Understanding the Androgynous Brand

Argiro Kliamenakis

A Thesis in the John Molson School of Business

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Science (Administration) at
Concordia University
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

December 2011

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY
School of Graduate Studies

This is to certify that the thesis prepared

By: Argiro Kliamenakis

Entitled: Understanding the Androgynous Brand

and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science (Administration)

complies with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the final examining committee:

_____ Chair
Lorne Switzer

_____ Examiner
H. Onur Bodur

_____ Examiner
Tieshan Li

_____ Supervisor
Bianca Grohmann

Approved by _____
Harjeet Bhabra
Chair of Department or Graduate Program Director

_____
Alan Hochstein
Dean of Faculty

Date December 8th, 2011

ABSTRACT

Understanding the Androgynous Brand

Argiro Kliamenakis

A considerable amount of research on gender identity congruence has explored consumer responses toward masculine and feminine products, brands and images. To a lesser extent, congruence with androgynous images has also been examined, yet only in advertising contexts. The present study therefore aims to extend past research on masculine and feminine brand personalities, by exploring androgynous individuals' responses to brands with androgynous personalities, as well as factors that moderate that relationship. Specifically, the influence of self-construal (i.e. private and collective), self-monitoring, concern for appropriateness and biological sex are examined within this relationship. Results revealed that individuals who possess an androgynous gender identity have a greater brand preference toward androgynous brands than masculine brands, but not feminine brands. Moreover, when the collective self is salient, androgynous women who have a high concern for appropriateness were revealed to have more favourable brand attitudes toward feminine brands than those brands that have masculine or androgynous personalities. Limitations and future avenues of research, as well as managerial implications are also presented.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESES 2

GENDER IDENTITY 2
GENDER AND CONSUMPTION 5
Product Gender Versus Brand Gender 6
Gender Identity Congruence 8
THE ANDROGYNOUS BRAND 12
SELF-CONCEPT MOTIVES AND SELF-CONSTRUAL SALIENCE 15
BIOLOGICAL SEX AND NORMATIVE PRESSURE 16
SELF-MONITORING AND CONCERN FOR APPROPRIATENESS 19
HYPOTHESES FORMULATION 22

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 29

PRETESTING 29
Pretest 1: Selection of Product Categories 29
Pretest 1 Results 32
Pretest 2: Selection of Brands 35
Pretest 2 Results 38
RESEARCH STUDY 42
Design and Procedure 42
Priming 43
Manipulation Check: Priming 44
Manipulation Check: Brand Gender 45
Dependent Variables 47
Independent Variables 48

RESULTS 53

HYPOTHESIS 1 53
HYPOTHESIS 2A 57
HYPOTHESIS 2B 60
HYPOTHESIS 3A 63
HYPOTHESIS 3B 68
HYPOTHESIS 3C 74
HYPOTHESIS 3D 84
HYPOTHESIS 4A 86
HYPOTHESIS 4B 87

DISCUSSION 89

THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTIONS 89
MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS 91
LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH 92

CONCLUSION 97
REFERENCES..... 99

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: PRETEST 1 PRODUCT CATEGORIES 30
TABLE 2: PRETEST 2 BRANDS 36
TABLE 3: PREFERENCE LEVELS FOR ANDROGYNOUS INDIVIDUALS 56
TABLE 4: PREFERENCE LEVELS FOR MASCULINE INDIVIDUALS 56
TABLE 5: PREFERENCE LEVELS FOR FEMININE INDIVIDUALS 56
TABLE 6: PREFERENCE LEVELS FOR UNDIFFERENTIATED INDIVIDUALS 56
TABLE 7: BRAND ATTITUDE FOR FEMININE FEMALES 81
TABLE 8: BRAND ATTITUDE FOR ANDROGYNOUS FEMALES 81

Introduction

An important decision for marketers is whether they should position their brands as feminine or masculine. Although it has often been assumed that feminine brands appeal to women, whereas masculine brands appeal to men, decades of research on gender identity support the notion that masculinity and femininity are not biological traits, but psychological ones, and, that, furthermore, these traits can exist in varying levels within an individual. This implies that, not only does sex not determine consumer responses in and of itself, but, that individuals could also be characterized as possessing both high levels of masculinity and femininity, defining such individuals as androgynous. Although throughout history, it was considered to be socially appropriate for individuals to acquire and exhibit only those traits that were associated with their biological sex, in recent decades, gender stereotypes have been under assault. Gender boundaries have thus become more relaxed, with individuals becoming increasingly socialized to identify with both masculine and feminine traits (Stern 1988; Fugate and Philips 2010). Consequently, individuals are now, more than ever, likely to define themselves as androgynous. The significance of this shift to marketers is emphasized in light of the fact that individuals choose to express their identities through their consumption choices. What's more, gender is one of the most basic dimensions of the self that needs to be expressed (Levy 1959; Solomon 1983). Taken together, this implies that developing brands that could provide androgynous individuals with a form of self-expression would be a profitable positioning strategy for marketers.

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to examine how men and women who identify with androgynous gender identities respond to brands with androgynous personalities. It is also important to consider, that despite a changing social climate that has led to a redefining of gender roles, gender norms are still far from being obsolete (Martin and Gnoth 2009). Consequently, individuals with non-traditional gender identities still face some pressure to conform to socially appropriate behaviour. It thus follows that although gender identity may influence consumers' responses to brands, this relationship cannot be observed in isolation. This study therefore aims to contribute to the existing literature by providing a useful first step in understanding how consumers respond to androgynous brands, as well as the different factors that may alter consumers' responses to these brands.

Background and Hypotheses

Gender Identity

Before the 1970's, biological sex was thought to be the main predictor of gender identity and gender-related behaviour (Stern 1988; see also Martin and Gnoth 2009). What's more, when biological sex was eventually measured separately from gender identity, gender research assumed that gender was a single bipolar dimension, with masculinity and femininity at opposite ends of the same continuum (Vitz and Johnston 1965; Fry 1971). Based on this assumption, an individual could not be both very masculine and very feminine. However, the eventual shift of societal beliefs about appropriate gender roles challenged this original conceptualisation of gender. Bem (1974) developed a two-dimensional gender identity model, with masculinity and

femininity recognized as two separate and important dimensions of the self-concept (Bem 1981). This new conceptualization of gender identity allowed for the possibility of masculinity and femininity to co-exist in varying degrees within an individual (Palan 2001). Moreover, instead of being influenced by biological sex, it was now asserted that gender identity was learned through socialization processes and was referred to as an individual's psychological sex (Bem 1979). Since then, different terminology has been used to label gender identity, including sex role orientation (Gentry and Doering 1979), gender (Deaux 1985), sex role self-concept (Stern 1988), sex role identity (Kahle and Homer 1985; Grohmann 2009), and gender identity (Martin and Gnoth 2009). However, when it comes to biological sex, the term "sex" is commonly accepted.

Specifically, gender identity is now defined as the degree to which an individual perceives him- or herself as possessing masculine or feminine personality traits (Spence 1984; see also Palan 2001). A feminine gender identity is guided by an expressive /communal orientation, which gives priority to facilitating the interaction process between individuals, concerns traits that involve being interdependent and relational, and gives importance to the understanding and dealing of emotions in the self and in others (Palan 2001). In particular, femininity consists of traits such as expressiveness, understanding, caring, responsibility, considerateness, sensitivity, nurturance, intuition, passion and emotionalism. On the other hand, a masculine gender identity is guided by an instrumental/agentic orientation, which refers to an individual's concern with the achievement of goals that are external to the interaction process (i.e. getting the job done) (Bem 1974; Palan 2001). In particular, masculinity consists of traits such as independence, assertiveness, reason, rationality, competitiveness, focus and activity.

It therefore follows that an individual who reports high levels of expressive traits and low levels of instrumental traits is categorized as feminine, while an individual who reports high levels of instrumental traits and low levels of expressive traits is categorized as masculine. Additionally, a significant contribution of Bem's (1974) work is that the two-dimensional conceptualization of gender identity permits for the categorization of individuals as androgynous, allowing individuals to report high levels of both instrumentality and expressiveness. For instance, such an individual can now be both assertive and yielding, both sensitive and competitive (Bem 1974).

The importance of this gender category is emphasized by a contemporary society in which gender roles are in transition. Over the past decades, individuals have been increasingly socialized to adopt both behaviours and traits that have traditionally been associated with the opposite sex, as well as their own. For instance, women are increasingly told it is acceptable to be competitive and assertive, while men are increasingly told that it is acceptable to express nurturing feelings and emotions (Stern 1987). This may be partly attributed to findings that androgynous individuals are in fact considered to be psychologically healthier than masculine or feminine individuals, due to their adaptability and freedom from constrained sex-defined behaviour (Anderson 1986). Consequently, this has likely led to a higher identification of feminine traits among men, and a higher identification of masculine traits among women, as compared to earlier points in history, suggesting that individuals are evermore approaching a certain middle ground, and moving toward an androgynous society.

The significance of this outcome is emphasized by findings that individuals consume products and use brand symbolism to signal their gender identities. Although, in the past, it was often assumed that masculine products appeal to males, while feminine products appeal to females, this logic was flawed on many levels (Alreck, Settle, and Belch 1982; Worth, Smith and Mackie 1992). First, this type of segmentation ignored the different psychological orientations within an individual's biological sex (Bem 1974), and second, it made it impossible to predict the consumption behaviour of those individuals categorized as androgynous.

Gender and Consumption

The literature on symbolic consumption asserts that individuals purchase and use products and brands not only for their functional properties but also for their ability to communicate something about their self-concept (Aaker, Benet-Martinez and Garolera 2001). This symbolism, which resides in the intangible properties of goods (Aaker et al. 2001), is often the primary reason for the purchase and use of many products and brands, and is often more predictive of a purchase than the functional utility of a product (Solomon 1983; Belk 1978, 1988). In particular, consumers use brands and products to shape the way they are perceived by others and create their own individual identities (Belk 1988; Kleine, Kleine, and Allen 1995; Ligas 1999; Elliott 1994; McCracken 1986; Wattanasuwan 2005). In fact, a considerable amount of consumer literature asserts that material possessions are actually an extension of the self (Belk 1988; Kleine et al. 1995; Ahuvia 2005; Mittal 2006). As with other components of the self-concept, consumers use products and brands to also signal their gender identities. This therefore implies that

if individuals use products and brands to express their gender identities, then, those products and brands are in some way imbued with gendered symbolism.

Product Gender Versus Brand Gender

One of the most fundamental questions in the study of gendered consumption symbolism is whether a product, like a person, has a gender (Alreck 1994). Earlier studies simply assumed that product gender image was unidimensional (Aiken 1963; Fry 1971; Morris and Cundiff 1971; Vitz and Johnson 1965). However, with the development of gender identity as a two-dimensional concept (Bem 1974), researchers began to explore the possibility of whether products could be classified along the same gender dimensions as people. Allison, Golden, Mullet and Coogan (1979) found that products, like people, may also be perceived as androgynous and undifferentiated, suggesting that androgynous products may be those which are used equally by both sexes, while undifferentiated products are those that have not yet established a gender image. However, not all studies on gendered perceptions of products found similar results. Golden, Allison and Clee (1977) could not find any of the products they tested to be perceived as androgynous or undifferentiated. Similarly, Iyer and Debevec (1986) found that product gender perception is unidimensional, and perceived as being either masculine or feminine, but not both. More recently, Fugate and Philips (2010) tested twenty products and only found four to be rated as androgynous, while none were rated as undifferentiated. In retrospect, the fact that product gender is often considered to be unidimensional seems logical, in view of the fact that product gender is largely derived from the perception of the sex of the stereotypical user (Allison et al. 1979; Iyer and

Debevec 1986; and Iyer and Debevec 1989), as well as that of the product spokesperson (Iyer and Debevec 1986, 1989). As a result, product gender perceptions are likely to have less to do with gender identity and more to do with perceptions of the biological sex of the average user.

Although gendered perceptions of products have received much attention in consumer research, considerably less attention has been given to gendered perceptions of brands. Intuitively, it may be assumed that gendered perceptions of brands follow the same logic as that of products. However, unlike products, brands can be imbued with personality traits, much like humans (Aaker 1997; Grohmann 2009). To this end, Aaker (1997) developed and tested a scale to tap into dimensions of brand personality. According to this scale, brand personality consists of five dimensions derived from multiple sources, such as brand spokesperson, endorsers, as well as user imagery. These dimensions are: sincerity, competence, ruggedness, sophistication and excitement (Aaker 1997). Extending this research, Grohmann (2009) developed a scale to measure gender dimensions of brand personality. Unlike gender perceptions of products, the gender dimensions of brand personality proved to be captured by two independent dimensions, Masculine Brand Personality (MBP) and Feminine Brand Personality (FBP), applying to both utilitarian and symbolic brands (Grohmann 2009). Specifically, MPB traits consist of adventurous, aggressive, brave, daring, dominant and sturdy, whereas FBP traits consist of fragile, graceful, expresses tender feelings, sweet, sensitive and tender (Grohmann 2009). Furthermore, unlike product gender perceptions, the two-dimensional structure of brand gender allows for the existence of androgynous brands,

emphasizing that brand personality refers to human personality traits associated with brands, rather than simple perceptions of typical user or spokesperson (Grohmann 2009).

Consequently, it is more relevant to examine the impact of gender identity on consumption at the brand level rather than at the product level, given the extent to which each has the ability to be imbued with instrumental and expressive traits. In other words, at the product level, gender symbolism is derived from the sex of the typical user or spokesperson and is therefore unlikely to be sufficient to engender perceptions of instrumentality and expressiveness, which are not associated with biological sex. On the other hand, brand gender has the ability to evoke perceptions of instrumentality and expressiveness given a brand's capacity to have a personality (Aaker 1997). Therefore, given individuals' needs to express their gender identities through consumption, brand choices are likely more reflective of this need than product choices, and as such, consumer responses to brands rather than products will be examined within this study.

Gender Identity Congruence

The theory that has been used in consumer research to understand the role of gender identity in consumption is image congruence. This theory posits that individuals prefer products and brands that are in some way consistent with different aspects of their self-concept (Grubb and Grathwohl 1967; Sirgy 1982; Graeff 1996; Mugge and Govers 2004). The self-concept is multi-dimensional and consists of self-perceived personal qualities, personality traits, as well behavioural and physical appearance characteristics (Sirgy 1982). Furthermore, the self-concept is composed of different components, one of which is gender identity. Therefore, gender identity congruence in consumer research

refers to the match between the gendered image of the stimulus (i.e. product, brand or advertisement) and the self-perceived gender identity of the individual.

The value of gender identity congruence to marketers is emphasized by findings that this match results in various favourable consumer outcomes. Early gender identity congruence studies found that consumer preferences were consistent with their gender identities (Aiken 1963; Fry 1971; Vitz and Johnston 1965). For example, smokers' preferences for masculine cigarette brands were found to be significantly correlated to a masculine gender identity (Vitz and Johnston 1965), while preferences for feminine cigarette brands were significantly correlated to a feminine gender identity (Fry 1971). However, these studies relied on bipolar gender identity scales for both respondents and brands, and therefore were not necessarily capturing congruence between self and brand perceptions of instrumentality and expressiveness.

Following the emergence of the two-dimensional conceptualization of gender identity (Bem 1974), findings continued to support gender identity congruence theory, however empirical evidence was not always consistent. For instance, Gentry and Doering (1977, 1979) and Gentry, Doering and O'Brien (1978) found that gender identity, rather than biological sex, was most predictive of consumer participation in leisure activities, and Gentry et al. (1978) demonstrated that individuals with a feminine gender identity reported a preference for feminine products over masculine ones.

In contrast however, Gould and Weil (1991) reported that biological sex rather than gender identity was a better predictor of product choice in gift giving situations. Similarly, Schmitt, Leclerc, Dube and Rioux (1988) also found that sex, rather than

gender identity, predicted product choice, with males more likely to choose masculine and neutral magazines rather than feminine magazines, and females more likely to choose feminine and neutral magazines rather than masculine magazines. Instead of discrediting gender identity congruence theory however, these findings demonstrate that measuring the congruence between human characteristics such as instrumentality and expressiveness, and product characteristics which are derived from the sex of the typical user, is flawed, especially given that gender identity and sex are not correlated (Palan, Areni and Kiecker 1999). Furthermore, some of these studies were flawed in their stimuli selection. For instance, in selecting magazines such as Cosmopolitan and Sports Illustrated, Schmitt et al. (1988) were not measuring the congruence between gender identity and product gender but instead between gender identity and a variety of personal interests such as men's and women's health issues, fashion, sports and hobbies.

Another area that has received much attention in gender identity congruence research is advertising. The extant literature consistently demonstrates that individuals with traditional gender identities (i.e. masculine men and feminine women) prefer gender-stereotyped advertising, while those with non-traditional gender identities (i.e. masculine women, feminine men and androgynous individuals) prefer non-gender-stereotyped advertising (Jaffe and Berger 1988; Jaffe 1994; Morrison and Shaffer 2003). Similarly, Worth et al. (1992), Chang (2006) and Feiereisen, Broderick and Douglas (2009) also demonstrated that for those individuals for which gender identity was a central and important aspect of their self-concept, there was a higher preference for advertisements that were congruent with their respective gender identity than those that were not.

On the other hand, Jaffe (1991) found no difference between feminine and masculine women in their preference for modern or traditional advertising of financial services, with both feminine and masculine women preferring the non-traditional advertising. Schmitt et al. (1988) also presented contradicting findings on gender identity advertisement congruence, concluding that sex was a better predictor than gender identity of attitudes towards sex-role conformist/non-conformist advertisements of jeans. Again, these findings do not necessarily discount gender identity congruence theory. In particular, it may have been more useful to measure gender role attitudes (Fisher and Arnold 1994) instead of gender identity. Gender role attitudes pertain to beliefs about women and men's roles, rights and responsibilities, and while gender identity is related to gender role attitudes, they are not necessarily congruent (Deaux 1985; Fisher and Arnold 1994; Palan et al. 1999). Therefore early empirical evidence on gender identity congruence may have been inconsistent because the wrong variables were being measured in relation to gender identity.

Unfortunately however, considerably less attention has been given to how gender identity congruence with gendered dimensions of brand personality affects consumer outcomes. The extant literature however has demonstrated numerous times that when the self-concept is congruent with other dimensions of brand personality, consumers exhibit favourable attitudes toward the brand (Parker 2009; Aaker 1999; Krohmer, Malär and Nyffenegger 2007). Where gender identity is concerned, Grohmann (2009) demonstrated that for brands with feminine and masculine brand personalities, gender identity congruence results in a number of positive consumer outcomes, including a stronger brand preference over other brands, increased brand affect and trust, higher degrees of

brand loyalty, stronger purchase intentions, and increased likelihood of engaging in positive word-of-mouth. To date however, gender identity congruence with an androgynous brand has not been examined due to the lack of brands being classified as androgynous, and therefore this is a notable gap in the literature.

The Androgynous Brand

If gender boundaries are blurring within society and individuals are increasingly adopting more androgynous personalities, incorporating both feminine and masculine traits within their self-concepts, gender congruence research would suggest that consumers would also find increased appeal for brands with androgynous personalities, since these brands would better reflect their identities. Yet gender identity research has often examined the impact of androgynous individuals' image congruence with either masculine or feminine stimuli on attitudes and evaluations. These studies often found that androgynous individuals did not respond differently to either masculine or feminine stimuli (Schmitt et al. 1988; Chang 2006). Researchers may have felt that studying androgynous congruence with an androgynous stimulus was not useful since, until recently, gendered perceptions of products and brands were often measured with bipolar scales, and, as such, did not allow for the classification of brands and products as androgynous. Moreover, it is not surprising that these early studies found that androgynous individuals did not respond differently to masculine and feminine stimuli, given that androgynous individuals have both masculine and feminine gender traits. It would have been more correct however, to examine whether such individuals had a more favourable response to androgynous stimuli than to feminine and masculine ones, given

that research on gender identity has defined androgyny as the co-presence of both instrumentality and expressiveness in a given situation (Stake 1997). Indeed, more recent studies on advertisement self-congruence have successfully utilized androgynous stimuli, finding that androgynous individuals have higher evaluations and more favourable attitudes towards advertisements with androgynous images, than either those that were masculine or feminine (Feiereisen et al. 2009; Martin and Gnoth 2009), confirming that although androgynous individuals may identify with both feminine and masculine traits, they identify best to advertisements that incorporate both dimensions.

Although gender identity congruence with androgynous advertisements has been examined, there is a notable absence of studies examining congruence with an androgynous brand personality. Similarly to an androgynous gender identity, an androgynous brand would be defined as having both high levels of masculine and feminine brand traits. Such a brand, for instance, could be perceived as being sweet, sensitive and tender, as well as brave, daring and dominant. Given the possible shifting of individuals' gender identities to an androgynous middle ground, marketers may be interested in knowing if the development of an androgynous brand personality is a viable marketing strategy that may offer a competitive advantage over other brands.

Marketers may be concerned however that an androgynous brand may result in conflicting consumer expectations, and thus not be a profitable marketing strategy (Grohmann 2009). For instance, will individuals have a difficult time negotiating traits such as aggressiveness and sweetness within the same brand? After all, literature on role conflict, has demonstrated that situations in which dual expectations are present may lead

to stress, anxiety and discomfort (Cooke and Rousseau 1984; see also Stake 1997). Therefore it may be expected that these negative feelings may also arise in situations in which individuals face expectations of both instrumentality and expressiveness. However, whether an individual experiences these tensions when faced with dual gender expectations or not likely depends on their own gender identities.

When facing dual expectations individuals will make use of either active or avoidant coping strategies (Stake 2000). What determines the coping strategy used is whether an individual evaluates his or her inner resources as sufficient to meet all situational demands (Stake 2000). Stake (2000) indeed confirmed that androgynous individuals, in particular, have been demonstrated to possess a broader range of skills and capacities to meet the demands of dual expectations, than those individuals who identify exclusively with masculine or feminine personality traits. Specifically, androgynous individuals appraise their personal resources as higher than masculine or feminine individuals do, resulting in the use of more active instead of avoidant coping to deal with both expressive and instrumental demands. Those individuals who use only expressive or instrumental traits in coping with dual expectations are more avoidant than androgynous individuals, because they can only be responsive to one but not both aspects of the dual expectations (Stake 1997). These findings thus suggest that androgynous individuals have enough inner resources to deal with the dual expectations that would likely be presented by an androgynous brand, making this type of brand worthy of further examination.

Self-Concept Motives and Self-Construal Salience

Based on information thus far, it can safely be predicted that congruence between an androgynous gender identity and an androgynous brand personality will result in positive outcomes. However this relationship cannot be observed in isolation. In particular, gender identity congruence will not always entail positive consumer outcomes for the reason that this relationship is mediated by self-concept motives. Self-esteem is an important self-concept motive that determines which dimension of the self-concept will be expressed and, consequently, the behaviour in which an individual will engage in (Epstein 1980; see also Sirgy 1982).

The self-esteem motive is linked to two functions of attitudes, value expressive and social adjustment, which consist of strategies that are adopted to maintain and enhance the self-worth of various aspects of the self-construal (Hogg, Cox and Keeling 2000). Self-construal refers to the perception of the self, much like self-concept (Triandis 1989). However, unlike the self-concept which refers to a relatively stable perception of the self, the self-construal refers to the perception of the self in specific situations (Martin and Gnoth 2009). It therefore follows that different self-construals can become salient or "activated" in different situations. When examining consumption, of interest are the private and collective self-construals. The private self involves cognitions about the self that include traits, states or behaviours (Triandis 1989). When the private self is salient, individuals strive to meet internalized values, through the value expressive function. In this case, individuals are motivated to express their true selves and choices reflect personal preferences (Martin and Gnoth 2009). In this context, gender identity

congruence will likely lead to positive consumer outcomes. The collective self, on the other hand, includes cognitions about group memberships (Triandis 1989). When the collective self is salient, individuals strive to meet the goals and expectations of important reference groups and avoid those of avoidance groups, through the social adjustment function (Hogg et al. 2000). This also results in individuals being concerned with what important others may think (Ybarra and Trafimow 1998; see also Martin and Gnoth 2009). In this context, gender identity congruence will likely only lead to favourable consumer responses if the individual judges his or her gender identity to be consistent with the norms of important reference groups.

In brief, a match between self-concept and brand personality interacts with self-esteem needs to motivate the individual to purchase the particular brand. Therefore, in observing the gender congruence relationship, it is essential to take into consideration the context (i.e. private or collective), reference groups, as well as those factors which could cause individuals to strive to conform to the norms of those reference groups.

Biological Sex and Normative Pressure

Although individuals may relate to a variety of different reference groups that they use as a standard for evaluating themselves, such as family or religious groups, when it comes to expressing gender identity, biological sex also serves as a reference group (Martin and Gnoth 2009). As a result, biological sex, although not correlated with gender identity, cannot be ruled out completely from the study of gender identity congruence because individuals may still seek out products that are congruent with their own biological sex, despite having androgynous or other non-traditional gender identities (i.e.

masculine females and feminine males). The reference group with which an individual is associated, in this case, being male or female, as well as the norms of this group, become a frame of reference for what are the "correct" traits and behaviours to exhibit. Thus, when the collective self is primed, individuals become concerned as to whether they are enacting traits and behaviours that are consistent with the group norm. What is more, such concerns override personal preferences (Martin and Gnoth 2009).

To this end, consumer research has demonstrated that both men and women are uncomfortable purchasing products that are not culturally sanctioned to be used by their sex (Milner and Fodness 1996; Alreck et al. 1982). Morris and Cundiff (1971) also demonstrated that men with a relatively high feminine identity and a high level of anxiety expressed strongly unfavourable attitudes toward the use of hair spray (perceived as feminine). These studies however did not examine the impact of the self-construal on the gender congruence relationship. More recently though, Martin and Gnoth (2009) demonstrated that when the collective self is salient, concerns about being correctly classified as possessing feminine traits drive feminine and androgynous men to endorse traditional masculinity and shun femininity in advertisements. Taken together, these findings suggest that traditional femininity is the group norm for females, whereas traditional masculinity is the group norm for males.

Furthermore, findings in consumer literature consistently show that, although both sexes are affected by normative pressures, males are more subject to such pressures than females. Consequently, although females will sometimes accept masculine products, males will almost always reject feminine products (Alreck et al. 1982; Alreck 1994;

Wolin 2003; Patterson and Hogg 2004; Fugate and Philips 2010). Men have even been demonstrated to be more resistant than women in accepting cross-gender brand extensions, especially in symbolic brand categories where gender image becomes a salient brand attribute (Jung and Lee 2006).

In an attempt to understand males and their consumption behaviour, Kimmel and Tissier-Desbordes (2000) conducted 30 interviews with French men, concluding that males have social fears, most notably the fear of admitting a feminine self-image and a fear of homosexuality, that are translated into their attitudes and behaviour. Similarly, Elliot and Elliot (2005) examined male responses to images of naked males in advertisements and concluded that males have an expressed fear of homosexuality. Although gender identity had not been measured within these studies, the findings overwhelmingly confirm that men are subject to normative pressure to endorse traditional masculinity. What is more, these fears are derived from reactions of other males that serve to ensure that males continue to enact traditional masculinity (Wade and Brittan-Powell 2001; see also Martin and Gnoth 2009). For this reason, men who do not identify with traditional masculinity have been shown to be concerned with social backlash, and to engage in activities to avoid such backlash (such a pretending to conform to traditional gender identities) (Maas, Cadinu, Guarnieri, and Grasselli 2003; Rudman and Fairchild 2004; see also Martin and Gnoth 2009).

Although females have been examined far less in the marketing literature, Martin, Schouten and McAlexander (2006) shed some light on this area through their ethnographic study of female Harley-Davidson riders. They demonstrate that, due to the

normative pressures to conform to traditional femininity that the women in this study faced in their everyday lives, the hyper-masculine environment of a biker subculture offered a form of escape. One conclusion that can be drawn from this study is that, although females do face normative pressures as well, to some extent they still are able to openly and publically consume a brand that does not conform to their traditional gender stereotypes.

If males and females therefore face different levels of normative pressure to conform to their respective traditional gender stereotypes, then it cannot be expected that androgynous males and females will respond in the same manner to an androgynous brand. To date however, no study has explored possible differences between the two sexes with respect to the androgynous gender identity. However, it is also important to consider that individuals do not face normative pressures in all consumption situations, with some contexts presenting less perceived social risk (i.e. the degree to which consumers feel they will be negatively judged (Lee 1990)), than others. Thus, in a collective self-context, although both androgynous men and women are likely to have more favourable responses towards gender conforming brands, androgynous men are more likely to feign gender conformity than androgynous females, given the difference in normative pressure faced by each sex. In a private self-context, on the other hand, both sexes would be expected to express their androgynous gender identities.

Self-Monitoring and Concern for Appropriateness

Despite the influence of reference group norms, not all individuals are equally concerned about the evaluations and judgements of others. In particular, a variable that

was not considered by Martin and Gnoth (2009) in examining the impact of self-construal on the gender congruence relationship is self-monitoring. Self-monitoring refers to individuals' conscious control and management of their behaviour in front of present others, with the goal of being perceived in a positive light, depending on the situation (Snyder 1974; Lennox and Wolfe 1984). High self-monitors regulate their behaviour to "fit" the situation, have a high concern for the appropriateness of their behaviour in a given social context, and adapt their expressive behaviour and self-presentation in accordance with situational cues, for the sake of a desired public appearance (Lennox and Wolfe 1984). This is done through social comparison and the monitoring of expressive behaviour and self-presentation of others in a given social situation (Lennox and Wolfe 1984). Low self-monitors, on the other hand, have consistent behaviour across different situations, are less likely to act in accordance with social norms, and lack the ability or desire to regulate their behaviour to match the appropriateness of the situation (Snyder 1974; Lennox and Wolfe 1984). Hogg et al. (2000) and Aaker (1999) further specify that low self-monitors rely on dispositional information, and are conscious of inner personality factors and the drive to accurately project their self-image in any given social situation. In other words, high self-monitors are more sensitive to the image they project to others in social situations than low self-monitors (Snyder 1974).

Hogg et al. (2000) proposed a conceptual model in which self-monitoring is used to explore the link between the self-esteem function of attitudes and the private and collective self. For high self-monitors, the primary function of attitudes is value expressive when the private self is activated and social adjustment when the collective self is activated. Therefore, when the private self is salient, the strategy used to achieve

self-worth by high self-monitors is congruence with internalized values, preferences and dispositions. However, when the collective self is salient, the strategy used to achieve self-worth is to comply with reference group norms. Individuals thus seek brands that are congruent with external factors (situational and social cues). For low self-monitors however, the primary function of attitudes is value expressive, regardless of self-construal salience (i.e. private or collective). Thus, the strategy used to maintain and enhance self-esteem is the achievement of internal values, in which case a brand that is consistent with personal preferences is sought (Hogg et al. 2000). What can therefore be concluded is that, although self-construal salience affects the gender identity congruence relationship, it does not have an impact for all individuals. Specifically, only those individuals that are high self-monitors are affected.

Another relevant variable to consider is concern for appropriateness (Lennox and Wolfe 1984). Concern for appropriateness is a closely related but separate concept to self-monitoring that was developed by Lennox and Wolfe (1984) while developing the revised self-monitoring scale. Concern for appropriateness involves the degree to which an individual alters his or her behaviour depending on the situation, and the degree to which an individual is aware of social cues, such as clothing, to which he or she needs to adapt (Lennox and Wolfe 1984). Given how closely related self-monitoring and concern for appropriateness are, it is logical to simultaneously study these two variables.

It would therefore be expected that pressure to conform to traditional gender identities would only have an impact on those androgynous individuals that are high self-monitors or who have a high concern for appropriateness. Moreover, self-monitoring and

concern for appropriateness would only have an impact on the gender identity congruence relationship when the collective self is primed, in which case individuals are made aware of important reference groups norms. Conversely, when the private self is primed the self-image would not need to be monitored. Additionally, those individuals who are low self-monitors or who have a low concern for appropriateness would be expected to have consistent consumption behaviour, regardless of their level of self-construal.

Hypotheses Formulation

Although traditionally, males have been socialized to internalize and enact masculine personality traits, while females have been socialized to internalize and enact feminine personality traits, changing gender roles within contemporary society have led to a blurring of genders. Individuals are increasingly socialized to adopt traits and behaviours that have traditionally been associated with the opposite sex, as well as their own (Stern 1987), suggesting that individuals will increasingly adopt androgynous personalities.

Thus, if individuals are increasingly adopting androgynous personalities, gender identity congruence research suggests that individuals would also find increased appeal for brands with androgynous personalities, since these brands would better reflect their self-concepts. Although the literature on gender identity congruence has placed much emphasis on congruence between self-concept and product image or advertisements, less attention has been given to congruence of self-concept with gendered dimensions of brand personality, and the subsequent outcomes. Moreover, although it has been

demonstrated that congruence between self-concept and masculine and feminine brand personalities entail numerous positive attitudinal and behavioural outcomes (Grohmann 2009), androgynous brand congruence has not been examined due to the lack of androgynous brands in the market. This gap in the market may be attributed to marketers' concerns that androgynous brands may result in conflicting consumer expectations, rendering such a marketing strategy unprofitable. However, findings in consumer psychology suggest that gender identity moderates the relationship between dual expectations and coping strategies (Stake 1997, 2000). Specifically, androgynous individuals, as opposed to masculine or feminine ones, are said to possess enough inner resources to deal with the dual expectations that would likely be presented by an androgynous brand, thus resulting in active behaviour toward the brand (Stake 2000). Taken together, findings suggest that creating an androgynous personality for a brand may be a viable marketing option. Given the lack of research on androgynous brands however, it is important to establish that androgynous individuals will indeed have more favourable responses toward brands with androgynous personalities than those with either masculine or feminine personalities.

> **H1**: Androgynous individuals, as opposed to other individuals (i.e. masculine, feminine and undifferentiated), will have more positive attitudes, a greater preference and increased purchase intentions for brands possessing an androgynous personality, than brands possessing a masculine or feminine brand personality.

However, due to normative pressures to conform to traditional gender stereotypes (Kimmel and Tissier-Desbordes 2000; Martin et al. 2006; Martin and Gnoth 2009), the likelihood that an individual will be concerned about others' judgements must also be considered within the gender congruence hypothesis. In contexts in which individuals are concerned about conforming to the norm of an in-group, they may seek out brands that are congruent with their biological sex. To this end, self-construal salience must be considered. In particular, when the collective self is primed, it is expected that androgynous individuals will seek to endorse the values of cultural reference groups, and as such choose to not express their androgynous personalities. Consequently, in such a context, androgynous individuals are expected to exhibit more favourable responses toward brands that possess a gender personality congruent with their biological sex, than brands that possess androgynous personalities. However, when the private self is primed, androgynous individuals will strive to meet internalized values and consequently are expected to exhibit more favourable responses toward androgynous brands than masculine or feminine ones.

H2a: When the private self is primed, androgynous individuals, as opposed to other individuals (i.e. masculine, feminine and undifferentiated), will have more positive attitudes, a greater preference and increased purchase intentions for androgynous brands, than those brands that have either masculine or feminine personalities.

H2b: When the collective self is primed, androgynous men as opposed to other men (i.e. masculine, feminine and undifferentiated), will have more positive

attitudes, a greater preference and increased purchase intentions for brands with masculine personalities, whereas androgynous women as opposed to other women (i.e. masculine, feminine and undifferentiated), will have more positive attitudes, a greater preference and increased purchase intentions for brands with feminine personalities.

However, not all individuals whose collective self is primed adopt a social adjustment strategy to maintain and enhance their self-esteem, in which they strive to meet the goals of important reference groups. Specifically, individuals who are low self-monitors or have a low concern for appropriateness adopt a value expressive strategy to maintain and enhance self-worth by striving to meet their internalized values regardless of which self-construal is activated (Snyder 1974; Lennox and Wolfe 1984; Aaker 1999). What's more, low self-monitors rely on dispositional information, are conscious of inner personality factors and are driven to accurately project their self-concept in any social situation (Hogg et al. 2000; Aaker 1999). Therefore, androgynous individuals that are also low-monitors or have a low concern for appropriateness are expected to prefer androgynous brands over other brands, regardless of whether their private of collective self is primed.

H3a: Androgynous individuals, as opposed to other individuals (i.e. masculine, feminine and undifferentiated), who are also low self-monitors (or have a low concern for appropriateness), will have more positive attitudes, a greater preference and increased purchase intentions for androgynous brands than other brands, regardless of whether the private or collective self is primed.

Conversely, because high self-monitors or those individuals that have a high concern for appropriateness do adopt a social adjustment strategy, when the collective self is primed, they continuously monitor social and situational cues in order to control the image they portray, and ensure that their behaviour is appropriate for the given situation (Snyder 1974; Lennox and Wolfe 1984). Consequently, when the collective self is primed, androgynous individuals that are also high self-monitors or have a high concern for appropriateness are expected to have more favourable responses toward brands with gender personalities representing their own biological sex over androgynous brands because such individuals will be more conscious of situational cues such as social pressure to conform to traditional gender norms. However, when the private self is primed, androgynous individuals who are also high self-monitors or have a high concern for appropriateness will prefer androgynous brands because, like low self-monitors, they will adopt a value expressive strategy.

H3b: Androgynous individuals, as opposed to other individuals (i.e. masculine, feminine and undifferentiated), who are also high self-monitors (or have a high concern for appropriateness), will have more positive attitudes, a greater preference and increased purchase intentions for androgynous brands than other brands when the private self is primed.

H3c: When the collective self is primed, androgynous men, as opposed to other men (i.e. masculine, feminine and undifferentiated) who are also high self-monitors (or have a high concern for appropriateness), will have more positive attitudes, a greater preference and increased purchase intentions for masculine

brands than other brands, whereas androgynous women, as opposed to other women (i.e. masculine, feminine and undifferentiated), who are also high self-monitors (or have a high concern for appropriateness), will have a greater preference, more positive attitudes and increased purchase intentions for feminine brands than other brands.

H3d: When the collective self is primed, attitudes, preferences and purchase intentions toward androgynous brands will be more positive for androgynous individuals (versus masculine, feminine and undifferentiated individuals) who are low self-monitors (or have a low concern for appropriateness), than those who are high self-monitors (or have a high concern for appropriateness).

Although to date, no studies have explored the difference between androgynous men and androgynous women, it cannot be assumed that both will have identical responses to an androgynous brand simply because they possess similar gendered personality traits. Even in contemporary society, males still experience more normative pressure to conform to traditional masculinity and reject femininity, than females, for whom it is sometimes acceptable to exhibit some masculinity (Alreck et al. 1982; Alreck 1994; Wolin 2003; Patterson and Hogg 2004; Fugate and Philips 2010). Moreover, due to concerns of harassment and negative reactions from others, men who do not identify with traditional masculinity may often feign gender conformity (Maas, Cadinu, Guarnieri, and Grasselli 2003; Rudman and Fairchild 2004; see also Martin and Gnoth 2009). It thus follows that, because men face more normative pressure to conform to traditional gender identities than women, when the collective self is primed, androgynous

men are more likely to feign gender conformity than androgynous women. Consequently, when the collective self is primed, women may perceive lower levels of social risk associated to using an androgynous brand than men, resulting in more favourable responses toward androgynous brands by androgynous females, than by androgynous males.

> **H4a**: When the collective self is primed, preferences, attitudes and purchase intentions toward androgynous brands will be more positive for androgynous women (versus masculine, feminine and undifferentiated women) than androgynous men (versus masculine, feminine and undifferentiated men).

Moreover, because social cues suggesting gender conformity are stronger for men than they are for women, male high self-monitors (or those who have a high concern for appropriateness) are likely to pick up on stronger cues to conform to a traditional gender identity than female high self-monitors (or those who have a high concern for appropriateness). Even though both male and female high self-monitors are concerned with portraying a positive public image, a female expressing an androgynous public image may face a less negative social reaction than a male expressing an androgynous public image. Therefore it is expected that when the collective self is primed, androgynous women who are also high self-monitors (or who have a high concern for appropriateness) will have more favourable responses toward androgynous brands than androgynous men who are also high self-monitors (or who have a high concern for appropriateness).

H4b: When the collective self is primed, attitudes, preferences and purchase intentions toward androgynous brands will be more positive for androgynous (versus masculine, feminine and undifferentiated) female high self-monitors (or those who have a high concern for appropriateness) than for androgynous (versus masculine, feminine and undifferentiated) male high self-monitors (or those who have a high concern for appropriateness).

Research Methodology

Pretesting

Two pretests were carried out in order to select the appropriate stimuli for the main study. The purpose of the first pretest was to select the appropriate product category, while the purpose of the second pretest was to select appropriate brands within that product category.

Pretest 1: Selection of Product Categories

In order to select the appropriate product category for the study, symbolic and functional characteristics, as well as product gender were measured for 22 product categories. Moreover, because selected product categories should have equal involvement and usage for both males and females, product involvement and product category usage were also measured.

Potential product categories were identified in the literature and then cross-referenced such that there were masculine, feminine and androgynous products in both

functional and symbolic categories to be pretested. Moreover, given that much of the product gender literature is relatively dated, other product categories that seemed relevant to today's market (e.g. MP3 players and USB keys) were also added.

One hundred and sixty American panel members (74 male, 86 female) participated in an online study. The mean age was 46.3 years. After being presented with a consent form, in which participants had to freely consent and voluntarily agree to participate in the study before proceeding, each participant was randomly presented with one of 6 versions of the pretest. Because of time constraints, the 22 product categories were divided amongst these 6 versions, with five versions randomly presenting participants with four product categories, and one version randomly presenting participants with two product categories (Table 1). The duration of the pretest was approximately 15 minutes.

Table 1: Pretest 1 Product Categories

Version 1	Version 2	Version 3	Version 4	Version 5	Version 6
Sunglasses	Mineral water	Pain relievers	USB keys	T-shirts	Digital cameras
Watches	Jeans	Athletic shoes	Laptops	Shampoo	Wall paint
Energy bars	Fragrance	Fashion apparel	Credit cards	Soap	
Soft drinks	Toothpaste	MP3 players	Vitamins	Cosmetics	

The utilitarian and symbolic dimensions of the 22 product categories were measured using four items rated on 7-point scales, and anchored by agree/disagree (Chang 2003, 2006). Specifically, participants rated their agreement with "When I

purchase [product category]: I take product functions into consideration/I take product quality into consideration/ I consider whether or not the product style fits my image/ I consider whether or not the product will catch others' attention." Principal components analysis indeed showed that there were two factors explaining the total variance, with the first factor explaining 58.9% of the total variance, and the second factor explaining 29.9% of the total variance. The "utilitarian" (r = .78) and "symbolic" (r = .75) variables were thus computed through averaging.

To further ensure that products were correctly categorized as either symbolic or functional, participants were asked to evaluate the level of functionality (not at all functional/very functional) and the prestige (not at all prestigious/very prestigious) of every product category, on a 7-point bipolar scale (Grohmann 2009). Again, only one factor was extracted in principal components analysis, explaining 65.5% of the total variance. However, given the low Pearson correlation (r = .31), the two items were treated as two dimensions.

Although much of the extant literature is in agreement that perceived product gender is uni-dimensional, some findings support that products may also be perceived as androgynous. To therefore allow for this possibility, product gender was evaluated using a two dimensional, 7-point bipolar, product gender scale (not at all masculine/extremely masculine; not at all feminine/extremely feminine). Principal components factor analysis did reveal only one factor explaining 62.6% of the total variance, however, again given the very low correlation between the two items (r = .25), masculinity and femininity were treated as two dimensions.

Product involvement was also measured to ensure that selected product categories were equally involving for both males and females. Participants rated each product category on the 10-items of The Revised Product Involvement Inventory (important/unimportant; irrelevant/relevant; means a lot to me/means nothing to me; unexciting/exciting; dull/neat; matters to me/doesn't matter to me; fun/not fun; appealing/unappealing; boring/interesting; of no concern to me/of concern to me) on a 7-point scale (McQuarrie and Munsoon 1991). Principal components factor analysis extracted two factors, with the first one explaining 67.2% of the total variance, and the second one explaining 11.1%, however, given that all items loaded onto one factor (> .70), the scale was treated as one dimension, as intended. After taking into account reverse coding, all items were averaged to create the "involvement" variable (Cronbach's $\alpha = .95$).

Similarly, because it was also important to select product categories that have equal usage among men and women, product usage was evaluated with one item (I never use this product/ I regularly use this product) on a 7-point bipolar scale.

Finally, demographic questions were asked, including sex, age, English proficiency, level of education and annual household income.

Pretest 1 Results

Selecting the appropriate product categories involved finding those categories which could be classified as high functional/high prestige; low functional/low prestige; high functional/low prestige and low functional/high prestige. Given that masculine and

feminine brand personalities apply to both symbolic and functional brands, having product categories in all four quadrants provided a greater scope of brands to be tested in pretest 2, thus increasing the possibility of uncovering an androgynous brand. Ideally, these product categories would also be relatively gender neutral, have no sex differences in gender perceptions, and have involvement and usage scores that do not differ significantly between males and females.

To classify the 22 product categories, a mean comparison approach was used through one-sample t-tests with the scale midpoint of 4 to identify the product categories that were rated significantly above 4 (high functional/symbolic; functionality/ prestige; masculinity femininity), significantly below 4 (low functional/symbolic; functionality/ prestige; and masculinity femininity), or not significantly different than 4 (medium categorization).

The functional/symbolic scale resulted in the following categorization: high functional/high symbolic: fragrance, fashion apparel, t-shirts; high functional/medium symbolic: sunglasses, watches, jeans, athletics shoes, mp3players, USB keys, laptops, shampoo, digital cameras, wall paint; high functional/low symbolic: soft drinks, mineral water, toothpaste, pain relievers, credit cards, vitamins; medium functional/medium symbolic: cosmetics; medium functional/ low symbolic: energy bars. Given the lack of products classified as low functional, products categorized as "medium" were considered to have low ratings. However, the functional/symbolic scale still did not result in any products that could be categorized as low functional/high symbolic, and therefore the functionality/prestige scale was used to further examine the product categories.

The functionality/prestige scale resulted in the following categorization: high functionality/high prestige: fashion apparel, laptops; high functionality/medium prestige: sunglasses, watches, jeans, athletics shoes, mp3 players, USB keys, credit cards, vitamins, t-shirts, shampoo, soap, digital cameras, wall paint; high functionality/low prestige: toothpaste, pain relievers; medium functionality/high prestige: fragrance; medium functionality/medium prestige: mineral water, cosmetics; medium functionality/low prestige: energy bars, soft drinks. Again, analysis revealed a lack of products that could be categorized as low functional, and therefore products categorized a "medium" were treated as having received a "low" rating. Therefore products that were further considered were those in the high/high, high/low, low/high, low/low quadrants, resulting in the following selection: fashion apparel, laptops, fragrance, toothpaste, pain relievers, energy bars, and soft drinks.

Moreover, the product list was further narrowed down to those products that received consistent ratings on both the functional/symbolic scale, as well as the functional/prestige scales. This resulted in the following selection energy bars, fashion apparel, pain relievers and toothpaste. Fragrance was also included despite receiving a low functional/high prestige and high functionality/high symbolic scoring due to the lack of other products in the high prestige/low functionality category.

The masculinity/femininity scale, resulted in the following categorization for the selected products: medium masculine/high feminine: fragrance, fashion apparel; medium masculinity/medium femininity: energy bar, toothpaste, pain relievers. Although fragrance and fashion apparel received a slightly more feminine than masculine

classification, none of the selected product categories received an exclusively feminine or masculine classification, and therefore they were deemed appropriate for this study.

In investigating involvement scores, independent t-test analysis was carried out for each remaining product category, confirming that at alpha = .05, there was no significant difference in involvement between men and women. Similarly, for usage scores, independent t-test analysis revealed no significant difference between men and women. Also, to verify if there were any differences in gendered perceptions of products between males and females, independent t-test analysis was conducted for the remaining product categories, revealing that, at alpha = .05, there was no reported difference in gendered perceptions between males and females.

Therefore the outcome of Pretest 1 resulted in the following product categories for further testing: fragrance, fashion apparel, energy bars, pain relievers and toothpaste.

Pretest 2: Selection of Brands

In order to select the appropriate brands for the main study, the masculine and feminine brand personalities, as well the symbolism and functionality of each brand was measured for 42 brands that were identified within the 5 product categories.

One hundred and ninety-six American panel members (106 male, 90 female) participated in an online study. The mean age was 43.5 years. After being presented with a consent form, in which participants had to freely consent and voluntarily agree to participate in the study before proceeding, each participant was randomly presented with one of 6 versions of the pretest. Similarly to pretest 1, the 42 product categories were

divided amongst these 6 versions which were randomly presented to participants. Moreover, each version had 7 brands to be evaluated, which were also randomly presented (Table 2). The duration of the pretest was approximately 15 minutes.

Table 2: Pretest 2 Brands

Version 1	Version 2	Version 3	Version 4	Version 5	Version 6
Hugo BOSS	Clinique	Colgate	Aim	Arm & Hammer	Diesel
GAP	Nike	Dior	Calvin Klein	Luna bar	Balance bar
Excedrin	Bayer	Estee Lauder	Oral-B	Motrin	Advil
Sensodyne	Crest	Tylenol	Adidas	Ralph Lauren	Rembrandt
Slim fast	PowerBar	Lacoste	Aquafresh	American Apparel	Kellogg's
Vera Wang	Chanel	Lululemon Athletica	Burberry	Kashi Go Lean	Vector
Fruit of the Loom	Levi's	Hammer Bar	Puma	Aleve	Guess
					Cliff bar

Participants rated each brand on a two-dimensional scale measuring gender dimensions of brand personality (Grohmann 2009). The scale included six items measuring masculine brand personality (adventurous, aggressive, brave, daring, dominant, sturdy) and six items measuring feminine brand personality (expresses tender feelings, fragile, graceful, sensitive, sweet, tender). Each item was evaluated on a 7-point scale (not at all descriptive/ extremely descriptive). Principal components factor analysis revealed 2 factors, with the first one explaining 69.7% of the total variance, and the second factor explaining 11.3% of the total variance. Given that the masculine items and

the feminine items all loaded onto two separate factors, the scale was used as intended, with the computation of the masculine brand personality (MBP) (Cronbach's α = .95) and feminine brand personality (FBP) (Cronbach's α = .95) variables through averaging.

Next, the symbolism dimension of each brand was evaluated. First, participants' attitude functions towards each brand were assessed on 7-point scales (completely agree/ completely disagree) adapted from the work of Wilcox, Kim and Sen (2009). Four items measured the value expressive function (This brand would reflect the kind of person I see myself to be/ This brand would help me communicate my self-identity/ This brand would help me express myself/ This brand would help me define myself) and four items measured the social adjustive function (This brand would be a symbol of social status/ This brand would help me fit into important social situations/ I would like to be seen wearing this brand/ I would enjoy it if people knew I was wearing this brand). Higher ratings indicated higher levels of brand symbolism. Principal components factor analysis revealed that all 8 items loaded onto one factor, and that this one factor explained 87.8% of the total variance. Therefore all items were averaged to create the "expression" variable (Cronbach's α = .98).

Next, the utilitarian dimension of consumer attitudes toward each brand was measured using five semantic differential response items (effective/ineffective, helpful/unhelpful, functional/not functional, necessary/unnecessary, practical/impractical) (Voss, Spangenberg, and Grohmann 2003). Principal components factor analysis yielded one factor explaining 81.0% of the total variance. Items were therefore reverse coded

(given that lower values were associated with more utilitarian brands), and averaged to form the "utilitarian" variable (Cronbach's α = .94).

Lastly, prestige and personality expression of each brand was evaluated on a 7-point scale (not at all descriptive/extremely descriptive) adapted from Bhat and Reddy (1998). The prestige factor comprised three items (prestigious, exciting, distinctive), whereas the personality expression factor comprised two items (symbolic, status symbol). High ratings indicated a symbolic brand. Principal components factor analysis resulted in one factor explaining 84.5% of the total variance, and therefore all items were averaged to form the "symbolic" variable (Cronbach's α = .95).

Furthermore, because it was also important to select brands that have equal usage and familiarity levels among men and women, brand usage (I never use this brand/ I regularly use this brand), and brand familiarity (how familiar are you with the brand: not at all familiar/very familiar) were measured on two 7-point scales.

Lastly, demographic data was also collected, including sex, age, English proficiency, level of education and annual household income.

Pretest 2 Results

The goal of the pretest analysis was to select a product category that offered a masculine, feminine and androgynous brand. Moreover, it was important to select brands for which perceptions of MBP and FBP, involvement and usage did not vary across males and females, and that had somewhat similar functional/symbolic ratings.

To classify the 42 brands, within each product category, a mean comparison approach was used through one-sample t-tests with the scale midpoint of 4 to identify the product categories that were rated significantly above 4 (high MBP/FBP; expression/utilitarian; symbolic/utilitarian), significantly below 4 (low MBP/FBP; expression/utilitarian; symbolic/utilitarian), or not significantly different than 4 (medium categorization).

For the MBP/FBP scale, within the fragrance category, brands were classified as follows: high MBP/low FBP: Hugo Boss; medium MBP/medium FBP: Chanel, Estee Lauder, Vera Wang; medium MBP/low FBP: Burberry, Diesel; low MBP/medium FBP: Clinique; and low MBP/low FBP: Dior. For the fashion apparel category, the brands were classified as follows: medium MBP/medium FBP: Gap, Calvin Klein; medium MBP/low FBP: Levi's, Puma, Ralph Lauren, Fruit of the Loom, Nike, Adidas; low MBP/low FBP: Lacoste, Lululemon Athletica, American Apparel, Guess. For the pain reliever category, the brands were classified as follows: medium MBP/medium FBP: Tylenol; medium MBP/low FBP: Bayer, Excedrin, Aleve, Advil; low MBP/low FBP: Motrin. For the toothpaste category, brands were classified as follows: low MBP/medium FBP: Sensodyne; low MBP/low FBP: Colgate, Aquafresh, Rembrandt; and medium MBP/low FBP: Crest, Aim, Oral-B, Arm & Hammer. For the energy bar category, the brands were classified as follows: medium MBP/low FBP: Power Bar, Kashi Go Lean, Slim Fast; and low MBP/low FBP: HammerBar, Luna Bar, Balance Bar, Kellog's Vector and Cliff Bar.

Based on this analysis, there was no variation in gendered brand personality in the pain reliever, toothpaste and energy bar categories and therefore these categories were eliminated. Between the fragrance and fashion apparel categories, no brands could be classified as high MBP/high FBP, and therefore brands classified as medium MBP/medium FBP were treated as androgynous. Furthermore, between those two categories, the fragrance product category offered more variation in terms of MBP/FBP classification, offering both a brand that could be considered relatively masculine (Hugo Boss), and relatively feminine (Clinique), whereas the fashion apparel category did not allow for this. Therefore, the fragrance category was deemed the most appropriate one for the main study.

To further investigate brands within the androgynous category, paired t-tests were conducted to compare MBP and FBP scores for each of the three fragrance brands in this category. Considering the medium levels of MBP and FBP of the androgynous brands, it was important that they at least have equal levels of MBP and FBP. Chanel (MBP M = 4.02, FBP M = 4.06, $t(27)= -.19$, $p > .85$),Vera Wang (MBP M = 3.67, FBP M = 3.73, $t(28) = -0.51$, $p >.61$) and Estee Lauder (MBP M = 3.51, FBP M = 3.88, $t(26) = -1.78$, $p > .08$) had levels of MBP and FBP that were not significantly different. Given this analysis, the final 3 brands selected were Chanel as the androgynous brand, Hugo Boss as the masculine brand, and Clinique as the feminine brand.

For the expression and utilitarian dimensions, all three brands were categorized as medium expression, medium utilitarian. For the symbolic and utilitarian dimensions, Hugo Boss and Clinique both received a medium symbolic/medium utilitarian rating,

while Chanel received a high symbolic/medium utilitarian rating. Therefore for the purposes of this study the brands are similar enough on these dimensions to be used as stimuli for the study.

To evaluate whether perceptions of MBP differed across men and women, univariate ANOVA analysis was conducted for brands within the fragrance category. Results revealed no main effect for sex ($p > .45$), a main effect for brand ($F (7, 233) = 2.64$, $p < .05$), and no interaction effect between sex and brand ($p > .28$). A similar analysis was conducted to evaluate whether perceptions of FBP for specific brands varied across men and women. For the fragrance product category, there was no significant effect for sex ($p > .32$), there was a significant effect for brand ($F (7, 233) = 3.69$, $p = .001$), and there was no significant interaction effect ($p > .06$). The analysis thus revealed that perceptions of gendered dimensions of brand personality did not vary between males and females for the selected brands.

To evaluate familiarity levels, univariate ANOVA was conducted for brands within the fragrance product category. The main effects of brand and sex were not significant, nor was the interaction between brand and sex (p's $> .07$).

Then to evaluate usage levels, univariate ANOVA analysis was carried out for brands within the fragrance category. The main effects of brand and sex were not significant (p's $> .73$), however the interaction between brand and sex was significant ($F (7, 233) = 2.38$, $p < .05$). Independent t-test analysis was carried out for the selected brands revealing that, for Hugo Boss, males ($M = 3.27$) and females ($M = 2.21$) reported equal levels of usage ($t(25.95) = 1.29$, $p > .20$); for Clinique, males ($M = 2.07$) and

females (M = 3.43) also reported equal levels of usage ($t(26) = -1.63$, $p > .06$); while for Chanel, males (M = 1.71) reported slightly lower levels of usage than females (M = 3.29, $t(21.35) = -2.29$, $p < .05$). Although not the ideal outcome, these results did not limit the selection of brands, since usage could be measured again and included as a covariate in the main study.

Therefore the outcome of Pretest 2 resulted in the following brands within the fragrance product category: Chanel (androgynous brand), Hugo Boss (masculine brand) and Clinique (feminine brand).

Research Study

Design and Procedure

The main study tests hypotheses H1 to H4 inclusively. The experimental design is a 2 (sex) x 3 (gender identity: masculine, feminine, androgynous) x 3 (brand personality: masculine, feminine, androgynous) x 2 (prime: private, collective) x 2 (self-monitoring/concern for appropriateness: high, low) design, with brand personality serving as a within-participants factor.

Five hundred and seventy-six American panel members (268 male, 308 female) participated in an online study. The mean age was 50.8 years. After being presented with a consent form, in which participants had to freely consent and voluntarily agree to participate in the study before proceeding, participants were randomly presented with one of the 2 priming conditions, and were subsequently instructed to complete the questionnaire.

Priming

Given that the private and collective self-construal can be primed, participants were randomly assigned to one of two priming conditions (private vs. collective).

Although several different priming tasks have been successfully used in the literature when it comes to self-construal, it was important to consider that for this study, the sample was not limited to college students, and represented a much broader demographic. Moreover, the study was done in an online environment with time constraints, and thus the task had to be easy to understand and to complete. The priming task that was thus selected was one developed by Wang and Ross (2005).

In the private priming task, participants were asked to list ten statements about themselves that differentiate them from others and make them unique:

> How would you define yourself as a unique individual? List ten personal qualities, attributes, beliefs, or behaviours that do not relate to others and make you unique. For example, "I am smart" and "I am honest."

In the collective priming task, participants were asked to list ten statements about their memberships to social groups in which they share a common factor.

> How would you define yourself as a member of a social group? List ten memberships of social groups with which you are likely to be experiencing a "common fate." For example, "I am a

Catholic" (membership in a religious group) and "I am a daughter" (membership in a family group).

Manipulation Check: Priming

Self-thoughts were measured on two 7-point items **(**While completing the previous task, please describe the extent to which: you thought just about yourself; your thoughts were focused just on you) (Martin and Gnoth 2009; Aaker and Lee 2001). A new "private" variable was computed through averaging of these two items (r = .84). Similarly, thoughts about others were measured on two 7-point items (While completing the previous task, please describe the extent to which: you thought about you and other people; your thoughts were focused on you and other people)) (Martin and Gnoth 2009; Aaker and Lee 2001). A new "collective" variable was computed through averaging of these two items (r = .86). The four items were anchored by not at all/a lot.

Answers provided in the open-ended questions were verified to ensure that participants provided descriptions appropriate for their respective priming condition. Moreover, an independent samples t-test revealed that those participants that received the private prime engaged in more self-thoughts (M = 5.32) than those participants that received the collective prime (M = 4.90, $t(574) = 3.16$, $p < .01$). Furthermore, those participants that received the collective prime engaged in more thoughts about others (M = 5.23) than those participants that received the private prime (M = 4.59, $t(561.20) = -4.80$, $p < .001$).

Moreover, a paired samples t-test revealed that participants who received the private prime engaged in significantly more self-thoughts (M = 5.32) than thoughts about others (M = 4.59, $t(300) = 4.50$, $p < .001$). Also, for those participants that received the collective prime, there were significantly less self-thoughts (M = 4.90) than thoughts about others (M = 5.23, $t(274) = -2.44$, $p < .05$). It can therefore be concluded that the manipulation of private and collective self was indeed successful.

Manipulation Check: Brand Gender

Participants were then randomly presented with each of the three brands (Chanel, Hugo Boss and Clinique), and were asked to rate levels of MBP and FBP. The brand names were randomly presented in the font typical of each brand, on a plain white background. Moreover, participants were informed that each brand offers fragrances for both men and women.

Participants rated all three brands on the two-dimensional scale measuring gender dimensions of brand personality (Grohmann 2009). The scale included the six items measuring MBP (Cronbach's $\alpha = .92$) and the six items measuring FBP (Cronbach's $\alpha = .94$) which were randomized. Each item was evaluated on a 7-point scale (not at all descriptive/ extremely descriptive). Principal components factor analysis indeed revealed two factors. The first factor (with the feminine items loading onto it) accounted for 39.4% of the total variance explained. An FBP variable was therefore computed for each of the three brands through averaging of the 6 feminine brand personality items. The second factor (with the masculine items loading onto it) accounted for 35.5% of the total

variance explained. An MBP variable was therefore also computed for each of the three brands through averaging of the 6 masculine brand personality items.

One-sample t-test analysis with a comparison scale midpoint value of 4 was used to identify whether the three brands were rated significantly above 4 (high MBP/high FBP), significantly below 4 (low MBP/low FBP), or have a medium categorization that is not significantly different than 4.

The MBP rating ($M = 4.27$) for Hugo Boss was classified as significantly high ($t(575) = 4.47$, $p < .001$), whereas the FBP rating ($M = 2.97$) was classified as significantly low ($t(575) = -18.41$, $p < .001$). Paired t-test analysis also revealed that the two means were significantly different from each other ($t(575) = 19.72$, $p < .001$).

The MBP rating ($M = 3.58$) for Clinique was classified as significantly low ($t(575) = -7.43$, $p < .001$), whereas the FBP rating ($M = 4.21$) was classified as significantly high ($t(575) = 3.67$, $p < .001$). Paired t-test analysis revealed that the two means were significantly different from each other ($t(575) = -12.06$, $p < .001$).

The MBP rating ($M = 3.86$) for Chanel was classified as significantly low ($t(575) = -2.51$, $p < .05$), whereas the FBP rating ($M = 4.27$) was classified as significantly high ($t(575) = 4.66$, $p < .001$). Paired t-test analysis also revealed that the two means were significantly different from each other ($t(575) = -7.01$, $p < .001$).

The results suggest that for Hugo Boss and Clinique, findings are consistent with pretest 2, and therefore Hugo Boss can be classified as a masculine brand, while Clinique is classified as a feminine brand. However, results for Chanel are not consistent with

pretesting. Findings from the manipulation check suggest that Chanel is slightly more feminine than masculine.

To further investigate this finding, paired t-tests were used to compare the MBP and FBP levels between Chanel and Clinique. Results showed that the two brands do not have significantly different levels of FBP ($t(575) = 1.02$, $p > .31$). However, Chanel has a significantly higher level of MBP than Clinique ($t(575) = 5.51$, $p < .001$). These findings thus suggest that in comparison to each other Chanel is the most androgynous brand of the three, and therefore for the purpose of this study is classified as such.

Dependent Variables

Participants rated their attitude towards the brand, brand preference and purchase intention on 7-point bipolar scales for all three brands (i.e. Chanel, Hugo Boss and Clinique).

Attitude toward the brand (Sirgy et al. 1997; Grohmann 2009) consisted of three items (negative/positive; dislike/like; favourable/unfavourable) on which participants rated their global evaluations of the brand (Cronbach's $\alpha = .90$). Principal components factor analysis revealed that the three items loaded onto one factor accounting for 83.3% of the total variance explained. The "brand attitude" variable was therefore computed for each of the three brands through averaging of the three items (taking account for reverse scoring for the favourable/ unfavourable item).

Brand preference (Sirgy et al. 1997; Grohmann 2009) consisted of three items (very poor/very good; very unsatisfactory/very satisfactory; very unfavourable/very

favourable) on which participants rated their degree of preference for the brand relative to other brands in the same category (Cronbach's α = .97). Principal components factor analysis revealed that the three items loaded onto one factor accounting for 94.4% of the total variance explained. The "brand preference" variable was therefore computed for each of the three brands through averaging of the three items.

Lastly, purchase intention (Sirgy et al. 1997; Grohmann 2009) was rated on two items (unlikely/likely; improbable/probable) on which participants rated the likeliness of a future purchase (r = .97). Principal components factor analysis revealed that the two items loaded onto one factor accounting for 98.6% of the total variance explained. The "purchase intention" variable was therefore computed for each of the three brands through averaging of the two items.

Independent Variables

For gender identity, the measurement of sex-linked trait indexes was used (Stern, Barak, and Gould 1987) which is based on the short-form BSRI (Bem 1974) as developed by Barak and Stern (1986). Feminine Trait Index (FTI) consists of 10 feminine items (i.e. affectionate, loyal, tender, sensitive to other's needs, sympathetic, compassionate, eager to soothe hurt feelings, understanding, gentle, warm) (Cronbach's α = .94). Masculine Trait Index (MTI) consists of 10 masculine items (i.e. have leadership abilities, willing to take a stand, ambitious, competitive, dominant, assertive, a strong personality, forceful, act like a leader, aggressive) (Cronbach's α = .90). All participants were asked to rate themselves on both the FTI and MTI items, which were anchored by never or almost never true/always or almost always true, and were randomly

presented. Principal components factor analysis also revealed two factors. The first factor (with the feminine items loading onto it) accounted for 33.8% of the total variance explained. The second factor (with the masculine items loading onto it) accounted for 27.0% of the total variance explained. The FTI and MTI were therefore computed through averaging of the feminine items and masculine items, respectively.

Based on their scores, each participant was then categorized as high or low on each of the sex- linked trait indexes, through mid-point classification. Independent t-test analysis confirmed that those individuals receiving a low FTI score ($M = 3.19$) were significantly different those receiving a high FTI score ($M = 5.68$, $t(574) = -18.17$, $p < .001$), and that those individuals receiving a low MTI score ($M = 3.17$) were significantly different than those receiving a high MTI score ($M = 5.17$, $t(274.63) = -30.16$, $p < .001$). Finally, each participant was categorized as either feminine, masculine, androgynous or undifferentiated. If participants had a high FTI score, and low MTI score, they were classified as "feminine" (22% of participants). If participants had a low FTI score, and high MTI score, they were classified as "masculine" (6% of participants). If they scored high on both FTI and MTI, they were classified as "androgynous" (70% of participants). Lastly, if they received low scoring on both indexes, they were classified as "undifferentiated" (2% of participants).

The Revised Self-Monitoring Scale (Lennox and Wolfe 1984) was used to measure self-monitoring. This scale is made up of 13 items scored on 6-point scales. Participants were asked to indicate to what extent the statements applied to them, anchored by certainly always false/generally false/somewhat false, but with

exceptions/somewhat true, but with exceptions/generally true/certainly always true. All items were randomized. Seven of the items pertain to an individual's ability to modify self-presentation (e.g. In social situations, I have the ability to alter my behaviour if I feel that something else is called for; I have the ability to control the way I come across to people, depending on the impression I wish to give them; Once I know what the situation calls for, it's easy for me to regulate my actions accordingly.) The other 6 items pertain to an individual's sensitivity to the expressive behaviours of others (e.g. I am often able to read people's true emotions correctly through their eyes; I can usually tell when I've said something inappropriate by reading it in the listener's eyes; If someone is lying to me, I usually know it at once from that person's manner of expression). Although items can be averaged within these two scales to form factor indexes, a principal components factor analysis revealed three factors, with the first factor explaining 40.4% of the total variance, the second factor explaining 13.3% of the total variance and the third factor explaining 7.8% of the variance. Therefore, after taking into account items requiring reverse scoring, instead of forming two variables, all 13 items were averaged to form an overall measure of self-monitoring (Cronbach's $\alpha = .85$) following prior research (Lennox and Wolfe 1984), and as is outlined in the Handbook of Marketing Scales (Bearden, Netemeyer and Haws 2011). Based on their scores, each participant was then categorized as either a high or low self-monitor, through median split (median = 4.31). Independent t-test analysis confirmed that those individuals receiving a low self-monitoring score ($M = 3.80$) were significantly different those receiving a high self-monitoring score ($M = 4.82$, $t(574) = -30.37$, $p < .001$)

Similarly, the Concern for Appropriateness Scale (Lennox and Wolfe 1984) was used to measure concern for appropriateness. This scale consists of 20 items scored on 6-point scales, with the same anchors used for the Revised Self-Monitoring Scale. Seven items pertain to an individual's cross-situational variability (e.g. I tend to show different sides of myself to different people; Different situations can make me behave like very different people; Different people tend to have different impressions about the type of person I am), and the other 13 items pertain to an individual's attention to social comparison information (e.g. I actively avoid wearing clothes that are not in style; I try to pay attention to the reactions of others to my behaviour in order to avoid being out of place; If I am the least bit uncertain as to how to act in a social situation, I look to the behaviour of others for cues). Items were randomly presented to participants. Again, principal components factor analysis revealed that instead of loading onto two factors, these 20 items loaded onto four factors (with the first factor explaining 35.5% of the total variance, the second factor explaining 48.4% of the total variance, the third factor explaining 6.9% of the total variance, and the fourth factor explaining 5.3% of the total variance). Therefore, following similar logic as with the self-monitoring scale, and after taking into account any item requiring reverse scoring, all 20 items were averaged to form an overall measure of concern for appropriateness (Cronbach's $\alpha = .89$). Based on their scores, each participant was then categorized as either having a high or low concern for appropriateness, through median split (median = 3.45). Independent t-test analysis confirmed that those individuals receiving a low concern for appropriateness score ($M = 2.87$) were significantly different those receiving a high concern for appropriateness score ($M = 4.05$, $t(574) = -29.57$, $p < .001$).

Although product category involvement was pretested, involvement with the fragrance category was measured again to ensure equal involvement with the fragrance category for both men and women. Participants therefore rated the fragrance product category on the 10 randomized items of The Revised Product Involvement Inventory (McQuarrie and Munsoon 1991) on a 7-point bipolar scale (Cronbach's $\alpha = .95$). One factor emerged from a principal components factor analysis, explaining 70.3% of the total variance. Therefore, after taking into account items requiring reverse scoring, the 10 items were averaged to form a measure of involvement. Results from an independent t-test analysis revealed that males ($M = 4.51$) had significantly lower levels of involvement that females ($M = 4.94$, $t(574) = -.40$, $p < .001$).

Similarly, brand usage (I never use this brand/ I regularly use this brand) and familiarity levels (how familiar are you with the brand: not at all familiar/very familiar) among males and females were evaluated on two 7 point-bipolar scales. For brand usage, univariate ANOVA analysis revealed that for the three brands, the main effects of sex ($F (1, 1722) = 39.28$, $p < .001$), and brand ($F (2, 1722) = 25.94$, $p < .001$) were both significant, and that the interaction between sex and brand was also significant ($F (2, 1722) = 55.76$, $p < .001$).

For brand familiarity, univariate ANOVA analysis also revealed that for the three brands, the main effects of sex ($F (1, 1722) = 36.53$, $p < .001$), and brand ($F (2, 1722) = 80.22$, $p < .001$) were both significant, and that the interaction between sex and brand was also significant ($F (2, 1722) = 39.84$, $p < .001$).

Given the outcome of this analysis, product category involvement, brand usage, brand familiarity and sex were included as covariates in the subsequent hypotheses testing, in order to control for their effects by removing the variance for which they account.

Results

Hypothesis 1

> **H1**: Androgynous individuals, as opposed to other individuals (i.e. masculine, feminine and undifferentiated), will have more positive attitudes, a greater preference and increased purchase intentions for brands possessing an androgynous personality, than brands possessing a masculine or feminine brand personality.

Repeated measures MANCOVA was carried out to determine whether the between-subject factor gender identity and the within-subject factor gendered brand personality had an effect on brand preference, attitudes and purchase intentions. Repeated measures MANCOVA was considered appropriate for this data analysis given that the measurement of the dependent variables was repeated for each of the brands under three different conditions (i.e. masculine, feminine, androgynous brand personalities). A separate analysis was run for each of the dependent variables, comparing the responses between each of the three brands.

In the first analysis, the dependent variables were Chanel brand attitude, Hugo Boss brand attitude and Clinique brand attitude. Mauchly's test indicated that the

assumption for sphericity had not been violated (χ^2 (2) = 3.13, p > .20), and therefore sphericity was assumed [Greenhouse-Geisser ε = .994]. Of the covariates, Chanel familiarity (F (1, 564) = 16.46, p < .001), Hugo Boss familiarity (F (1, 564) = 7.85, p = .005), Clinique usage (F (1, 564) = 4.20, p < .05), Clinique familiarity (F (1, 564) = 4.62, p < .05) and involvement (F (1, 564) = 45.82, p < .001) were significant. Also, the interaction between involvement and brand was significant (F (2, 1128) = 5.71, p < .005), as were the interactions between usage and brand, as well as familiarity and brand (Chanel: brand and usage (F (2, 1128) = 12.37, p < .001), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1128) = 21.82, p < .001); Hugo Boss: brand and usage (F (2, 1128) = 27.51, p < .001), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1128) = 12.84, p < .001); Clinique: brand and usage (F (2, 1128) = 17.659, p < .001), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1128) = 21.65, p < .001)). No other covariate effects emerged (p's > .05). Results revealed no significant main or interaction effects (p's > .06). Therefore, for brand attitudes, H1 is rejected.

The analysis was run again, however this time the dependent variables were Chanel preference, Hugo Boss preference and Clinique preference. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity was violated (χ^2 (2) = 9.18, p < .05), and therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity (ε = .984). Of the covariates, Chanel familiarity (F (1, 564) = 29.09, p < .001), Hugo Boss familiarity (F (1, 564) = 10.02, p = .005), Clinique usage (F (1, 564) = 8.71, p < .05), Clinique familiarity (F (1, 564) = 5.62, p < .05) and involvement (F (1, 564) = 31.05, p < .001) were significant. Also, the interaction between involvement and brand was significant (F (2, 1110.04) = 2.95, p < .005), and lastly interactions between usage and brand, as well as familiarity and brand were significant for all three brands (Chanel:

brand and usage ($F(2, 1110.04) = 15.15$, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity ($F(2, 1110.04) = 29.55$, $p < .001$); Hugo Boss: brand and usage ($F(2, 1110.04) = 15.34$, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity ($F(2, 1110.04) = 12.84$, $p < .001$); Clinique: brand and usage ($F(2, 1110.04) = 11.60$, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity ($F(2, 1110.04) = 23.25$, $p < .001$)). No other covariate effects emerged (p's $> .05$). Results showed that the main effect of gender identity was significant ($F(3, 564) = 3.39$, $p < .05$), but the main effect of brand was not significant ($p > .52$). The interaction between brand and gender identity was also significant ($F(6, 1110.04) = 2.49$, $p < .05$).

To further investigate these results, paired-samples t-tests were conducted for androgynous, masculine and feminine individuals, in order to compare preference levels between the brand congruent to their gender identity, and the other ones. For androgynous individuals (Table 7), preference levels for Chanel were greater than those of Hugo Boss ($t(407) = 9.38$, $p < .001$), however preference levels between Chanel and Clinique were not significantly different ($t(407) = -1.14$, $p > .25$). For masculine individuals (Table 8), preference levels for Hugo Boss were lower than those for Chanel, ($t(24) = 2.45$, $p < .05$), while there was no significant difference between preference for Hugo Boss and Clinique ($t(24) = -1.45$, $p > .16$). For feminine individuals (Table 9), there were significantly greater levels of brand preference for Clinique than Hugo Boss ($t(127) = -8.36$, $p < .001$), however there was no significant difference between Clinique and Chanel, ($t(127) = .19$, $p > .85$). Lastly, for undifferentiated individuals (Table 10), there were significantly greater levels of brand preference for Chanel than Hugo Boss ($t(14) = 2.68$, $p < .05$), however there was no significant difference between Clinique and

Chanel, ($t(14) = -1.99$, $p > .06$), nor between Hugo Boss and Clinique ($t(14) = -1.36$, $p > .19$). Therefore for brand preferences, H1 is partially supported.

Table 3: Preference Levels for Androgynous Individuals

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Chanel Preference	5.34	1.35
Hugo Boss Preference	4.66	1.21
Clinique Preference	5.26	1.29

Table 4: Preference Levels for Masculine Individuals

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Chanel Preference	4.91	1.16
Hugo Boss Preference	4.07	1.12
Clinique Preference	4.55	1.44

Table 5: Preference Levels for Feminine Individuals

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Chanel Preference	5.13	1.23
Hugo Boss Preference	4.12	1.20
Clinique Preference	5.15	1.13

Table 6: Preference Levels for Undifferentiated Individuals

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Chanel Preference	4.76	1.48
Hugo Boss Preference	3.31	1.49
Clinique Preference	3.89	1.58

Lastly, the analysis was run again, this time with dependent variables Chanel purchase intention, Hugo Boss purchase intention and Clinique purchase intention.

Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity was not violated (χ^2 (2) = 4.39, p > .11), and therefore sphericity was assumed [Greenhouse-Geisser ε = .992]. Of the covariates, Chanel usage (F (1, 564) = 69.58, p < .001), Hugo Boss usage (F (1, 564) = 43.87, p = .005), Clinique usage (F (1, 564) = 80.50, p < .05), and involvement (F (1, 564) = 49.84, p < .001) were significant. Also, interactions between usage and brand, as well as familiarity and brand were significant for all three brands (Chanel: brand and usage (F (2, 1128) = 61.44, p < .001), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1128) = 6.36, p < .001); brand and usage (F (2, 1128) = 49.37, p < .001), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1128) = 2.87, p<.001); brand and usage (F (2, 1128) = 54.83, p < .001), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1128) = 10.48, p < .001)). There were no other significant effects involving the covariates (p's > .06). The results showed that the main effect of brand was significant (F (2, 1128) = 4.23, p < .05). The main effect of gender identity and the interaction between brand and gender identity, however, were not significant (p's > .10). Therefore, for purchase intention H1 is rejected.

Hypothesis 2a

> **H2a**: When the private self is primed, androgynous individuals, as opposed to other individuals (i.e. masculine, feminine and undifferentiated), will have more positive attitudes, a greater preference and increased purchase intentions for androgynous brands, than those brands that have either masculine or feminine personalities.

Repeated measures MANCOVA was conducted to determine whether the between-subject factors prime and gender identity and the within-subject factor gendered

brand personality had an effect on attitudes, preference and purchase intentions. As before, sex, brand familiarity and usage, as well as product involvement were included as covariates. Moreover, an analysis was run for each of the dependent variables, comparing the responses between each of the three brands.

In the first analysis for hypothesis 2a, the dependent variables were Chanel brand attitude, Hugo Boss brand attitude and Clinique brand attitude. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity had not been violated (χ^2 (2) = 3.95, $p > .13$), and therefore sphericity was assumed [Greenhouse-Geisser $\varepsilon = .993$]. Of the covariates, Chanel familiarity ($F (1, 560) = 17.83$, $p < .001$), Hugo Boss familiarity ($F (1, 560) = 7.65$, $p < .01$), Clinique usage ($F (1, 560) = 4.55$, $p < .05$) and Clinique familiarity ($F (1, 560) = 4.76$, $p < .05$), as well as involvement ($F (1, 560) = 45.92$, $p < .001$) were all significant. Also, the interaction between involvement and brand was significant ($F (2, 1120) = 6.44$, $p < .005$), and interactions between usage and brand, and between familiarity and brand were significant for all three brands (Chanel: brand and usage ($F (2, 1120) = 11.98$, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity ($F (2, 1120) = 20.78$, $p < .001$); Hugo Boss: brand and usage ($F(2, 1120) = 26.82$, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity ($F(2, 1120) = 13.09$, $p < .001$); Clinique: brand and usage ($F (2, 1120) = 17.81$, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity ($F (2, 1120) = 20.62$, $p < .001$)). No other significant covariate effects emerged ($p's > .33$). Results revealed that the interactions between brand and gender identity ($F (6, 1120) = 3.07$, $p < .01$), and between brand and prime ($F (2, 1120) = 6.18$, $p < .005$) were significant, however no other main or interaction effects were significant ($p's > .07$). Therefore, for brand attitude, H2a is rejected.

In the second analysis for hypothesis 2a, the dependent variables were Chanel preference, Hugo Boss preference and Clinique preference. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity was violated (χ^2 (2) = 9.82, p > .01), and therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity (ε = .983). Of the covariates, Chanel familiarity (F (1, 560) = 29.54, p < .001), Hugo Boss familiarity (F (1, 560) = 9.72, p < .005), Clinique usage (F (1, 560) = 9.02, p < .005) and Clinique familiarity (F (1, 560) = 5.51, p < .05), as well as involvement (F (1, 560) = 31.02, p < .001) were all significant. Also, the interaction between involvement and brand was significant (F (2, 1100.83) = 3.18, p < .05), and interactions between usage and brand, as well as those between familiarity and brand were significant for all three brands (Chanel: brand and usage (F (2, 1100.83) = 14.78, p < .001), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1100.83) = 28.48, p < .001); Hugo Boss: brand and usage (F (2, 1100.83) = 22.03, p < .001), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1100.83) = 15.29, p < .001); Clinique: brand and usage (F (2, 1100.83) = 11.33, p < .001), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1100.83) = 22.66, p < .001)). No other significant effects involving covariates emerged (p's > .12). Results revealed a significant interaction of brand and gender identity (F (6, 1100.83) = 2.56, p < .05) and a significant main effect for gender identity (F (3, 560) = 2.76, p < .05), but no other significant main or interaction effects were present (p's >.22). Therefore, for brand preferences, H2a is rejected.

In the last analysis for hypothesis 2a, the dependent variables were Chanel purchase intention, Hugo Boss purchase intention and Clinique purchase intention. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity had not been violated (χ^2 (2) = 4.27, p > .11), and therefore sphericity was assumed [Greenhouse-Geisser ε = .992]. Of

the covariates, Chanel usage ($F (1, 560) = 70.33$, $p < .001$), Hugo Boss usage ($F (1, 560) = 44.39$, $p < .001$), Clinique usage ($F (1, 560) = 78.16$, $p < .001$) and involvement ($F (1, 560) = 49.84$, $p < .001$) were all significant. Also, the interaction between usage and brand was significant for all three brands, while the interaction between familiarity and brand was significant for Chanel and Clinique only (Chanel: brand and usage ($F (2, 1120) = 60.63$, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity ($F (2, 1120) = 6.34$, $p < .001$); Hugo Boss: brand and usage ($F (2, 1120) = 48.47$, $p < .001$); Clinique: brand and usage ($F (2, 1120) = 55.15$, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity ($F (2, 1120) = 9.83$, $p < .001$)). There were no other significant covariate effects (p's $> .05$). Results showed that the main effect of brand was significant ($F (2, 1120) = 4.48$, $p < .05$). No other main and interaction effects reached significance (p's $> .13$). Therefore, for purchase intentions, H2a is rejected.

Hypothesis 2b

> **H2b**: When the collective self is primed, androgynous men as opposed to other men (i.e. masculine, feminine and undifferentiated), will have more positive attitudes, a greater preference and increased purchase intentions for brands with masculine personalities, whereas androgynous women as opposed to other women (i.e. masculine, feminine and undifferentiated), will have more positive attitudes, a greater preference and increased purchase intentions for brands with feminine personalities.

Repeated measures MANCOVA was carried out again, this time to determine whether the between-subject factors prime, gender identity and sex and the within-subject factor gendered brand personality had any effect on brand attitudes, preferences and

purchase intentions. Brand familiarity and usage, as well as product involvement were included as covariates. The analysis was run for each of the dependent variables, comparing the responses between each of the three brands.

In the first analysis for hypothesis 2b, the dependent variables were Chanel brand attitude, Hugo Boss brand attitude and Clinique brand attitude. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity had not been violated (χ^2 (2) = 3.30, $p > .19$), and therefore sphericity was assumed [Greenhouse-Geisser $\varepsilon = .994$]. Of the covariates, Chanel usage ($F (1, 553) = 4.43$, $p < .05$), Chanel familiarity ($F (1, 553) = 17.53$, $p < .001$), Hugo Boss familiarity ($F (1, 553) = 7.31$, $p < .01$), Clinique familiarity ($F (1, 553) = 5.95$, $p < .05$) and involvement ($F (1, 553) = 48.13$, $p < .001$) were significant. Also, the interaction between involvement and brand was significant ($F (2, 1106) = 6.36$, $p < .005$), and interactions between usage and brand, as well as familiarity and brand were significant for all brands (Chanel: brand and usage ($F (2, 1106) = 11.93$, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity ($F (2, 1120) = 20.18$, $p < .001$); Hugo Boss: brand and usage ($F (2, 1106) = 28.27$, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity ($F (2, 1106) = 12.91$, $p < .001$); Clinique: brand and usage ($F (2, 1106) = 17.72$, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity ($F (2, 1106) = 20.85$, $p < .001$)). No other covariate effects were significant (p's > .06). Results revealed that the interactions between brand and gender identity ($F (6, 1106) = 2.90$, $p < .01$), between brand and prime ($F (2, 1106) = 6.64$, $p = .001$), between gender identity and sex ($F (3, 553) = 3.97$, $p < .05$), as well as between gender identity, prime and sex ($F (3, 553) = 2.89$, $p < .05$) and between brand, gender identity and prime ($F (6, 1106) = 2.30$, $p < .05$) were all significant. However, no other main or interaction effects reached significance (p's > .05). Therefore, for brand attitudes, H2b is rejected.

In the second analysis for hypothesis 2b, the dependent variables were Chanel preference, Hugo Boss preference and Clinique preference. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity was violated (χ^2 (2) = 9.16, $p < .05$), and therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity ($\varepsilon = .984$). Of the covariates, Chanel familiarity (F (1, 553) = 28.98, $p < .001$), Hugo Boss familiarity (F (1, 553) = 9.36, $p < .005$), Clinique usage (F (1, 553) = 6.68, $p = .01$), Clinique familiarity (F (1, 553) = 6.96, $p < .01$) and involvement (F (1, 553) = 33.03, $p < .001$) were significant. Also, the interaction between involvement and brand was significant (F (2, 1088.09) = 2.92, $p < .05$), as well as those interactions between usage and brand, and familiarity and brand (Chanel: brand and usage (F (2, 1088.09) = 14.41, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1088.09) = 29.02, $p < .001$); Hugo Boss: brand and usage (F (2, 1088.09) = 22.19, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1088.09) = 14.88, $p < .001$); Clinique: brand and usage (F (2, 1088.09) =11.580, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1088.09) = 23.29, $p < .001$)). No other covariate effect emerged (p's > .14). Results revealed that the main effect of gender identity (F (3, 553) = 2.68, $p < .05$) and interactions between gender identity and sex (F (3, 553) = 3.72, $p < .05$), between brand and gender identity (F (6, 1088.09) = 2.61, $p < .05$), between brand, gender identity and prime (F (6, 1088.09) = .60, $p < .05$), and lastly, between brand and sex (F (2, 1088.09) = 3.32, $p < .05$) were all significant. However, no other main or interaction effects reached significance (p's > .09). Therefore, for brand preference, H2b is rejected.

In the last analysis for hypothesis 2b, the dependent variables were Chanel purchase intention, Hugo Boss purchase intention and Clinique purchase intention. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity had not been violated (χ^2 (2) =

4.21, $p > .12$), and therefore sphericity was assumed [Greenhouse-Geisser $\varepsilon = .992$]. Of the covariates, Chanel usage ($F (1, 553) = 72.44$, $p < .001$), Hugo Boss usage ($F (1, 553) = 44.94$, $p < .001$), Clinique usage ($F (1, 553) = 73.19$, $p < .001$) and involvement ($F (1, 553) = 49.02$, $p < .001$) were significant. Also, interactions between usage and brand were significant for all three brands, while interactions between familiarity and brand were significant only for Chanel and Clinique (Chanel: brand and usage ($F (2, 1106) = 58.79$, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity ($F (2, 1120) = 6.18$, $p < .01$); Hugo Boss: brand and usage ($F (2, 1106) = 49.87$, $p < .001$); Clinique: brand and usage ($F (2, 1106) = 54.64$, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity ($F(2, 1106) = 9.97$, $p < .001$)). No other covariate effect was significant (p's $> .05$). Results revealed that the interaction between brand and sex ($F (2, 1106) = 4.45$, $p < .05$) was significant, but there were no other significant main or interaction effects (p's $> .05$). Therefore, for purchase intentions, H2b is rejected.

Hypothesis 3a

> **H3a**: Androgynous individuals, as opposed to other individuals (i.e. masculine, feminine and undifferentiated), who are also low self-monitors (or have a low concern for appropriateness), will have more positive attitudes, a greater preference and increased purchase intentions for androgynous brands than other brands, regardless of whether the private or collective self is primed.

Repeated measures MANCOVA was also conducted to determine whether the between-subject factors self-monitoring/ concern for appropriateness and gender identity and the within-subject factor gendered brand personality had an effect on brand preference, attitudes and purchase intentions. As before, sex, brand familiarity and usage,

as well as product involvement were included as covariates. Moreover, an analysis was run for each of the dependent variables separately, comparing the responses between each of the three brands.

In the first analysis for hypothesis 3a, the dependent variables were Chanel brand attitude, Hugo Boss brand attitude and Clinique brand attitude, with self-monitoring, gender identity and gendered brand personality as the independent variables. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity had not been violated (χ^2 (2) = 3.50, p > .17), and therefore sphericity was assumed [Greenhouse-Geisser ε = .994]. Of the covariates, Chanel familiarity (F (1, 560) = 16.74, p < .001), Hugo Boss familiarity (F (1, 560) = 7.04, p < .01), Clinique usage (F (1, 560) = 4.38, p < .05), Clinique familiarity (F (1, 560) = 3.88, p < .05) and involvement (F (1, 560) = 42.29, p < .001) were significant. Also, the interaction between involvement and brand was significant (F (2, 1120) = 6.13, p < .005), as were all interactions between usage and brand, and familiarity and brand (Chanel: brand and usage (F (2, 1120) = 12.59, p < .001), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1120) = 20.93, p < .001); Hugo Boss: brand and usage (F (2, 1120) = 26.88, p < .001), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1120) = 12.52, p < .001); Clinique: brand and usage (F (2, 1120) = 18.24, p < .001), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1120) = 20.14, p < .001)). No other significant covariate effect emerged (p's > .05). Furthermore, results revealed no significant main or interaction effects (p's > .22).

The same analysis was re-run, but this time self-monitoring was replaced with concern for appropriateness. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity had not been violated (χ^2 (2) = 2.92, p > .23), and therefore sphericity was assumed

[Greenhouse-Geisser ε = .995]. Of the covariates, Chanel usage ($F (1, 560) = 3.98$, $p < .05$), Chanel familiarity ($F (1, 560) = 16.65$, $p < .001$), Hugo Boss familiarity ($F (1, 560) = 7.44$, $p < .01$), Clinique familiarity ($F (1, 560) = 4.53$, $p < .05$) and involvement ($F (1, 560) = 45.33$, $p < .001$) were significant. Also, the interaction between involvement and brand was significant ($F (2, 1120) = 5.86$, $p < .005$), and interactions between usage and brand, as well as familiarity and brand were significant for all three brands (Chanel: brand and usage ($F (2, 1120) = 12.32$, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity ($F (2, 1120) = 21.65$, $p < .001$); Hugo Boss: brand and usage ($F (2, 1120) = 24.19$, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity ($F (2, 1120) = 12.89$, $p < .001$); Clinique: brand and usage ($F (2, 1120) = 17.46$, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity ($F (2, 1120) = 21.49$, $p < .001$)). No other significant covariate effect emerged (p's $> .06$). Results also revealed no significant main or interaction effects (p's $> .06$). Therefore, for brand attitudes, H3a is rejected.

In the second analysis for hypothesis 3a, the dependent variables were Chanel preference, Hugo Boss brand preference and Clinique preference, and the independent variables were self-monitoring, gender identity and gendered brand personality. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity was violated ($\chi^2 (2) = 9.34$, $p < .01$), therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity ($\varepsilon = .983$). Of the covariates, Chanel familiarity ($F (1, 560) = 30.19$, $p < .001$), Hugo Boss familiarity ($F (1, 560) = 8.94$, $p < .005$), Clinique usage ($F (1, 560) = 9.20$, $p < .005$), Clinique familiarity ($F (1, 560) = 4.63$, $p < .05$) and involvement ($F (1, 560) = 28.05$, $p < .001$) were significant. Also, the interaction between involvement and brand ($F (2, 1101.75) = 3.46$, $p < .05$) was significant, as were interactions between usage and brand, and familiarity and brand for all three brands (Chanel: brand and usage (F (2,

1101.75) = 15.20, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity ($F (2, 1101.75) = 28.60$, $p < .001$); Hugo Boss: brand and usage ($F (2, 1101.75) = 21.63$, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity ($F (2, 1101.75) = 15.18$, $p < .001$); Clinique: brand and usage ($F (2, 1101.75) = 11.54$, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity ($F (2, 1101.75) = 21.73$, $p < .001$)). No other significant covariate effect emerged (p's $> .38$). Furthermore, results revealed no significant main or interaction effects (p's $> .21$).

The same analysis was carried out, again with the self-monitoring variable replaced with concern for appropriateness. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity was violated ($\chi^2 (2) = 8.71$, $p < .05$), and therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity ($\varepsilon = .985$). Of the covariates, Chanel familiarity ($F (1, 560) = 29.18$, $p < .001$), Hugo Boss familiarity ($F (1, 560) = 9.80$, $p < .005$), Clinique usage ($F (1, 560) = 8.29$, $p < .005$), Clinique familiarity ($F (1, 560) = 5.41$, $p < .05$) and involvement ($F (1, 560) = 30.30$, $p < .001$) were significant. Also, interactions between usage and brand, as well as familiarity and brand were significant for all three brands (Chanel: brand and usage ($F (2, 1102.94) = 15.38$, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity ($F (2, 1102.94) = 28.59$, $p < .001$); Hugo Boss: brand and usage ($F (2, 1102.943) = 19.71$, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity ($F (2, 1102.94) = 15.09$, $p < .001$); Clinique: brand and usage ($F (2, 1102.94) = 11.68$, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity ($F (2, 1102.94) = 23.01$, $p < .001$)). No other significant covariate effect emerged (p's $> .05$). Results revealed that the main effect for gender identity ($F (3, 560) = 3.28$, $p < .05$) and the interaction between brand and gender identity ($F (6, 1102.94) = 2.94$, $p < .01$) were significant, however, all other main and interaction effects were not significant (p's $> .21$). Therefore, for brand preference, H3a is rejected.

In the last analysis for hypothesis 3a, the dependent variables were Chanel purchase intention, Hugo Boss purchase intention and Clinique purchase intention, and the independent variables were self-monitoring, gender identity and gendered brand personality. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity was not violated (χ^2 (2) = 4.34, p > .11), and therefore sphericity was assumed [Greenhouse-Geisser ε = .992]. Of the covariates, Chanel usage (F (1, 560) = 69.27, p < .001), Hugo Boss usage (F (1, 560) = 41.29, p < .001), Clinique usage (F (1, 560) = 80.46, p < .001) and involvement (F (1, 560) = 46.49, p < .001) were significant. Also, the interaction between involvement and brand was significant (p < .05), and interactions between usage and brand were significant for all three brands, while the interactions between familiarity and brand were significant only for Chanel and Clinique (Chanel: brand and usage (F (2, 1120) = 62.26, p < .001), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1120) = 5.76, p < .005); Hugo Boss: brand and usage (F (2, 1120) = 50.46, p < .001); Clinique: brand and usage (F (2, 1120) = 55.52, p < .001), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1120) = 9.99, p < .001)). All other covariate effects were not significant (p's > .05). Results revealed no significant main or interaction effects (p's > .05).

The same analysis was re-run, with concern for appropriateness replacing self-monitoring. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity had not been violated (χ^2 (2) = 4.42, p > .11), and therefore sphericity was assumed [Greenhouse-Geisser ε = .992]. Of the covariates, Chanel usage (F (1, 560) = 67.07, p < .001), Hugo Boss usage (F (1, 560) = 40.64, p < .001), Clinique usage (F (1, 560) = 79.92, p < .001) and involvement (F (1, 560) = 48.89, p < .001) were significant. Also, interactions between usage and brand were significant for all three brands, while those between

familiarity and brand were significant for Chanel and Clinique only (Chanel: brand and usage ($F(2, 1120) = 61.58$, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity ($F(2, 1120) = 6.24$, $p < .005$); Hugo Boss: brand and usage ($F(2, 1120) = 44.50$, $p < .001$); Clinique: brand and usage ($F(2, 1120) = 55.22$, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity ($F(2, 1120) = 10.30$, $p < .001$)). All other covariate effects were not significant (p's $> .06$). Results revealed that the main effect of brand was significant ($F(2, 1120) = 4.37$, $p < .05$), but there were no other significant main or interaction effects (p's $> .19$). Therefore, for purchase intention, H3a is rejected.

Hypothesis 3b

> **H3b**: Androgynous individuals, as opposed to other individuals (i.e. masculine, feminine and undifferentiated), who are also high self-monitors (or have a high concern for appropriateness), will have more positive attitudes, a greater preference and increased purchase intentions for androgynous brands than other brands when the private self is primed.

Repeated measures MANCOVA was conducted again to determine whether the between-subject factors self-monitoring/ concern for appropriateness, gender identity and prime and the within-subject factor gendered brand personality had an effect on brand preference, attitudes and purchase intentions. As before, sex, brand familiarity and usage, as well as product involvement were included as covariates. Moreover, an analysis was run for each of the dependent variables, comparing the responses between each of the three brands.

In the first analysis for hypothesis 3b, the dependent variables were Chanel brand attitude, Hugo Boss brand attitude and Clinique brand attitude, and the independent variables were self-monitoring, gender identity, prime and gendered brand personality. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity had not been violated (χ^2 (2) = 4.73, p > .09), and therefore sphericity was assumed [Greenhouse-Geisser ε = .992]. Of the covariates, Chanel familiarity (F (1, 553) = 17.94, p < .001), Hugo Boss familiarity (F (1, 553) = 6.98, p < .01), Clinique usage (F (1, 553) = 4.78, p < .05) and involvement (F (1, 553) = 42.42, p < .001) were significant. Also, the interaction between involvement and brand was significant (F (2, 1106) = 6.72, p = .001), and lastly the interactions between usage and brand, as well as familiarity and brand were significant for all three brands (Chanel: brand and usage (F (2, 1106) = 13.26, p < .001), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1106) = 19.46, p < .001); Hugo Boss: brand and usage (F(2, 1106) = 26.15, p < .001), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1106) = 13.07, p < .001); Clinique: brand and usage (F (2, 1106) = 18.33, p < .001), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1106) = 19.09, p < .001)). No other significant covariate effect emerged (p's > .05). Results revealed that the interaction between brand and prime (F (2, 1106) = 5.40, p = .005) was significant, such that there was a significant difference for Chanel between the private (M = 5.31) and collective conditions (M = 5.06, t(574) = 2.30, p < .05), and Hugo Boss between the private (M = 4.59) and collective conditions (M = 4.32, t(574) = 2.72, p < .01), but not for Clinique (private condition (M = 5.17), collective condition (M = 5.09, t(549.71) = .73, p > .46)). All other main and interaction effects were not significant (p's > .06).

Again, the same analysis was conducted, replacing self-monitoring with concern for appropriateness. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity had not

been violated (χ^2 (2) = 3.33, p > .19), and therefore sphericity was assumed [Greenhouse-Geisser ε = .994]. Of the covariates, Chanel familiarity (F (1, 553) = 16.93, p < .001), Hugo Boss familiarity (F (1, 553) = 7.17, p < .01), Clinique familiarity (F (1, 553) = 5.06, p < .05) and involvement (F (1, 553) = 46.67, p < .001) were significant. Also, the interaction between involvement and brand was significant (F (2, 1106) = 7.27, p = .001), and interactions between usage and brand, as well as familiarity and brand were significant for all three brands (Chanel: brand and usage (F (2, 1106) = 12.62, p < .001), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1106) = 20.17, p < .001); Hugo Boss: brand and usage (F (2, 1106) = 26.08, p < .001), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1106) = 12.68, p < .001); Clinique: brand and usage (F (2, 1106) = 17.91, p < .001), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1106) = 20.28, p < .001)). No other significant covariate effect emerged (p's > .06). Results revealed that the interactions between brand and gender identity (F (6, 1106) = 2.89, p < .01), and brand and prime (F (2, 1106) = 6.24, p < .005), as well as the interaction between brand, gender identity, concern for appropriateness and prime (F (4, 1106) = 2.41, p < .05) were significant. All other main and interaction effects were not significant (p's > .08).

To further investigate the significant interaction between brand, gender identity, concern for appropriateness and prime, a repeated measures MANCOVA was conducted for those individuals in the private prime. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity had not been violated (χ^2 (2) = 2.50, p > .28), and therefore sphericity was assumed [Greenhouse-Geisser ε = .991]. Of the covariates, Chanel familiarity (F (1, 286) = 7.43, p < .01), Hugo Boss familiarity (F (1, 286) = 9.98, p < .005), sex (F (1, 286) = 4.64, p < .05) and involvement (F (1, 286) = 23.86, p < .001) were significant. Also, the

interaction between involvement and brand was significant ($F (2, 572) = 5.91$, $p < .005$), interactions between usage and brand were significant for all three brands, and interactions between familiarity and brand were only significant for Chanel and Clinique (Chanel: brand and usage ($F (2, 572) = 7.23$, $p = .001$), brand and familiarity ($F (2, 572) = 9.39$, $p < .001$); Hugo Boss: brand and usage ($F (2, 572) = 22.03$, $p < .001$); Clinique: brand and usage ($F (2, 572) = 9.30$, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity ($F (2, 572) = 9.35$, $p < .001$)). No other significant covariate effect emerged (p's $> .24$). Results revealed that the interaction between brand and gender identity was significant ($F (6, 572) = 3.28$, $p < .005$), however all other main and interaction effects were not significant (p's $> .60$). Therefore, for brand attitudes, H3b is rejected.

In the second analysis for hypothesis 3b, the dependent variables were Chanel brand preference, Hugo Boss brand preference and Clinique brand preference, and the independent variables were self-monitoring, gender identity, prime and gendered brand personality. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity was violated ($\chi^2 (2) = 10.02$, $p < .01$), and therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity ($\varepsilon = .982$). Of the covariates, Chanel familiarity ($F (1, 553) = 30.18$, $p < .001$), Hugo Boss familiarity ($F (1, 553) = 8.43$, $p < .005$), Clinique usage ($F (1, 553) = 9.29$, $p < .005$), Clinique familiarity ($F (1, 553) = 4.66$, $p < .05$) and involvement ($F (1, 553) = 28.01$, $p < .001$) were significant. Also, the interaction between involvement and brand was significant ($F (2, 1086.46) = 3.68$, $p = .001$), as were the interactions between usage and brand, as well as between familiarity and brand for all three brands (Chanel: brand and usage ($F (2, 1086.46) = 17.04$, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity ($F (2, 1086.46) = 26.16$, $p < .001$); Hugo Boss: brand and usage ($F (2,$

1086.46) = 21.45, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1086.46) = 16.05, $p < .001$); Clinique: brand and usage (F (2, 1086.46) = 11.35, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1086.46) = 21.05, $p < .001$)). All other covariate effects were not significant (p's > .14). Results revealed that the interaction between brand, self-monitoring and prime (F (2, 1086.46) = 4.04, $p < .05$) was significant, however all other main and interaction effects were not significant (p's > .08).

The same analysis was conducted, replacing self-monitoring with concern for appropriateness. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity was violated (χ^2 (2) = 9.31, p = .01), and therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity (ε = .984). Of the covariates, Chanel familiarity (F (1, 553) = 29.19, $p < .001$), Hugo Boss familiarity (F (1, 553) = 9.26, $p < .005$), Clinique usage (F (1, 553) = 8.24, $p < .005$), Clinique familiarity (F (1, 553) = 5.45, $p < .05$) and involvement (F (1, 553) = 29.36, $p < .001$) were significant. Also, the interaction between involvement and brand was significant (F (2, 1087.81) = 3.44, $p < .05$), and lastly, interactions between usage and brand, as well as familiarity and brand were significant for all three brands (Chanel: brand and usage (F (2, 1087.81) = 15.54, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1087.81) = 26.97, $p < .001$); Hugo Boss: brand and usage (F (2, 1087.81) = 20.34, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1087.81) = 14.57, $p < .001$); Clinique: brand and usage (F (2, 1087.81) = 11.48, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1087.81) = 22.16, $p < .001$)). No other significant covariate effect emerged (p's > .13). Results revealed that the interactions between brand and gender identity (F (6, 1087.81) = 3.16, p = .005), and between brand and prime (F (2, 1087.81) =

3.52, $p < .05$) were significant. All other main and interaction effects were not significant (p's $> .05$). Therefore for brand preference, H3b is rejected.

In the last analysis for hypothesis 3b, the dependent variables were Chanel purchase intention, Hugo Boss purchase intention and Clinique purchase intention, and the independent variables were self-monitoring, gender identity, prime and gendered brand personality. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity had not been violated (χ^2 (2) = 4.47, $p > .10$), and therefore sphericity was assumed [Greenhouse-Geisser $\varepsilon = .992$]. Of the covariates, Chanel usage (F (1, 553) = 69.73, $p < .001$), Hugo Boss usage (F (1, 553) = 41.07, $p < .001$), Clinique usage (F (1, 553) = 79.17, $p < .001$) and involvement (F (1, 553) = 46.86, $p < .001$) were significant. Also, interactions between usage and brand, as well as familiarity and brand were significant for all three brands (Chanel: brand and usage (F (2, 1106) = 62.69, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1106) = 5.33, $p = .005$); Hugo Boss: brand and usage (F (2, 1106) = 49.39, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1106) = 3.12, $p < .05$); Clinique: brand and usage (F (2, 1106) = 55.37, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1106) = 9.38, $p < .001$)). No other covariate effects were significant (p's $> .10$). Results revealed that the main effect of brand was significant (F (2, 1106) = 3.07, $p < .05$), however all other main and interaction effects were not significant (p's $> .05$).

Again, the same analysis was conducted, replacing self-monitoring with concern for appropriateness. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity had not been violated (χ^2 (2) = 4.98, $p > .08$), and therefore sphericity was assumed [Greenhouse-Geisser $\varepsilon = .991$]. Of the covariates, Chanel usage (F (1, 553) = 67.77, $p < .001$), Hugo

Boss usage ($F(1, 553) = 40.42$, $p < .001$), Clinique usage ($F(1, 553) = 77.11$, $p < .001$) and involvement ($F(1, 553) = 48.67$, $p < .001$) were significant. Also, the interaction between involvement and brand was significant ($F(2, 1106) = 3.19$, $p < .05$), and interactions between usage and brand were significant for all three brands, while the interactions between familiarity and brand were significant only for Chanel and Clinique (Chanel: brand and usage ($F(2, 1106) = 61.62$, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity ($F(2, 1106) = 6.18$, $p < .005$); Hugo Boss: brand and usage ($F(2, 1106) = 44.62$, $p < .001$); Clinique: brand and usage ($F(2, 1106) = 55.27$, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity ($F(2, 1106) = 9.76$, $p < .001$)). No other significant covariate effect emerged (p's $> .06$). Results revealed that the main effect of brand was significant ($F(2, 1106) = 5.12$, $p < .01$), however no other significant main or interaction effect emerged (p's $> .18$). Therefore, for purchase intention, H3b is rejected.

Hypothesis 3c

> **H3c**: When the collective self is primed, androgynous men, as opposed to other men (i.e. masculine, feminine and undifferentiated) who are also high self-monitors (or have a high concern for appropriateness), will have more positive attitudes, a greater preference and increased purchase intentions for masculine brands than other brands, whereas androgynous women, as opposed to other women (i.e. masculine, feminine and undifferentiated), who are also high self-monitors (or have a high concern for appropriateness), will have a greater preference, more positive attitudes and increased purchase intentions for feminine brands than other brands.

Repeated measures MANCOVA was conducted again to determine whether the between- subject factors self-monitoring/ concern for appropriateness, gender identity, prime and sex and the within-subject factor gendered brand personality had an effect on brand preference, attitudes and purchase intentions. As before, sex, brand familiarity and usage, as well as product involvement were included as covariates. Moreover, an analysis was run for each of the dependent variables, comparing the responses between each of the three brands.

In the first analysis for hypothesis 3c, the dependent variables were Chanel brand attitude, Hugo Boss brand attitude and Clinique brand attitude, and the independent variables were self-monitoring, gender identity, prime, sex and gendered brand personality. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity had not been violated (χ^2 (2) = 3.95, $p > .13$), and therefore sphericity was assumed [Greenhouse-Geisser $\varepsilon = .993$]. Of the covariates, Chanel usage ($F (1, 540) = 4.16$, $p < .05$), Chanel familiarity ($F (1, 540) = 17.78$, $p < .001$), Hugo Boss familiarity ($F (1, 540) = 6.20$, $p < .05$), Clinique familiarity ($F (1, 540) = 4.71$, $p < .05$) and involvement ($F (1, 540) = 41.77$, $p < .001$) were significant. Also, the interaction between brand and involvement was significant ($F (2, 1080) = 6.71$, $p = .001$), and interactions between usage and brand, as well as familiarity and brand were significant for all three brands (Chanel: brand and usage ($F (2, 1080) = 13.09$, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity ($F (2, 1080) = 18.24$, $p < .001$); Hugo Boss: brand and usage ($F (2, 1080) = 27.08$, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity ($F (2, 1080) = 12.58$, $p < .001$); Clinique: brand and usage ($F (2, 1080) = 18.50$, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity ($F (2, 1080) = 17.98$, $p < .001$)). No other covariate effect was significant ($p's > .06$). Results revealed that the interactions between brand and

prime (F (2, 1080) = 5.73, p < .005), between brand, gender identity and prime (F (6, 1080) = 2.38, p < .05), and between brand, prime and sex (F (2, 1080) = 4.37, p < .05) were all significant. No other main or interaction effects were significant (p's > .07).

The same analysis was conducted, replacing self-monitoring with concern for appropriateness. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity had not been violated (χ^2 (2) = 2.11, p > .34), and therefore sphericity was assumed [Greenhouse-Geisser ε = .996]. Of the covariates, Chanel usage (F (1, 539) = 5.32, p < .05), Chanel familiarity (F (1, 539) = 14.50, p < .001), Hugo Boss familiarity (F (1, 539) = 7.80, p = .005), Clinique familiarity (F (1, 539) = 7.50, p < .01) and involvement (F (1, 539) = 47.82, p < .001) were significant. Also, the interaction between brand and involvement was significant (F (2, 1078) = 6.67, p = .001), and interactions between usage and brand, as well as familiarity and brand were significant for all three brands (Chanel: brand and usage (F (2, 1078) = 13.08, p < .001, brand and familiarity (F (2, 1078) = 17.67, p < .001); Hugo Boss: brand and usage (F (2, 1078) = 27.22, p < .001), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1078) = 12.09, p < .001); Clinique: brand and usage (F (2, 1078) = 17.33, p < .001), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1078) = 19.95, p < .001)). No other covariate effect was significant (p's > .24). Results revealed that interaction between brand, gender identity, prime, concern for appropriateness and sex was significant (F (2, 1078) = 2.53, p < .05). Also, interactions between gender identity and sex (F (3, 539) = 3.84, p = .01), between brand and gender identity (F (6, 1078) = 2.35, p < .05), between brand and prime (F (2, 1078) = 6.30, p < .005), between brand, gender identity and prime (F (6, 1078) = 2.18, p < .05), between brand, sex and concern for appropriateness (F (2, 1078) = 5.11, p < .01) and between gender identity, prime, sex and concern for appropriateness (F (2,

539) = 3.36, p < .05) were all significant. All other main and interaction effects did not reach significance (p's > .05).

To further investigate the significant interaction between brand, gender identity, prime, concern for appropriateness and sex, a repeated measures MANCOVA was run for males and females in the private and collective conditions.

In the private condition, as expected results were not significant for both males and females. For males, Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity had not been violated (χ^2 (2) = 4.57, p > .10), and therefore sphericity was assumed [Greenhouse-Geisser ε = .962]. Of the covariates, Hugo Boss familiarity (F (1, 114) = 9.34, p < .005), Clinique familiarity (F (1, 114) = 13.55, p < .001) and involvement (F (1, 125) = 23.67, p < .001) were significant. Also, the interaction between brand and involvement was significant (F (2, 228) = 5.52, p = .005), and interactions between usage and brand were significant only for Hugo Boss, while the interactions between familiarity and brand were significant for Chanel and Clinique only (Chanel: brand and familiarity (F (2, 228) = 11.04, p < .001); Hugo Boss: brand and usage (F (2, 228) = 13.56, p < .001); Clinique: brand and familiarity (F (2, 228) = 6.85, p = .001)). No other covariate effect reached significance (p's > .05). Results revealed that the interaction between gender identity and concern for appropriateness was significant (F (3, 125) = 2.71, p < .05), but no other main or interaction effect reached significance (p's > .05).

For females, Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity had not been violated (χ^2 (2) = 2.73, p > .25), and therefore sphericity was assumed [Greenhouse-Geisser ε = .983]. Of the covariates, Chanel familiarity (F (1, 159) = 15.07, p < .001),

Hugo Boss familiarity ($F (1, 159) = 4.02$, $p < .05$) and involvement ($F (1, 159) = 12.44$, $p = .001$) were significant. Also, interactions between usage and brand were significant for all three brands, while the interactions between familiarity and brand were significant only for Clinique (Chanel: brand and usage ($F (2, 318) = 5.68$, $p < .005$); Hugo Boss: brand and usage ($F (2, 318) = 9.74$, $p < .001$); Clinique: brand and usage ($F (2, 318) = 7.78$, $p = .001$), brand and familiarity ($F (2, 318) = 3.21$, $p < .05$)). No other covariate effect reached significance (p's $> .14$). Results revealed that the main effect of gender identity ($F (3, 159) = 3.98$, $p < .01$) was significant, but no other main or interaction effect reached significance (p's $> .10$).

In the collective condition, for males, Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity had not been violated ($\chi^2 (2) = 1.70$, $p > .42$), and therefore sphericity was assumed [Greenhouse-Geisser $\varepsilon = .987$]. Of the covariates, Clinique familiarity ($F (1, 125) = 5.45$, $p < .05$) and involvement ($F (1, 125) = 7.71$, $p < .01$) were significant. Also, interactions between usage and brand were significant for Chanel and Hugo Boss, while the interactions between familiarity and brand were significant for all three brands (Chanel: brand and usage ($F (2, 250) = 3.24$, $p < .05$), brand and familiarity ($F (2, 250) = 6.74$, $p = .001$); Hugo Boss: brand and usage ($F (2, 250) = 3.09$, $p < .05$), brand and familiarity ($F (2, 250) = 10.74$, $p < .001$); Clinique: brand and familiarity ($F (2, 250) = 11.00$, $p < .001$)). No other covariate effect reached significance (p's $> .17$). Results revealed that the interaction between gender identity and concern for appropriateness ($F (3, 125) = 2.71$, $p < .05$) was significant; however no other main or interaction effect reached significance (p's $> .07$).

In the collective condition, for females, Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity had not been violated (χ^2 (2) = .14, p > .93), and therefore sphericity was assumed [Greenhouse-Geisser ε = .999]. Of the covariates, Chanel usage (F (1, 120) = 5.22, p = .05) and involvement (F (1, 120) = 11.61, p = .001) were significant. Also, interactions between usage and brand were significant for all three brands, while the interaction between familiarity and brand were significant for Chanel and Hugo Boss (Chanel: brand and usage (F (2, 240) = 4.35, p < .05), brand and familiarity (F (2, 240) = 4.85, p < .01); Hugo Boss: brand and usage (F (2, 240) = 4.56, p < .05), brand and familiarity (F (2, 240) = 6.96, p = .001); Clinique: brand and usage (F (2, 240) = 7.13, p = .001)). No other covariate effect reached significance (p's > .08). Results revealed the interaction between brand, gender identity and concern for appropriateness was significant (F (6, 240) = 2.41, p < .05). Also, the interaction between brand and concern for appropriateness (F (2, 240) = 4.90 p < .01) was significant. All other main and interaction effects were not significant (p's > .18).

To further investigate the significant interaction between brand, gender identity and concern for appropriateness for females in the collective condition, a repeated measures MANCOVA was run for individuals scoring low and high concern for appropriateness.

For females scoring low concern for appropriateness, Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity had not been violated (χ^2 (2) = 1.29, p > .52), and therefore sphericity was assumed [Greenhouse-Geisser ε = .979]. Of the covariates, Hugo Boss usage (F (1, 60) = 6.13, p < .05), Clinique familiarity (F (1, 60) = 5.97, p <

.05) and involvement (F (1, 60) = 28.77, p < .001) were significant. Also, the interaction between brand and involvement was significant (F (2, 120) = 4.16, p < .05), the interaction between usage and brand was significant only for Clinique, and interactions between familiarity and brand were only significant for Chanel and Hugo Boss (Chanel: brand and familiarity (F (2, 120) = 4.09, p < .05); Hugo Boss: brand and familiarity (F (2, 120) = 7.18, p = .001); Clinique: brand and usage (F (2, 120) = 6.57, p < .005)). No other significant covariate effect emerged (p's > .08). Moreover, results revealed that main and interaction effects were not significant (p's > .05).

For females scoring high concern for appropriateness, Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity had not been violated (χ^2 (2) = .04, p > .98), and therefore sphericity was assumed [Greenhouse-Geisser ε = .999]. Of the covariates, Chanel familiarity (F (1, 53) = 4.79, p < .05) was significant, but no other significant covariate effect emerged (p's > .05). Results revealed that the interaction between brand and gender identity (F (6, 106) = 3.25, p < .01) was significant. Main effects were not significant (p's > .53).

Next, to investigate the significant interaction between brand and gender identity for females with a high concern for appropriateness in the collective condition, paired t-test analysis was conducted for androgynous and feminine individuals. Undifferentiated individuals were removed from further analysis and no participants were in the masculine category for further examination.

Paired t-test analysis revealed that, feminine females reported higher levels of positive attitudes toward Clinique as compared to Hugo Boss (t(13) = -3.95, p < .005).

However, there was no significant difference between their attitudes toward Clinique and Chanel ($t(13) = -.40$, $p > .69$) (Table 7).

Table 7: Brand Attitude for Feminine Females

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Chanel Attitude	5.36	1.14
Hugo Boss Attitude	4.05	1.47
Clinique attitude	5.50	1.44

More importantly, the analysis also revealed that, in the collective prime, for androgynous females who have a high concern for appropriateness, there are significantly higher levels of positive attitudes toward a feminine brand than for a masculine brand ($t(43) = -5.23$, $p < .001$) or an androgynous brand ($t(43) = -2.26$, $p < .05$) (Table 8). Therefore, for brand attitudes, H3c is partially supported.

Table 8: Brand Attitude for Androgynous Females

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Chanel Attitude	5.28	1.43
Hugo Boss Attitude	4.71	1.11
Clinique Attitude	5.71	1.31

In the second analysis for hypothesis 3c, the dependent variables were Chanel brand preference, Hugo Boss brand preference and Clinique brand preference, and the independent variables were self-monitoring, gender identity, prime, sex and gendered brand personality. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity had been violated (χ^2 (2) = 9.38, $p < .05$), and therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity ($\varepsilon = .983$). Of the covariates, Chanel familiarity ($F(1, 540) = 29.88$, $p < .001$), Hugo Boss familiarity ($F(1, 540) = 7.61$, $p <$

.01), Clinique usage (F (1, 540) = 7.15, p < .01), Clinique familiarity (F (1, 540) = 5.68, p < .05) and involvement (F (1, 540) = 28.48, p < .001) were significant. Also, the interaction between brand and involvement was significant (F (2, 1061.68) = 3.27, p < .05), and interactions between usage and brand, as well as familiarity and brand were significant for all three brands (Chanel: brand and usage (F (2, 1061.68) = 15.65, p < .001), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1061.68) = 26.44, p < .001); Hugo Boss: brand and usage (F (2, 1061.68) = 20.48, p < .001), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1061.68) = 16.08, p < .001); Clinique: brand and usage (F (2, 1061.68) = 11.52, p < .001), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1061.68) = 20.36, p < .001)). No other significant covariate effect emerged (p's > .16). Moreover, results revealed no significant main or interaction effects (p's > .06).

The same analysis was conducted, replacing self-monitoring with concern for appropriateness. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity was violated (χ^2 (2) = 7.42, p < .05), and therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity (ε = .986). Of the covariates, Chanel familiarity (F (1, 539) = 28.62, p < .001), Hugo Boss familiarity (F (1, 539) = 9.26, p < .005), Clinique usage (F (1, 539) = 5.70, p < .05), Clinique familiarity (F (1, 539) = 7.15, p < .01) and involvement (F (1, 539) = 32.17, p < .001) were significant. Also, the interaction between brand and involvement was significant (F (2, 1063.44) = 3.36, p < .05), and interactions between usage and brand, as well as familiarity and brand were significant for all three brands (Chanel: brand and usage (F (2, 1063.44) = 15.22, p < .001), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1063.44) = 25.17, p < .001); Hugo Boss: brand and usage (F (2, 1063.44) = 20.28, p < .001), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1063.44) = 14.45, p

< .001); Clinique: brand and usage (F (2, 1063.44) = 11.07, p < .001), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1063.44) = 21.73, p < .001)). No other significant covariate effect emerged (p's > .14). Results revealed that the interactions between gender identity and sex (F (3, 539) = 2.82, p < .05), between brand and gender identity (F (6, 1063.44) = 2.73, p < .05), as well as between brand, prime, sex and concern for appropriateness (F (6, 1063.44) = 3.32, p < .05) were significant. All other main and interaction effects were not significant (p's > .05).

In the last analysis for hypothesis 3c, the dependent variables were Chanel purchase intention, Hugo Boss purchase intention and Clinique purchase intention, and the independent variables were self-monitoring, gender identity, prime, sex and gendered brand personality. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity had not been violated (χ^2 (2) = 4.39, p > .11), and therefore sphericity was assumed [Greenhouse-Geisser ε = .992]. Of the covariates, Chanel usage (F (1, 540) = 68.92, p < .001), Hugo Boss usage (F (1, 540) = 40.98, p < .001), Clinique usage (F (1, 540) = 72.87, p < .001) and involvement (F (1, 540) = 44.45, p < .001) were significant. Also, interactions between usage and brand were significant for all three brands, while those between familiarity and brand were significant only for Chanel and Clinique (Chanel: brand and usage (F (2, 1080) = 59.15, p < .001), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1080) = 5.08, p < .01); Hugo Boss: brand and usage (F (2, 1080) = 49.49, p < .001); Clinique: brand and usage (F (2, 1080) = 54.01, p < .001), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1080) = 8.96, p < .001)). No other significant covariate effect emerged (p's > .05). Furthermore, results revealed no significant main or interaction effects (p's > .07).

The same analysis was conducted, replacing self-monitoring with concern for appropriateness. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption for sphericity had not been violated (χ^2 (2) = 4.47, $p > .10$), and therefore sphericity was assumed [Greenhouse-Geisser $\varepsilon = .992$]. Of the covariates, Chanel usage (F (1, 539) = 66.52, $p < .001$), Hugo Boss usage (F (1, 539) = 41.86, $p < .001$), Clinique usage (F (1, 539) = 68.32, $p < .001$) and involvement (F (1, 539) = 47.72, $p < .001$) were significant. Also, interactions between usage and brand were significant for all three brands, while interactions between familiarity and brand were significant only for Clinique and Chanel (Chanel: brand and usage (F (2, 1078) = 57.21, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1078) = 6.10, $p < .005$); Hugo Boss: brand and usage (F (2, 1078) = 45.48, $p < .001$); Clinique: brand and usage (F (2, 1078) = 53.64, $p < .001$), brand and familiarity (F (2, 1078) = 9.38, $p < .001$)). No other significant covariate effect emerged (p's $> .05$). Results revealed that the main effect of brand was significant (F (2, 1078) = 3.50, $p < .05$), as was the interaction between brand and sex (F (2, 1078) = 4.21, $p < .05$). The remaining main and interaction effects were not significant (p's $> .13$). Therefore for purchase intention, H3c is rejected.

Hypothesis 3d

> **H3d**: When the collective self is primed, attitudes, preferences and purchase intentions toward androgynous brands will be more positive for androgynous individuals (versus masculine, feminine and undifferentiated individuals) who are low self-monitors (or have a low concern for appropriateness), than those who are high self-monitors (or have a high concern for appropriateness).

Multivariate ANCOVA analysis was carried out to establish whether prime, gender identity and self-monitoring had an impact on brand attitude, preference and purchase intention toward the androgynous brand Chanel. Of the covariates, the following were significant for brand attitudes: involvement ($F(1, 553) = 48.58$, $p < .001$), Chanel usage ($F(1, 553) = 19.91$, $p < .001$), and Chanel familiarity ($F(1, 553) = 48.08$, $p < .001$). The following were significant for brand preference: involvement ($F(1, 553) = 29.31$, $p < .001$), Chanel usage ($F(1, 553) = 19.16$, $p < .001$) and Chanel familiarity ($F(1, 553) = 73.67$, $p < .001$). And lastly, the following were significant for purchase intention: involvement ($F(1, 553) = 42.12$, $p < .001$), Chanel usage ($F(1, 553) = 193.93$, $p < .001$), Chanel familiarity ($F(1, 553) = 6.81$, $p < .001$), Clinique usage ($F(1, 553) = 9.94$, $p < .005$) and Clinique familiarity ($F(1, 553) = 5.68$, $p < .05$). No other significant covariate effect emerged (p's $> .07$). Results revealed that the main effect of prime was significant for brand attitudes ($F(1, 553) = 8.27$, $p < .005$), but there were no other significant main or interaction effects (p's $> .05$).

The same analysis was carried out again; however this time, self-monitoring was replaced by concern for appropriateness in order to establish whether prime, gender identity and concern for appropriateness had an impact on brand attitude, preference and purchase intention toward the androgynous brand Chanel. Of the covariates, the following were significant for brand attitudes: involvement ($F(1, 553) = 52.92$, $p < .001$), Chanel usage ($F(1, 553) = 19.25$, $p < .001$), and Chanel familiarity ($F(1, 553) = 48.01$, $p < .001$). The following were significant for brand preference: involvement ($F(1, 553) = 29.70$, $p < .001$), Chanel usage ($F(1, 553) = 17.19$, $p < .001$) and Chanel familiarity ($F(1, 553) = 73.41$, $p < .001$). And lastly, the following were significant for purchase intention:

involvement (F (1, 553) = 46.91, p < .001), Chanel usage (F (1, 553) = 189.34, p < .001), Chanel familiarity (F (1, 553) = 7.64, p < .01), Clinique usage (F (1, 553) = 9.75, p < .005) and Clinique familiarity (F (1, 553) = 5.57, p < .05). No other significant covariate effect emerged (p's > .06). Results revealed that the main effect of prime was significant for brand attitudes (F (1, 553) = 10.99, p = .001) and for preference (F (1, 553) = 4.54, p < .05), however all other main and interaction effects were not significant (p's > .08). Therefore, H3d is rejected.

Hypothesis 4a

> **H4a**: When the collective self is primed, preferences, attitudes and purchase intentions toward androgynous brands will be more positive for androgynous women (versus masculine, feminine and undifferentiated women) than androgynous men (versus masculine, feminine and undifferentiated men).

Multivariate ANCOVA analysis was carried out to establish whether prime, gender identity and sex had an impact on brand attitude, preference and purchase intention toward the androgynous brand Chanel. Of the covariates, the following were significant for brand attitudes: involvement (F (1, 553) = 51.60, p < .001), Chanel usage (F (1, 553) = 20.18, p < .001), and Chanel familiarity (F (1, 553) = 48.75, p < .001). The following were significant for brand preference: involvement (F (1, 553) = 30.34, p < .001), Chanel usage (F (1, 553) = 17.66, p < .001) and Chanel familiarity (F (1, 553) = 76.42, p < .001). And lastly, the following were significant for purchase intention: involvement (F (1, 553) = 44.40, p < .001), Chanel usage (F (1, 553) = 188.22, p < .001), Chanel familiarity (F (1, 553) = 7.99, p = .005), Clinique usage (F (1, 553) = 10.08, p <

.005) and Clinique familiarity (F (1, 553) = 5.32, p < .05). No other significant covariate effect emerged (p's > .05). Results revealed that the main effect of prime was significant for brand attitudes (F (1, 553) = 12.08, p = .001), and the interaction of prime and gender was significant for brand attitudes (F (3, 553) = 2.78, p < .04). No other main or interaction effects reached significance (p's > .06). Therefore, H4a is rejected.

Hypothesis 4b

> **H4b**: When the collective self is primed, attitudes, preferences and purchase intentions toward androgynous brands will be more positive for androgynous (versus masculine, feminine and undifferentiated) female high self-monitors (or those who have a high concern for appropriateness) than for androgynous (versus masculine, feminine and undifferentiated) male high self-monitors (or those who have a high concern for appropriateness).

Multivariate ANCOVA analysis was carried out to establish whether prime, gender identity, self-monitoring and sex had an impact on brand attitude, preference and purchase intention toward the androgynous brand Chanel. Of the covariates, the following were significant for brand attitudes: involvement (F (1, 540) = 47.87, p < .001), Chanel usage (F (1, 540) = 21.05, p < .001), and Chanel familiarity (F (1, 540) = 46.26, p < .001). The following were significant for brand preference: involvement (F (1, 540) = 28.21, p < .001), Chanel usage (F (1, 540) = 18.78, p < .001) and Chanel familiarity (F (1, 540) = 74.02, p < .001). And lastly, the following were significant for purchase intention: involvement (F (1, 540) = 39.12, p < .001), Chanel usage (F (1, 540) = 185.63, p < .001), Chanel familiarity (F (1, 540) = 7.09, p < .01), Clinique usage (F (1, 540) =

9.83, $p < .005$) and Clinique familiarity ($F (1, 540) = 5.48$, $p < .05$). No other significant covariate effect emerged (p's $> .06$). Results revealed that the main effect of prime was significant for brand attitudes ($F (1, 540) = 9.85$, $p < .005$), but there were no other significant main or interaction effects (p's $> .05$).

A similar analysis was carried out, this time replacing the self-monitoring variable by concern for appropriateness to establish whether prime, gender identity, concern for appropriateness and sex had an impact on brand attitude, preference and purchase intention towards the androgynous brand Chanel. Of the covariates, the following were significant for brand attitudes: involvement ($F (1, 539) = 51.94$, $p < .001$), Chanel usage ($F (1, 539) = 22.85$, $p < .001$), and Chanel familiarity ($F (1, 539) = 41.64$, $p < .001$). The following were significant for brand preference: involvement ($F (1, 539) = 31.23$, $p < .001$), Chanel usage ($F (1, 539) = 17.99$, $p < .001$) and Chanel familiarity ($F (1, 539) = 70.03$, $p < .001$). And lastly, the following were significant for purchase intention: involvement ($F (1, 539) = 45.28$, $p < .001$), Chanel usage ($F (1, 539) = 178.32$, $p < .001$), Chanel familiarity ($F (1, 539) = 7.91$, $p < .01$), Clinique usage ($F (1, 539) = 8.64$, $p < .005$) and Clinique familiarity ($F (1, 539) = 4.81$, $p < .05$). No other significant covariate effect emerged (p's $> .06$). Results revealed that the main effect of prime ($F (1, 539) = 13.83$, $p < .001$), and the interactions between prime and gender identity ($F (3, 539) = 3.43$, $p < .05$), and between gender identity and concern for appropriateness ($F (3, 539) = 2.71$, $p < .05$) were significant for brand attitudes, but no other main or interaction effects were significant (p's $> .05$). Therefore, H4b is rejected.

Discussion

Theoretical Contributions

Overall, gender identity congruence theory provides a strong framework in which consumer responses to brands can be observed. Identifying the role of the androgynous brand within this framework contributes to the existing literature on gendered perceptions of brands. Although past research has revealed that gender identity congruence with masculine and feminine brands leads to numerous favourable outcomes (Grohmann 2009), androgynous brands are distinct in the sense that they are defined by the co-presence of both masculine and feminine traits. However, past research in gender identity congruence with androgynous images has been limited to advertising contexts, and therefore this has been the first time that this relationship has been examined with an androgynous brand.

Results from this study demonstrate that congruence between an androgynous gender identity and an androgynous brand results in greater brand preference when compared to a masculine brand, although similar outcomes did not ensue when the comparison was made with a feminine brand. Thus the present findings extend prior research on gender identity congruence with masculine and feminine brands (Grohmann 2009), suggesting that dual expectations presented by androgynous brands do not result in conflict for androgynous individuals. In addition, given that the sample was not limited to college students, results from this study are quite generalizable. Findings from the current study however did not support the prediction that androgynous individuals, as opposed to other individuals (i.e. masculine, feminine and undifferentiated), would have

a higher preference for androgynous brands than feminine ones. Also, although it was posited that androgynous individuals, as opposed to others, would have more positive attitudes, as well as a greater likelihood of purchase intention toward androgynous brands than other brands, findings from the current study did not support this hypothesis. Despite this, these findings do not dismiss gender identity congruence theory, but speak to the limitations of the current study.

Furthermore, findings from the present study did not support the hypothesis that the self-construal has an impact on the gender identity congruence relationship, nor that self-monitoring or concern for appropriateness in conjunction with self-construal influence this relationship. Moreover, despite expectations that males face more pressure than women to conform to in-group norms, no significant difference was observed between androgynous men and androgynous women, regarding responses toward androgynous brands. Nevertheless, the present findings contribute to the research on gender identity congruence by demonstrating that the relationship between congruence and brand outcomes cannot be observed in isolation. Specifically, findings from the current study reveal that when the collective self is salient, androgynous women who have a high concern for appropriateness have more favourable brand attitudes for feminine brands than those brands that have masculine or androgynous personalities. This extends prior research that suggests that when the collective self is salient, androgynous men have more favourable responses toward masculine advertisements, as opposed to feminine and androgynous ones (Martin and Gnoth 2009). The implication is that, individuals whose gender identities do not conform to in-group norms, such as traditional masculinity and femininity, feign gender conformity to both “fit in” and avoid

negative evaluation from others. However, unlike previous research, the present study revealed that only those women who have a high concern for appropriateness are likely to feign conformity. This suggests that perhaps Martin and Gnoth (2009) may have found that those androgynous men who had a high concern for appropriateness were more likely to have favourable responses toward masculine brands than those who had a low concern for appropriateness, had this variable been measured.

Managerial Implications

Given the potential shift toward androgynous identities within contemporary society, the implication of the current findings for managers is that it may be more profitable to imbue brands with both masculine and feminine traits, as opposed to only one of the two. This is for the reason that, even though androgynous individuals identify to both instrumental and expressive traits, their identities consist of a co-presence of the two, and, as such, respond best to brands that also have a co-presence of both types of traits. Managers can imbue their brands with androgynous personalities through brand user imagery, employees, brand associations (Aaker 1997), as well as brand spokesperson (Grohmann 2009). An example of such a spokesperson for instance could be a man or a woman, who exhibits both daring and sweet, or both adventurous and graceful personality traits.

Findings that when the collective self is primed, androgynous women who have a high concern for appropriateness have a greater preference for feminine brands imply that, for women, androgynous congruence may only lead to favourable brand responses in contexts in which consumption is done away from settings with present others. In

contexts in which brand offerings include products that are consumed socially by women, feminine brands may not only attract women with feminine identities, but women with androgynous ones too (notably those androgynous women who have a high concern for appropriateness). Therefore, despite a shift in gender roles within society, offering brands with feminine personalities may still be a viable strategy to pursue.

Limitations and Future Research

The lack of significant findings for the majority of the hypotheses may be attributed to several limitations. First, pretest results showed that none of the 42 brands that were tested could be categorized as having both high masculinity and high femininity. Instead, at most, brands possessed equal and medium levels of masculinity and femininity. Also, although by this categorization, Chanel was demonstrated to be androgynous in the pretest, manipulation checks in the study revealed that respondents perceived Chanel to have higher levels of femininity than masculinity. Nevertheless, Chanel was still categorized as the androgynous brand within this study, given that, when compared to the other brands, Chanel was perceived as the most androgynous of the three. This may suggest that the difference between Chanel and Clinique may not have been sufficient for some respondents, and therefore gender identity congruence did not yield favourable outcomes. Therefore, it is recommended that future studies on androgynous brands select brands with very strong androgynous personalities. It does seem however that the androgynous brand within the market is elusive, and therefore it may be more fruitful to use fictitious brands that are imbued with gendered personalities, such as through spokespersons.

The use of existing brands has other disadvantages as well. Although the use of real brands increases external validity, other uncontrolled differences between the brands may exist. For instance, the three brands used within this study have existed for a long period of time, over which they have been subjected to countless and varied marketing campaigns and strategies. Moreover, consumers may have had varying levels of personal experiences with each brand, which may influence participants' responses in some way that is not measured. To a certain extent, there is an attempt to control for this variability by measuring brand familiarity and usage, but these measures cannot possibly capture the influence of all their personal experiences with these brands upon their responses. Consequently, this may be another reason as to why future studies should be carried out using fictitious brands.

Another factor that may have contributed to the lack of significant results may be the use of the fragrance product category. Although consumers may express themselves through fragrance choices, the possibility exists that the extent to which they do so is lower than other product categories. This may be attributed to the level of visibility of the product. Individuals usually use fragrance in the privacy of their own homes, and as such, regardless of which self-construal is salient, or their level of self-monitoring, may not feel that there exists a high risk of being negatively evaluated on this use (unless of course the fragrance is unpleasant to others), nor that specific brands within this product category are conducive to self-expression. Even if the use of fragrance is noticed by others, it is often difficult to identify the fragrance brand given the lack of visible markers. To add to this, only those individuals who are in close proximity to the fragrance wearer would notice the fragrance in the first place. Future studies should

therefore choose a product category for which consumption is more visible, and thus presents increased potential for self-expression, as well as perceived risk.

Self-construal salience is an important factor that influences consumption behaviour and is therefore examined to a great extent in the marketing literature. In practice however, self-construal salience can be controlled by marketers only in limited contexts, such as through priming in advertising. In view of this, it may be useful for marketing managers if they were able to predict responses to their brands based on conspicuousness of the product category. Product conspicuousness (i.e. the degree to which a product is visible) is suggested to directly influence perceived social risk, and thus it has been argued that individuals alter their consumption choices based on the conspicuousness of the consumption situation (Landon 1974). Graeff (1996) demonstrated that, in fact, self-monitoring moderates the relationship between self-concept congruence and evaluation of public brands, but not private brands. Similar findings may therefore be expected with regards to the gender identity congruence relationship. Thus when purchasing a brand from a very public category, individuals who have non-traditional gender identities may be expected to comply with cultural norms of traditional masculinity and femininity, out of fear of social backlash. On the other hand, when purchasing from a private product category, the degree of perceived risk is minimized, consequently gender identity congruence is likely to lead to more favourable responses in this instance. Therefore it may be predicted that androgynous individuals may be more resistant to androgynous brands that are in a public product category versus those androgynous brands that are in a private category. To add to this,

only those individuals who are high self-monitors, or who have a high concern for appropriateness would likely be influenced by the degree of product conspicuousness.

Future research could also address whether the symbolic and functional dimensions of a product category influence the gender identity congruence relationship of androgynous brands. Brands that fall into the symbolic product category typically offer benefits that are extrinsic in nature, corresponding to non-product related attributes, such as user-imagery (Jung and Lee 2006). These benefits are linked to needs for social approval, personal expression and self-esteem (Solomon 1983). Brands that fall into the functional product category typically offer benefits that are intrinsic in nature, corresponding to product-related attributes (Jung and Lee 2006). These benefits are linked to basic motivations to solve consumption problems or avoid negative states (Fennell 1978). Consequently, acquiring the wrong symbolic product could result in much greater psychological and social risks than acquiring the wrong functional product (Jung and Lee 2006). Thus it follows that an androgynous brand in a symbolic product category may have a higher level of perceived risk than one in a functional product category. Notably, brand gender carries with it a perceived social risk to the extent that it is not compliant with traditional gender norms. What's more, with symbolic products, brand gender tends to become a salient attribute, whereas with functional products, brand gender becomes less salient than other functional attributes of the brand (Jung and Lee 2006). Thus perceived social risk is further increased for androgynous brands in symbolic categories, while further decreased for brands in functional product categories. Therefore, product attributes may be expected to moderate the relationship between androgynous congruence and consumer responses. Furthermore, the impact of product

category may be expected to be greater when the collective self is primed, or when product conspicuousness is high, than when the private self is primed or when product conspicuousness is low. Specifically, in collective or conspicuous consumption contexts, in which individuals are concerned for the evaluations of others, androgynous congruence is more likely to lead to favourable responses for brands within functional product categories, than symbolic ones. In private consumption contexts however, given that there is no potential to be negatively evaluated by others, androgynous congruence should lead to favourable outcomes regardless of the product category.

Furthermore, to the extent that not conforming to traditional gender norms presents more of a social risk for men than for women, men and women may exhibit different responses to androgynous brands based on product category. For instance, it has been observed that men's perceptions of brand image fit of cross-gender extensions is greater when the brand belongs to a functional product category than when it belongs to a symbolic one, whereas women's perceptions are no different whether the brand belonged to a symbolic category or to a functional one (Jung and Lee 2006). Androgynous men are thus likely to be more resistant than women to using androgynous brands in symbolic categories than those in functional categories. Furthermore, this resistance is likely heightened in collective self-contexts, or when product conspicuousness is high, as compared to private self-contexts, or when product conspicuousness is low.

Exploring antecedents to gendered brand personality may also be another avenue for future research, with the potential of providing valuable information to marketing managers. Thus far, the use of a masculine and feminine spokesperson in print

advertisements has been revealed to increase gendered perceptions of masculine and feminine brands, respectively (Grohmann 2009). Marketers may also be interested in knowing what other factors can imbue brands with gendered personalities, when use of a spokesperson is not a desired option. For perceived product gender for instance, many factors, besides typical user and spokesperson, have been demonstrated to contribute to perceived masculinity and femininity. Notably, Friedman and Dipple (1978) and Alreck et al. (1982) were able to manipulate perceived gender of a product through brand name, while Worth et al. (1992) did so through the language text used in an advertisement. For brands however, less is known about the extent to which factors such as these can influence perceived gender personality, especially since perceived product gender and perceived brand gender are two very distinct concepts. It may also be useful for marketers to know to what extent these factors can influence a change in an already established gendered personality, given a potential shift of gender identities towards androgyny within society. Debevec and Iyer (1986), for instance, found that changing the image of an already gendered product can successfully be done by using a spokesperson with the sex of the desired image; however, they found that it was somewhat more difficult to "genderize" a product that was considered neutral, such as toothpaste. Therefore, future research could explore to what extent such outcomes also apply to brands.

Conclusion

Despite its limitations, the present study sheds valuable light on the impact of an androgynous self-concept on responses to androgynous brands, as well as on other

variables that may moderate this influence. Findings from the current study support the importance of examining individuals' gender identities, as well as the degree of congruence between gender identities and brand personalities. There is still much to learn however about the relationship between individuals' gender identities and gendered perceptions of brands, especially androgynous ones, as well as consumer responses to them. This study thus provides a useful first step in understanding the androgynous brand, leaving much room for future research to extend the current findings.

References

Aaker, Jennifer L. (1997), "Dimensions of Brand Personality," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34 (August), 347–356.

Aaker, Jennifer L. (1999), "The Malleable Self: The Role of Self–Expression in Persuasion," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 36 (February), 45–57.

Aaker, Jennifer, Veronica Benet-Martinez and Jordi Garolera (2001), "Consumption Symbols as Carriers of Culture: A Study of Japanese and Spanish Brand Personality Symbols," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81 (3), 492–508.

Aaker, Jennifer and Angela Lee (2006), "Understanding Regulatory Fit," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 43 (Feb), 15–19.

Ahuvia, Aaron C. (2005), "Beyond the Extended Self: Loved Objects and Consumers' Identity Narratives," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 32 (1), 171–184.

Aiken, Lewis R., Jr. (1963), "The Relationships of Dress to Selected Measures of Personality in Undergraduate Women," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 59 (1), 119–128.

Allison, Neil, Linda L. Golden, Gary M. Mullet, and Donna Coogan (1979), "Sex-Typed Product Images: The Effects of Sex, Sex-Role Self-Concept and Measurement Implications," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 7, Jerry Olson, ed., Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research, 604–609.

Alreck, Pamela L. (1994), "Commentary: A New Formula for Gendering Products and Brands," *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 3 (1), 6–18.

Alreck, Pamela L., Robert B. Settle, and Michael A. Belch (1982), "Who Responds to 'Gendered' Ads, and How?" *Journal of Advertising Research*, 22 (2), 25–31.

Anderson, Kristine L. (1986), "Androgyny, Flexibility, and Individualism," *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 50 (2), 265–278.

Barak, Benny and Barbara Stern (1986), "Sex-Linked Trait Indexes Among Baby-Boomers and Pre-Boomers: A Research Note," *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 13, ed. Richard Lutz. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 204-209.

Bearden, William O., Kelly L. Haws and Richard G. Netemeyer, eds. (2011), *Handbook of Marketing Scale: Multi-Item Measures for Marketing and Consumer Behaviour*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Belk, Russell (1978), "Assessing the Effects of Visible Consumption on Impression Formation," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 5, Ken Hunt, ed., Ann Abor: Association for Consumer Research, 39–47.

Belk, Russell W. (1988), "Possessions and the extended self," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15 (2), 139–68.

Bem, Sandra L. (1974), "The Measurement of Psychological Androgyny," *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42 (2), 155–62.

Bem, Sandra L. (1979), "Theory and Measurement of Androgyny: A Reply to the Pedhazur-Tetenbaum and Locksley-Colten Critiques," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37 (6), 1047–1054.

Bem, Sandra L. (1981), "Gender Schema Theory: A Cognitive Account of Sex Typing," *Psychological Review*, 88 (4), 354–364.

Bhat, Subodh and Srinivas K. Reddy (1998), "Symbolic and Functional Positioning of Brands," *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 15 (1), 32–43.

Chang, Chingching (2003), "Diagnosticity of Masculinity and Femininity in Processing Advertising Messages," *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association,* Marriott Hotel, San Diego, CA, 1–38.

Chang, Chingching (2006), "The Influence of Masculinity and Femininity in Different Advertising Processing Contexts: An Accessibility Perspective," *Sex Roles*, 55 (5–6), 345–356.

Cooke, Robert A., and Denise M. Rousseau, (1984), "Stress and Strain From Family Roles and Work- Role Expectations," *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 69 (2), 252–260.

Deaux, Kay (1985), "Sex and Gender," *Annual Review of Psychology*, 36, 49–81.

Debevec, Kathleen and Easwar Iyer (1986), "Sex Roles and Consumer Perceptions of Promotions, Products, and Self: What Do We Know and Where Should We Be Headed?" in *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 13, Richard J. Lutz, ed., Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 210–214.

Elliot, Richard (1994), "Exploring the Symbolic Meaning of Brands," *British Journal of Management*, 5 (June), 13–19.

Elliott, Richard and Christine Elliot (2005), "Idealized Images of the Male Body in Advertising: A Reader-Response Exploration," *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 11 (1), 3–19.

Epstein, Seymour (1980), "The Self-Concept: A Review and the Proposal of an Integrated Theory of Personality," *Personality: Basic Issues and Current Research*, Ervin Staub and Englewood Cliffs, eds. NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Feiereisen, Stephanie, Amanda J. Broderick and Susan P. Douglas (2009), "The Effect and Moderation of Gender Identity Congruity: Utilizing "Real Women" Advertising Images," *Psychology & Marketing*, 26 (9), 813–843.

Fennel, Geraldine (1978), "Consumer's Perceptions of the Product-Use Situations," *Journal of Marketing*, 42, 38–47.

Fischer, Eileen and Stephen J. Arnold (1994), "Sex, Gender Identity, Gender Role Attitudes, and Consumer Behavior," *Psychology & Marketing*, 11 (2), 163–182.

Friedman, Hershey H. and William S. Dipple (1978), "The Effect of Masculine and Feminine Brand Names on the Perceived Taste of a Cigarette," *Decision Sciences*, 9 (3), 467–471.

Fry, Joseph (1971), "Personality Variables and Cigarette Brand Choice," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 8 (3), 298–304.

Fugate, Douglas L. and Joanna Phillips (2010), "Product Gender Perceptions and Antecedents of Product Gender Congruence," *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 27 (3), 251–261.

Gentry, James W., and Mildred Doering (1977), "Masculinity-Femininity Related to Consumer Choice," in *Contemporary Marketing Thought*, Barnett A. Greenberg and Danny N. Bellinger, eds. Chicago, IL: American Marketing Association, 423–427.

Gentry, James W., and Mildred Doering (1979), "Sex Role Orientation and Leisure," *Journal of Leisure Research*, 11 (2), 102–111.

Gentry, James W., Mildred Doering, and Terrence O'Brien (1978), "Masculinity and Femininity Factors in Product Perception and Self-Image," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 5, H. Keith Hunt, ed. Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research, 326–332.

Golden, Linda, Neil Allison, and Mona Clee (1977), "The Role of Sex Role Self-Concept in Masculine and Feminine Product Perceptions," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 5, H. Keith Hund, ed. Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research, 599–605.

Gould, Stephen J. and Claudia E. Weil (1991), "Gift-Giving and Gender Self-Concepts," *Sex Roles*, 24 (9–10), 617–637.

Graeff, Timothy R. (1996), "Image Congruence Effects on Product Evaluations: The Role of Self-Monitoring and Public/Private Consumption," *Psychology and Marketing*, 13 (5), 481–499.

Grohmann, Bianca (2009), "Gender Dimensions of Brand Personality," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 46 (1), 105–119.

Grubb, Edward L. and Harrison L. Grathwohl (1967), "Consumer Self-Concept, Symbolism and Market Behavior: A Theoretical Approach," *Journal of Marketing*, 31 (October), 22–27.

Hogg, Margaret K., Alastair J. Cox and Kathy Keeling (2000), "The Impact of Self-Monitoring on Image Congruence and Product/Brand Evaluation," *European Journal of Marketing*, 34 (5–6), 641–666.

Iyer, Easwar S. and Kathleen Debevec (1986), "Bases for the Formations of Product Gender Images," in J.M. Hawes and J. Thanopoulos, (eds.) *Developments in Marketing Science*, 12, 38–42.

Jaffe, Lynn J. (1991), "Impact of Positioning and Sex-Role Identity on Women's Responses to Advertising," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 31 (June/July), 57–64.

Jaffe, Lynn J. (1994), "The Unique Predictive Ability of Sex-Role Identity in Explaining Women's Response to Advertising," *Psychology & Marketing*, 11 (5), 467–482.

Jaffe, Lynn J. and Paul D. Berger (1988), "Impact on Purchase Intent of Sex-Role Identity and Product Positioning," *Psychology & Marketing*, 5 (3), 259–271.

Jung, Kwon and Winston Lee (2006), "Cross-Gender Extensions: Effects of Gender of the Brand, Gender of Consumer, and Product Type on Evaluation of Cross-Gender Extensions," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 33 (1), 67–74.

Kahle, Lynn R. And Pamela Homer (1985), "Androgyny and Midday Mastication: Do Real Men Eat Quiche?" *Advances in Consumer Research*, 12 (1), 242–246.

Kimmel, Allan J. and Elisabeth Tissier-Desbordes (1999), "Males, Masculinity, and Consumption: An Exploratory Investigation", in *European Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 4, Bernard Dubois, Tina M. Lowrey, and L. J. Shrum, Marc Vanhuele, eds., Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 243–251.

Kleine, Susan Schultz, Robert E. Kleine, III, and Chris T. Allen (1995), "How is a Possession "Me" or "Not Me"? Characterizing Types and an Antecedent of Material Possession Attachment," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 22 (December), 327–343.

Krohmer, Harley, Lucia Malär and Bettina Nyffenegger (2007), "The Fit Between Brand Personality and Consumer's Self: The Importance of Self-Congruence for Brand Performance," *AMA Winter Educators' Conference Proceedings*, 18, 172–173.

Lee, Dong Hwan (1990), "Symbolic Interactionism: Some Implications for Consumer Self-Concept and Product Symbolism Research," in *Advances in Consumer Research* Vol. 17, Marvin E. Goldberg, Gerald Gorn, and Richard W. Pollay, eds., Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 386–393.

Lennox, Richard D. and Raymond N. Wolfe (1984), "Revision of the Self-Monitoring Scale," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46 (6), 1349–1364.

Levy, Sidney J. (1959), "Symbols for Sale," *Harvard Business Review*, 37 (July–August), 17–24.

Ligas, Mark and June Cotte (1999), "The Process of Negotiating Brand Meaning: A Symbolic Interactionist Perspective," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 26, Eric J. Arnould and Linda M. Scott, eds., Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 609–614.

Maas, Anne, Mara Cadinu, Gaia Guarnieri and Annalisa Grasselli (2003), "Sexual Harassment Under Social Identity Threat: The Computer Harassment Paradigm," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85 (5), 853–870.

Martin, Brett A.S. and Juergen Gnoth (2009), "Is the Marlboro Man the Only Alternative? The Role of Gender Identity and Self-Construal Salience in Evaluations of Male Models," *Marketing Letters*, 20 (4), 353–367.

Martin, Diane, John Schouten and James McAlexander (2006), "Claiming the Throttle: Multiple Femininities in a Hyper-Masculine Subculture," *Consumption, Markets and Culture*, 9 (3), 171–205.

McCracken, Grant (1986), "Culture and Consumption: Theoretical Account of the Structure and Movement of the Cultural Meaning of Consumer Goods," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13 (June), 71-84.

McQuarrie, Edward F. and J. Michael Munson (1992), "A Revised Product Involvement Inventory: Improved Usability and Validity," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 19, John F. Sherry, Jr. and Brian Sternthal, eds., Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 108–115.

Milner, Laura M. and Dale Fodness (1996), "Product Gender Perceptions: The Case of China," *International Marketing Review*, 13 (4), 40–51.

Mittal, Banwari (2006), "I, Me, and Mine –How Products Become Consumers' Extended Selves," *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 5 (6), 550–562.

Morris, George P. and Edward W. Cundiff (1971), "Acceptance by Males of Feminine Products," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 8 (August), 372–374.

Morrison, Maria Michelle and David R. Shaffer (2003), "Gender-Role Congruence and Self-Referencing as Determinants of Advertising Effectiveness," *Sex Roles*, 49 (5–6), 265–275.

Mugge, Ruth and Pascalle C.M. Govers (2004), ""I Love My Jeep, Because it's Tough Like Me." The Effect of Product-Personality Congruence on Product Attachment," *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Design and Emotion*, Ankara, Turkey.

Palan, Kay M. (2001), "Gender Identity in Consumer Behavior Research: A Literature Review and Research Agenda," *Academy of Marketing Science*, 10, [Online] Available: http://www.amsreview.org/articles/palan10–2001.pdf

Palan, Kay M., Charles S. Areni and Pamela Kiecker (1999), "Reexamining Masculinity, Femininity, and Gender Identity Scales," *Marketing Letters* 10 (4), 363–377.

Parker, Brian T. (2009), "A Comparison of Brand Personality and Brand User-Imagery Congruence," *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 26 (3), 175–184.

Patterson, Claudine E. and Margaret K. Hogg (2004), "Gender Identity, Gender Salience and Symbolic Consumption," in *Gender and Consumer Behavior* Vol. 7: Association for Consumer Research, 1–3.

Rudman, Laurie A., and Kimberly Fairchild (2004), "Reactions to Counterstereotypic Behavior: The Role of Backlash in Cultural Stereotype Maintenance," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87 (2), 157–176.

Schmitt, Bernd H., France Leclerc and Laurette Dubé-Rioux (1988), "Sex Typing and Consumer Behavior: A Test of Gender Schema Theory," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15 (1), 122–128.

Sirgy, M. Joseph (1982), "Self-Concept in Consumer Behavior," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9 (3), 287–300.

Sirgy, M. Joseph, Dhruv Grewal, Tamara F. Mangleburg, Jae-Ok Park, Kye-Sung Chon, C.B. Claiborne, et al. (1997), "Assessing the Predictive Validity of Two Methods of Measuring Self-Image Congruence," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 25 (3), 229–41.

Snyder, Mark (1974), "Self-Monitoring of Expressive Behavior," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 30 (4), 526–537.

Solomon, Michael R. (1983), "The Role of Products as Social Stimuli: A Symbolic Interactionism Perspective," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 10 (3), 319–329.

Spence, Janet T. (1984), "Masculinity, Femininity, and Gender-Related Traits: A Conceptual Analysis and Critique of Current Research," *Progress in Experimental Personality Research*, 13, 1–97.

Stake, Jayne E. (1997), "Integrating Expressiveness and Instrumentality in Real-Life Settings: A New Perspective on the Benefits of Androgyny," *Sex Roles*, 37 (7–8), 541–564.

Stake, Jayne E. (2000), "When Situations Call for Instrumentality and Expressiveness: Resource Appraisal, Coping Strategy Choice, and Adjustment," *Sex Roles*, 42 (9–10), 865–885.

Stern, Barbara B. (1987), "Gender Research and the Services Consumer: New Insights and New Directions," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 14, Melanie Wallendorf and Paul Anderson, eds., Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 514–518.

Stern, Barbara B. (1988), "Sex-Role Self-Concept Measures and Marketing: A Research Note," *Psychology & Marketing*, 5 (1), 85–99.

Stern, Barbara B., Benny Barak, and Stephen J. Gould (1987), "Sexual Identity Scale: A New Self-Assessment Measure," *Sex Roles*, 17 (9–10), 503–519.

Triandis, Harry C. (1989), "The Self and Social Behavior in Differing Cultural Contexts," *Psychological Review*, 96 (3), 506–520.

Vitz, Paul C. and Donald Johnston (1965), "Masculinity of Smokers and the Masculinity of Cigarette Images," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 49 (3), 155–59.

Voss, Kevin E., Eric R. Spangenberg and Bianca Grohmann (2003), "Measuring the Hedonic and Utilitarian Dimensions of Consumer Attitude," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 40 (3), 310–320.

Wade, Jay C., and Chris Brittan-Powell (2001), "Men's Attitudes Toward Race and Gender Equity: The Importance of Masculinity Ideology, Gender-Related Traits, and Reference Group Identity Dependence," *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 2 (1), 42–50.

Wang, Qi and Michael Ross (2005), "What We Remember and What We Tell: The Effects of Culture and Self-Priming on Memory Representations and Narratives," *Memory*, 13 (6), 594–606.

Wattanasuwan, Kritsadarat (2005), "The Self and Symbolic Consumption," *The Journal of American Academy of Business*, 6 (March), 179–184.

Wilcox, Keith, Hyeong Min Kim and Sankar Sen (2009), "Why Do Consumers Buy Counterfeit Luxury Brands?" *Journal Marketing Research*, 46 (2), 247–259.

Wolin, Lori D. (2003), "Gender Issues in Advertising –An Oversight Synthesis of Research: 1970-2002," *Journal of Advertising*, 43 (1), 111–129.

Worth, Leila T., Jeanne Smith and Diane M. Mackie (1992), "Gender Schematicity and Preference for Gender-Typed Products," *Psychology & Marketing*, 9 (1), 17–30.

Ybarra, Oscar and David Trafimow (1998), "How Priming the Private Self or Collective Self Affects the Relative Weights of Attitudes and Subjective Norms," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24 (4), 362-370.