you with this website? Please rate your familiarity level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=unfamiliar and 7=familiar.

Regarding the website Sportsvite, you feel:

- 1 (Unfamiliar)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 (Familiar)

2. Have you ever used Sportsvite before?

- Yes
 - No
 - Unsure
-

1. Select the amount of time, on average, that you spend using Sportsvite:

- Less than once a month
- Once a month
- Less than 1 hour per week
- 1-2 hours per week
- 3-4 hours per week
- 5-6 hours per week
- 7-8 hours per week
- 9-10 hours per week
- More than 10 hours per week

2. Do you currently have a registered Sportsvite account?

- Yes
- No

3. How satisfied are you with your experience with Sportsvite? Please rate your satisfaction level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=Dissatisfied and 7=Satisfied.

- 1 (Dissatisfied)
- 2
- 3
- 4

- 5
 - 6
 - 7 (Satisfied)
-

MySpace

1. Think about MySpace. How familiar are you with this website? Please rate your familiarity level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=unfamiliar and 7=familiar.

Regarding the website MySpace, you feel:

- 1 (Unfamiliar)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 (Familiar)

2. Have you ever used MySpace before?

- Yes
 - No
 - Unsure
-

1. Select the amount of time, on average, that you spend using MySpace:

- Less than once a month
- Once a month
- Less than 1 hour per week
- 1-2 hours per week
- 3-4 hours per week
- 5-6 hours per week
- 7-8 hours per week
- 9-10 hours per week
- More than 10 hours per week

2. Do you currently have a registered MySpace account?

- Yes
- No

3. How satisfied are you with your experience with MySpace? Please rate your satisfaction level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=Dissatisfied and 7=Satisfied.

- 1 (Dissatisfied)
- 2
- 3
- 4

- 5
 - 6
 - 7 (Satisfied)
-

Classmates.com

1. Think about Classmates.com. How familiar are you with this website? Please rate your familiarity level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=unfamiliar and 7=familiar.

Regarding the website Classmates.com, you feel:

- 1 (Unfamiliar)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 (Familiar)

2. Have you ever used Classmates.com before?

- Yes
 - No
 - Unsure
-

1. Select the amount of time, on average, that you spend using Classmates.com:

- Less than once a month
- Once a month
- Less than 1 hour per week
- 1-2 hours per week
- 3-4 hours per week
- 5-6 hours per week
- 7-8 hours per week
- 9-10 hours per week
- More than 10 hours per week

2. Do you currently have a registered Classmates.com account?

- Yes
- No

3. How satisfied are you with your experience with Classmates.com? Please rate your satisfaction level by selecting a number 1 through 7 where 1=Dissatisfied and 7=Satisfied.

- 1 (Dissatisfied)
- 2
- 3
- 4

- 5
- 6
- 7 (Satisfied)

In this section, I am interested in finding out your opinions of these websites based on the characteristics and attributes that comprise the personality and/or image they give off. This is entirely based on your opinion, and no opinion is wrong. I am aware that you may or may not be familiar with the following websites however please answer to the best of your knowledge and ability for each item.

Sportsvite

Directions: Think about Sportsvite as if it were a person with a distinct personality. What kind of person would it be? For each of the items below, please indicate how you would describe Sportsvite's personality by selecting the adjective from each pair that best describes Sportsvite.

- | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Sportsvite is: | ○ Assertive | ○ Mild |
| 2. Sportsvite is: | ○ Systematic | ○ Imaginative |
| 3. Sportsvite is: | ○ Logical | ○ Emotional |
| 4. Sportsvite is: | ○ Clear-cut, definite | ○ Undecided, variable |
| 5. Sportsvite is: | ○ Idealistic, visionary | ○ Realistic, down-to-earth |
| 6. Sportsvite is: | ○ Soft-hearted | ○ Firm |
| 7. Sportsvite is: | ○ Adaptable | ○ Deliberate |
| 8. Sportsvite is: | ○ Reserved | ○ Active |
| 9. Sportsvite is: | ○ Cold | ○ Warm |
| 10. Sportsvite is: | ○ Dependable | ○ Changeable |
| 11. Sportsvite is: | ○ Moderate | ○ Dynamic |
| 12. Sportsvite is: | ○ Creative, theoretical | ○ Practical, functional |
| 13. Sportsvite is: | ○ Innovative | ○ Steadfast |
| 14. Sportsvite is: | ○ Sociable | ○ Shy |
| 15. Sportsvite is: | ○ Sensible, factual | ○ Instinctual |
| 16. Sportsvite is: | ○ Sympathetic | ○ Indifferent |
| 17. Sportsvite is: | ○ Quiet | ○ Outspoken |
| 18. Sportsvite is: | ○ Wide-interests | ○ Precise |
| 19. Sportsvite is: | ○ Rational, reasonable | ○ Passionate, perceptive |
| 20. Sportsvite is: | ○ Indistinct | ○ Well-defined |
| 21. Sportsvite is: | ○ Energetic | ○ Calm |
| 22. Sportsvite is: | ○ Conservative | ○ Unconventional |
| 23. Sportsvite is: | ○ Excitable | ○ Stoic |
| 24. Sportsvite is: | ○ Decided | ○ Flexible |

MySpace

Now think about MySpace as if it were a person with a distinct personality. What kind of person would it be? For each of the items below, please indicate how you would describe MySpace's personality by selecting the adjective from each pair that best describes MySpace.

- | | | |
|-----------------|---|--|
| 1. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Assertive | <input type="radio"/> Mild |
| 2. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Systematic | <input type="radio"/> Imaginative |
| 3. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Logical | <input type="radio"/> Emotional |
| 4. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Clear-cut, definite | <input type="radio"/> Undecided, variable |
| 5. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Idealistic, visionary | <input type="radio"/> Realistic, down-to-earth |
| 6. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Soft-hearted | <input type="radio"/> Firm |
| 7. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Adaptable | <input type="radio"/> Deliberate |
| 8. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Reserved | <input type="radio"/> Active |
| 9. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Cold | <input type="radio"/> Warm |
| 10. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Dependable | <input type="radio"/> Changeable |
| 11. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Moderate | <input type="radio"/> Dynamic |
| 12. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Creative, theoretical | <input type="radio"/> Practical, functional |
| 13. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Innovative | <input type="radio"/> Steadfast |
| 14. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Sociable | <input type="radio"/> Shy |
| 15. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Sensible, factual | <input type="radio"/> Instinctual |
| 16. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Sympathetic | <input type="radio"/> Indifferent |
| 17. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Quiet | <input type="radio"/> Outspoken |
| 18. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Wide-interests | <input type="radio"/> Precise |
| 19. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Rational, reasonable | <input type="radio"/> Passionate, perceptive |
| 20. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Indistinct | <input type="radio"/> Well-defined |
| 21. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Energetic | <input type="radio"/> Calm |
| 22. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Conservative | <input type="radio"/> Unconventional |
| 23. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Excitable | <input type="radio"/> Stoic |
| 24. MySpace is: | <input type="radio"/> Decided | <input type="radio"/> Flexible |

Classmates.com

Now think about Classmates.com as if it were a person with a distinct personality. What kind of person would it be? For each of the items below, please indicate how you would describe Classmates.com's personality by selecting the adjective from each pair that best describes Classmates.com.

- | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| 1. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Assertive | <input type="radio"/> Mild |
| 2. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Systematic | <input type="radio"/> Imaginative |
| 3. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Logical | <input type="radio"/> Emotional |
| 4. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Clear-cut, definite | <input type="radio"/> Undecided, variable |
| 5. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Idealistic, visionary | <input type="radio"/> Realistic, down-to-earth |
| 6. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Soft-hearted | <input type="radio"/> Firm |
| 7. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Adaptable | <input type="radio"/> Deliberate |
| 8. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Reserved | <input type="radio"/> Active |
| 9. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Cold | <input type="radio"/> Warm |

- | | | |
|------------------------|---|--|
| 10. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Dependable | <input type="radio"/> Changeable |
| 11. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Moderate | <input type="radio"/> Dynamic |
| 12. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Creative, theoretical | <input type="radio"/> Practical, functional |
| 13. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Innovative | <input type="radio"/> Steadfast |
| 14. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Sociable | <input type="radio"/> Shy |
| 15. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Sensible, factual | <input type="radio"/> Instinctual |
| 16. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Sympathetic | <input type="radio"/> Indifferent |
| 17. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Quiet | <input type="radio"/> Outspoken |
| 18. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Wide-interests | <input type="radio"/> Precise |
| 19. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Rational, reasonable | <input type="radio"/> Passionate, perceptive |
| 20. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Indistinct | <input type="radio"/> Well-defined |
| 21. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Energetic | <input type="radio"/> Calm |
| 22. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Conservative | <input type="radio"/> Unconventional |
| 23. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Excitable | <input type="radio"/> Stoic |
| 24. Classmates.com is: | <input type="radio"/> Decided | <input type="radio"/> Flexible |
-

The following questions serve to provide a basic overview of all survey participants in this study. This information will not in any way be connected to your personal responses to this questionnaire, but rather serve as part of an overall description of all respondents. Please select the answer that best applies to you. Should the “other” category best apply to you on any particular question, please select “other” and write in your response.

1. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

2. What is your age?

3. What is your academic classification?

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- Other

If selecting “other” please specify: _____

4. What is your race/ethnicity?

- Arabic
- Asian
- Black/African-American
- Hispanic/Latino
- Native American
- Pacific Islander
- White/Caucasian

- Other

If selecting “other” please specify: _____

5. What social class best exemplifies you?

- Upper class
- Upper middle class
- Middle class
- Lower middle class
- Lower class
- Unsure

6. What kind of computer do you use?

- Mac/Apple
- PC

7. What is your current major?

In order to receive extra credit for participating in this survey, you will need to state your name and UFID number. Your name/UFID will not be associated with, or connected to, your responses in this survey.

It will only be placed on a list of students who have completed the survey and will thus receive extra credit.

Please state your name below as it appears on UF records. Do not use nicknames.

Last name:

First name:

Middle initial:

UF ID number:

Please create a 4-digit code for yourself that you can easily remember. Should it occur that you do not receive your extra credit points, you will report this number to your professor as proof of your completion.

Code: ____

Thank you so much for taking the time to participate in this study. Your opinions will greatly help in my research efforts. Should you have any questions regarding today’s study, feel free to contact me at Aprshaps@ufl.edu. Have a great day!

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Aaker, Jennifer L (1997), "Dimensions of Brand Personality," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34 (3), 347-356.
- Aaker, Jennifer and Susan Fournier (1995), "A Brand as a Character, A Partner and a Person: Three Perspectives on the Question of Brand Personality," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 22, 391-395.
- Babbie, Earl (2007), *The Practice of Social Research (11th ed.)*. California: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Babbie, Earl (1973), *Survey Research Methods*. California: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Belk, Russell W. (1988), "Possessions and the Extended Self," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15 (2), 139-168.
- Bruner, Gordon C., Karen E. James, and Paul J. Hensel (2001), *Marketing Scales Handbook: A Compilation of Multi-Item Measures (Volume III)*. Illinois: American Marketing Association.
- Burke, Bill (1994), "Position, Personality, Not Price, Should Frame Consumer Messages," *Brandweek*, 35 (36), 20.
- CAPT (Center for Applications of Psychological Type) (2007), "Jung's Theory of Psychological Types and the MBTI Instrument," (accessed November 12, 2007), [available at <http://www.capt.org>].
- Carrillat, Francois A., Barbara A. Lafferty and Eric G. Harris (2005), "Investigating sponsorship effectiveness: Do less familiar brands have an advantage over more familiar brands in single and multiple sponsorship arrangements?" *Journal of Brand Management*, 13 (1), 50-64.
- Clifford, Andrew (2008), "Fungibility," *Toolbox for IT Project Management Community*, (accessed November 27, 2008), [available at <http://it.toolbox.com/blogs/minimalit/fungibility-27324>].
- Dictionary.com (2008), *Fungibility*. (accessed November 27, 2008), [available at <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/fungibility&>].
- Dougherty, Thomas (1996), "Don't mix brand with position," *Brandweek*, 37 (13), 16.
- Fournier, Susan (1998), "Consumers and Their Brands: Developing Relationship Theory in Consumer Research," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 24, 343-373.
- Grubb, Edward L., and Harrison L. Grathwohl (1967), "Consumer Self-Concept, Symbolism and Market Behavior: A Theoretical Approach," *Journal of Marketing*, 31, 22-27.

- Grubb, Edward L. and Gregg Hupp (1968), "Perception of Self, Generalized Stereotypes, and Brand Selection," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 5, 58-63.
- Ha, Hong-Youl and Helen Perks (2005), "Effects of consumer perceptions of brand experience on the web: Brand familiarity, satisfaction and brand trust," *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 4 (6) 438-452.
- Heath, Adam P. and Don Scott (1998), "The Self-Concept and Image Congruence Hypothesis: An empirical evaluation in the motor vehicle market" *European Journal of Marketing*, 32 (11/12), 1110-1123.
- Hoyer, Wayne D. and Deborah J. MacInnis (2007), *Consumer Behavior (4th ed.)*. Boston/New York: Houghton Mifflin Company
- Keller, Kevin L. (1993), "Conceptualizing, Measuring, Managing Customer-Based Brand Equity," *Journal of Marketing*, 57 (1), 1-22.
- Kent, Robert J. and T. Allen Chris, (1994), "Competitive Interference Effects in Consumer Memory for Advertising: The Role of Brand Familiarity," *Journal of Marketing*, 58 (July), 97-105.
- Lowry, Richard (2008), *VassarStats Contingency Table*, (accessed November 26, 2008), [available at <http://faculty.vassar.edu/lowry/newcs.html>].
- Martin, K.A., and I.E. Alexander (2006), "A study of personality stability and change in autobiographical narratives," *Individual Differences Research*, 4 (4), 253-271.
- Ostrow, Adam (2008), "Live Video Startups Rejoice: YouTube is Sitting This One Out," *Mashable.com*, (accessed August 13, 2008), [available at <http://mashable.com/category/news/>].
- Paladin Associates (2008), *MBTI Personality Comparison*, (accessed November 28, 2008), [available at <http://www.paladinexec.com/personality.htm>].
- Parker, Brian T. (2005), "This Brand's For Me: Brand Personality and User Imagery Based Self-Congruity," *Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida*.
- Plummer, Joseph T. (2000), "How Personality Makes a Difference," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 40 (6), 79-83.
- Rooney, Jennifer (Ed.) (2007), "Measure brand equity by consumer choice," *Advertising Age*, 78 (19), 28.
- Schultz, Don E. and Heidi F. Schultz (2004), *Brand Babble: Sense and Nonsense About Branding (1st ed.)*. Ohio: South-Western Educational Publishing.

- Shamus, Ryan (2008), *RyanShamus.com*, (accessed August 13, 2008), [available at <http://ryanshamus.com/2008/01/16/free-social-networking-sites/>].
- Shank, Matthew D. and Lynn Langmeyer (1993), “Does Personality Influence Brand Image?” *Journal of Psychology*, 128 (2), 157-164.
- Sportsvite (2008), *Sportsvite Frequently Asked Questions*, (accessed November 27, 2008), [available at <http://sportsvite.com/faq>].
- Stein, Dena (2004), “Testing the Reliability and Validity of a Brand Personality Measurement Tool,” *Master’s thesis, University of Florida*.
- Strausbaugh, Kirsten L. (1998) “‘Miss Congeniality’ or ‘No More Mr. Nice Guy?’: On a Method for Assessing Brand Personality and Building Brand Personality Profiles,” *Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida*.
- Swartz, Jon (2008a), “Social-networking sites work to turn users into profits,” *USAToday.com*, (accessed August 10, 2008), [available at http://www.usatoday.com/tech/techinvestor/industry/2008-05-11-social-networking_N.htm].
- Swartz, Jon (2008b), “Social Networks vs. TV Networks,” *USAToday.com*, (accessed August 10, 2008), [available at http://www.usatoday.com/money/media/2008-05-12-social-net-side_N.htm].
- Wikipedia (2008a), “List of social networking websites,” *Wikipedia*, (accessed August 11, 2008), [available at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_social_networking_websites].
- Wikipedia (2008b), “Social network service,” *Wikipedia*, (accessed August 12, 2008), [available at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_network_service].

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

April Shapiro was born in 1985 in Ft. Lauderdale, Florida. She received a Bachelor of Science in advertising, summa cum laude, from the University of Florida in May 2007 and expects to receive the Master of Advertising degree from the University of Florida in May 2009. She plans to pursue a career in advertising with specific interests account and brand management.