

DOES SOCIAL EXCLUSION MOTIVATE CONSUMPTION TO
SATISFY THE NEED TO BELONG?

A Master's Thesis

by
GÜLBERK YILDIRIM

Department of
Management
Bilkent University
Ankara
May 2009

DOES SOCIAL EXCLUSION MOTIVATE CONSUMPTION TO SATISFY THE
NEED TO BELONG?

The Institute of Economics and Social Sciences
of
Bilkent University

by

GÜLBERK YILDIRIM

In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

THE DEPARTMENT OF
MANAGEMENT
BİLKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

May 2009

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science in Management.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Destan Kandemir
Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science in Management.

Prof. Dr. Güliz Ger
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science in Management.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Selin Atalay
Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Erdal Erel
Director

ABSTRACT

DOES SOCIAL EXCLUSION MOTIVATE CONSUMPTION TO SATISFY THE NEED TO BELONG?

Yıldırım, Gülberk

M.S., Department of Management

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Destan Kandemir

May 2009

The current thesis examines the effect of social exclusion on the consumption of affiliating products. Within a social exclusion framework we argue that social exclusion increases people's need to belong and desire for affiliation. In two studies we show that social exclusion leads to more favorable evaluations of affiliating products (Experiments 1 and 2) and socially excluded individuals are more likely to purchase affiliating products compared to those who are not socially excluded (Experiment 2). We provide evidence to suggest that the source of affiliation is an important factor in people's attempts to satisfy their need to belong by consuming affiliating products (Experiment 2). We suggest that people strategically chose which affiliations to display via consumption. Neither impulsivity nor state self-esteem mediate the relationship between social exclusion and affiliating product evaluations. The social exclusion effect is not moderated by individuals' trait self-esteem. The results are not due to a mood effect induced by the social exclusion manipulation.

Keywords: Social exclusion, need to belong, affiliation, consumption

ÖZET

SOSYAL DIŞLANMA KİŞİLERİ AİDİYET İHTİYAÇLARINI KARŞILAMAK İÇİN TÜKETİME TEŞVİK EDİYOR MU?

Yıldırım, Gülberk

Yüksek Lisans, İşletme Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Destan Kandemir

Mayıs 2009

Bu tez sosyal dışlanmanın kişilerin bir gruba bağlılığı simgeleyen ürünlerin tüketimi üzerindeki etkilerini incelemektedir. Bu çerçevede, sosyal dışlanmanın kişilerin aidiyet ihtiyaçlarını ve bir gruba bağlı olma isteklerini arttırdığını savunmaktadır. İki deneyde sosyal dışlanmanın bir gruba bağlılığı simgeleyen ürünler hakkındaki yorumları pozitif yönde etkilediği gösterilmiş (Deney 1 ve 2) ve dışlanan kişilerin dışlanmayanlara oranla bir gruba bağlılığı simgeleyen ürünleri satın almaya daha yatkın oldukları tespit edilmiştir (Deney 2). Ait olunan grubun kaynağının bir gruba bağlılığı simgeleyen ürünler kullanarak aidiyet ihtiyacını karşılamada önemli bir faktör olduğunu gösteren kanıtlar bulunmuştur (Deney 2). Kişilerin tüketim yoluyla hangi gruba ait olduklarını göstermeyi seçerken stratejik kararlar verdikleri savunulmaktadır. Ayrıca bu çalışma dürtüsel davranış, anlık veya karakter özgüveninin sosyal dışlanma ve bir gruba aidiyet gösteren ürünler arasındaki ilişkiyi etkilemediğini göstermiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sosyal dışlanma, aidiyet ihtiyacı, bir gruba bağlılık, tüketim

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special thanks to my mentor, Selin Atalay. I gratefully acknowledge her continuous support, patience and guidance throughout this process. I want to thank her for all her feedback and comments. This thesis would not be possible without her support and encouragement. I want to acknowledge the support and helpful comments of my supervisor, Destan Kandemir. Many thanks to Güliz Ger for the direction she provided during my graduate education. Thanks to Özlem Sandıkçı for introducing me Consumer Culture Theory and helped broadening my perspective in Consumer Behaviour research. I wish to thank to Türker Özkan for his helpful comments. I would like to thank to the faculty members for their help and understanding in data collection during class hours. I would also thank to Alev Kuruoğlu and Meltem Türe for their amazing help in the data collection process, their emotional support and especially for their friendship.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ÖZET	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2: SOCIAL EXCLUSION, THE NEED TO BELONG AND THE PSYCHOLOGY OF AFFILIATION.....	5
2.1 Social Exclusion	5
2.2 The Consequences of Social Exclusion	7
2.3 The Need to Belong	9
2.4 The Psychology of Affiliation	12
CHAPTER3: CONSUMPTION, SOCIAL EXCLUSION AND THE PSYCHOLOGY OF AFFILIATION	15
3.1 Social Exclusion and Evaluations of Affiliating Products	18
Hypothesis 1: Socially excluded individuals will evaluate affiliating products more positively compared to those who are not socially excluded.	19
3.2 Social Exclusion and Self-esteem	19
Hypothesis 2a: Individuals' state self-esteem will be lowered by anticipated social exclusion.....	20
Hypothesis 2b: The lowered state self-esteem will mediate the effect of social exclusion on the evaluations of affiliating products.....	20

Hypothesis 3: Trait self-esteem will moderate the effects of social exclusion on the evaluations of affiliating products...	21
3.3 Social Exclusion and Impulsivity	21
Hypothesis 4a: Anticipated social exclusion will cause individuals to become more impulsive..	22
Hypothesis 4b: The impulsivity induced by social exclusion will mediate the effect of social exclusion on the evaluations of affiliating products...	22
CHAPTER 4: STUDY 1	23
4.1 Overview	23
4.2 Method	23
4.2.1 Pretest	23
4.2.2 Participants	24
4.2.3 Materials and Procedure	24
4.2.3.1 Social Exclusion Manipulation	24
4.2.3.2 Manipulation Check	25
4.2.3.3 Product Evaluations	26
4.2.3.4 Covariates	26
4.3 Results	27
4.3.1 Manipulation Check	27
4.3.2 How Appealing was the Bilkent Mug?	27
4.3.3 Would the Participants Like to Receive the Bilkent Mug as a Gift?	28
4.3.4 Would the Bilkent Mug Make the Participants Feel Like a Part of Something Valuable?	39
4.3.5 Alternative Explanations	29
4.4 Discussion	30
CHAPTER 5: STUDY 2	32
5.1 Overview	32

5.2 Method	33
5.2.1 Participants	33
5.2.2 Materials and Procedure	33
5.2.2.1 Social Exclusion Manipulation.....	33
5.2.2.2 Manipulation Check	35
5.2.2.3 Types of Affiliation	35
5.2.2.4 Product Evaluations	35
5.2.2.5 Measurement of State Self-esteem	36
5.2.2.6 Measurement of Trait Self-esteem	37
5.2.2.7 Measurement of Impulsivity	37
5.2.2.8 Mood	37
5.2.2.9 Loneliness	38
5.2.2.10 Being Bilkent proud, degree of supporting the favorite team and considering being a member of the university/team as an achievement	38
5.3 Results	39
5.3.1 Manipulation Check	39
5.3.2 How Much were the Participants Willing to Pay for the Affiliating Products?	39
5.3.3 How Much were the Participants Willing to Pay for the Neutral Products?	40
5.3.4 How Appealing were the Affiliating Products?	41
5.3.5 How Appealing were the Neutral Products?	42
5.3.6 Would the Participants Like to Receive the Affiliating and Neutral Products as Gifts?	43
5.3.7 Would Owning the Affiliating Products Make the Participants Feel Like a Part of Something Valuable?	44
5.3.8 Would Owning the Neutral Products Make the Participants Feel Like a Part of Something Valuable?	45

5.3.9 Did Owning the Affiliating Products Reflect the Individuality of the Person?	46
5.3.10 Did Owning the Neutral Products Reflect the Individuality of the Person?.....	47
5.3.11 Social Exclusion and State Self-esteem	48
5.3.12 Social Exclusion and Trait Self-esteem	49
5.3.13 Social Exclusion and Impulsivity	50
5.3.14 Alternative Explanations	51
5.3.14.1 Mood	51
5.3.14.2 Gender	51
5.3.14.3 Loneliness	52
5.3.15 Why the University and Team Affiliated Products Evaluated Differently?	52
5.3.15.1 Being university proud and degree of supporting favorite team	52
5.3.15.2 Considering being a member of the university/team as an achievement	53
5.4 Discussion	53
CHAPTER 6: GENERAL DISCUSSION	55
6.1 Managerial Implications	58
6.2 Limitations and Future Directions	59
BIBLIOGRAPHY	62
APPENDICES	
A. SOCIAL EXCLUSION MANIPULATION	68
B. STATE SELF-ESTEEM SCALE	69
C. TRAIT SELF-ESTEEM SCALE	71
D. IMPULSIVITY SCALE	72
E. STUDY 2: RESULTS FOR THE CONTRAST ANALYSES	73

F. STUDY 2: SUMMARY OF ANOVA FUTURE EXPECTATIONS AND NEUTRAL PRODUCT EVALUATIONS	74
G. STUDY 2: SUMMARY OF ANOVA ON FUTURE EXPECTATIONS AND EVALUATIONS OF PRODUCTS THAT DEMONSTRATE TEAM AFFILIATION.....	75
H. STUDY 2: SUMMARY OF THE PEARSON CORRELATIONS AMONG PROPOSED MEDIATORS AND PRODUCT EVALUATIONS...	76
I. STUDY 2: SUMMARY OF THE ANCOVA ON FUTURE EXPECTATIONS AND PRODUCT EVALUATIONS WHEN TRAIT SELF- ESTEEM IS CONTROLLED	77
J. STUDY 2: SUMMARY OF THE ANOVA ON HIGH AND LOW LEVELS OF TRAIT SELF-ESTEEM AND PRODUCT EVALUATIONS IN FUTURE LONELINESS GROUP.....	78

LIST OF TABLES

1. Study 2: Willingness to Pay for the Bilkent Products.....	40
2. Study 2: “I Find This Product Very Appealing”	42
3. Study 2: “I Would Be Happy to Receive This Product as a Gift”	44
4. Study 2: “Owning This Product Would Make Me Feel Like a Part of Something Valuable”	45
5. Study 2: “If I Owned This Product Everybody Who Sees It Would Have a Clue About Who I Am”	47

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Affiliating products are a large industry. In 2007 and 2008 each more than 1000 Bilkent students purchased products that demonstrate their affiliation with the university from the university's bookstore (Meteksan 2008). Likewise supporters of Beşiktaş Sports Team purchased Besiktas memorabilia amounting about 10.000.000 YTL in 2007 and 15.000.000 YTL in 2008 (Beşiktaş Spor Kulübü 2008). Revealing the mechanisms underlying such purchasing behavior is an interesting topic for both academics and marketing professionals. The current research explores what motivates the need to purchase and own these affiliating products. We focus on social exclusion as a motivator of this behavior.

Today, people are connected to each other in different ways compared to the past generations. People spend large chunks of time in front of their computers. They seek friends and relationships via the internet. Facebook, the leading online friendship network, had more than 175 million active users as of March 2009. An average member on Facebook has 120 friends on his/her network. Often times most of these friends are just acquaintances (i.e. classmates from one's primary school) that the person has not interacted with for years. More than 15 million users update their profiles at least once a day, in order to tell their "*friends*" the latest news about

themselves, inform them about their plans for the weekend, and to communicate their psychological states (Facebook 2009). Interestingly, their face to face contact with their "*friends*" are limited.

Kraut and his colleagues (1998) report that physical contact has been minimized; people have fewer meaningful and stable relationships compared to decades ago, and they are more individualized, lonely and depressed. Individuals face social exclusion in the form of alienation and fewer intimate relationships.

Nonetheless, people have a fundamental need to belong. Being part of a community or feeling that one is a part of something valuable is a basic need of every human being (Baumeister and Leary 1995). No one wants to live in isolation. People strive to be a part of a community or group. As such, group associations are at the heart of people's daily lives and they are necessary for individuals to sustain their well being. Failing to satisfy the need to belong may result in both psychological (Baumeister and Tice 1990; Baumeister and Leary 1995; Baumeister et al. 2002; Baumeister et al. 2005; Buckley et al. 2004; Caicoppo et al. 2003; Leary 1990; Leary et al. 1995; Rudman et al. 2007; Schachter 1977; Twenge et al. 2001; Twenge et al. 2002, 2003; Twenge et al. 2007) and physical problems (Eisenberger et al. 2003; Eisenberger et al. 2006; MacDonald and Leary 2005). The need to belong is fundamental to one's well being. Affiliation with a particular group or community can satisfy the need to belong (Maner et al. 2007).

Marketers have realized the importance of people's need to belong and desire to affiliate. Products that demonstrate group membership such as university sweatshirts, car stickers of alma mater, team uniforms, Harley Davidson boots, Greenpeace pins and the like are increasingly available in today's marketplace.

These products help the consumer display their affiliation with various groups. The consumption of these products helps the person affiliate with specific groups as well as helping them show the world that they are a part of a community (e.g. Kates 2002, 2004; Schouten and McAlexander 1995; Kozinets 2001; Muniz Jr. and Schau 2005; Thompson and Troester 2002). Consumption is critical to affiliation.

Consumer research also posits that the desire to belong motivates community formation. More specifically, community-forming activities in those individuals who are excluded from *mainstream* social groups. Kates (2002, 2004) examined the consumption behavior of gay consumers and found that they consume in a strategic way to conform to the norms of their community. They use marker goods such as putting their handkerchiefs in their back pocket, wearing tight jeans, using products with the rainbow logo and by shopping from gay friendly stores. Some of these communities that are specifically centered on brands and consumption have also been formed. Some brands that are examined have community building features are Harley Davidson (Schouten and McAlexander 1995), Apple Newton (Muniz Jr. and Schau 2005) and Star Trek movies and television series (Kozinets 2001). However, none of these studies have explicitly examined the relationship between social exclusion, affiliation, community building and consumption.

The current thesis focuses on how social exclusion influences consumers' judgments about those products that have affiliating features. Within the social exclusion framework it argues that social exclusion leads to more favorable evaluations of affiliating products. The relationship between self-esteem and impulsivity induced by social exclusion and their effects on the evaluations of

affiliating products are also investigated. The next section provides an overview of social exclusion, the need to belong and the psychology of affiliation.

CHAPTER 2

SOCIAL EXCLUSION, THE NEED TO BELONG AND THE PSYCHOLOGY OF AFFILIATION

2.1. Social Exclusion

Communities have survival and protective features both in animals and human species. In the nature, animals live in herds and those who are rejected by the group members and left alone usually lose their chance to survive (Lancaster 1986). Similarly in human beings, groups have a protective function; group members support each other and save their fellow group members from outsiders' harmful acts (Ainsworth 1989). Therefore, like animals, individuals also have a tendency to group together.

As well as the tendency to group together there is also a tendency to systematically exclude others for various reasons. According to Kurzban and Leary (2001), social exclusion is an inherent characteristic of humans as well as animals. It has an evolutionary basis in the sense that it provides both survival and reproductive benefits. Establishment of status hierarchies, competition for limited resources, not including others to particular areas (territorializing) and social ostracism are behaviors that are seen not only in animal species, but also in human beings (for a

review, see Kurzban and Leary 2001). By excluding outsiders, groups benefit from sharing labor, resources and information; cooperating and overcoming stress and threat together. Members of a certain group use social exclusion as a justification of existing social structure by making attributions about their group members' deservingness and worthiness as well as the negative traits of out-group members (Kurzban and Leary 2001).

Out-group members are the ones who are poor partners for social exchange. People try to avoid interactions with such individuals. Poor partners are either people with little or no valuable and/or beneficial offerings in a reciprocal relationship or people who fail to follow conventional rules or norms (Kurzban and Leary 2001). For instance children do not play with other children who do not let them to play with their toys, teenagers exclude individuals who do not conform to the fashion standards of their in group, and adults avoid coworkers who gossip in the office. These behaviors all demonstrate social exclusion.

Social exclusion is a contested term used for different contexts changing from group to individual basis. According to Burchardt et al. (1999: 229):

An individual is socially excluded if (a) he or she is geographically resident in a society but (b) for reasons beyond his or her control he or she cannot participate in the normal activities of citizens in that society and (c) he or she would like to so participate.

Though geographical and technological constraints on interactions are much more relaxed when compared to a century ago, lives are much more fragmented and face-to-face interactions are more scarce and impersonal as well (Appadurai 1996). In such an isolated world and individualized culture, people can feel socially excluded more easily. In fact, according to Baumeister and Leary (1995), "relatedness without interaction" and "interaction without bond of caring or positive

concern”, are much more crucial aspects of social exclusion than geographical and spatial constraints. Today, we can contact more people by the means of internet, we work in large plazas and live in more crowded cities where we encounter more people while going to our homes; in other words there are more people around us. However, individuals in front of computers and handling nearly all social interactions via the internet, communicate less with their families and friends. Thus their social circle shrinks and they have fewer meaningful, intimate and stable relationships. Hence people become increasingly lonely and depressed (Kraut et al. 1998). The effects of alienation and consequences of social exclusion can be devastating for the individuals.

2.2. The Consequences of Social Exclusion

Social exclusion induces an intense feeling of loneliness (Baumeister and Leary 1995; Leary 1990; Kraut et al. 1998). Loneliness can lead to severe psychological problems including stress, depression and insomnia (Caicoppo et al. 2003). Research on autobiographies of extremely isolated and lonely people such as prisoners, religious hermits and castaways showed that social isolation can result in disturbance, anxiety, mental and physical pain, state of withdrawal and detachment, hallucinations and extreme suffering (Schachter 1977). It has been documented that that the emotional pain felt due to social exclusion resembles physical pain; because the two share common physiological mechanism. The part of the brain that responds to physical injuries is the same part that responds to social injuries (Eisenberger et al. 2003; Eisenberger et al. 2006; MacDonald and Leary 2005). The psychological outcomes of exclusion are much more severe than inducing pain.

To begin with, social exclusion creates anxiety (Leary 1990; Baumeister and Tice 1990; Schachter 1977) and depression (Buckley et al. 2004; Kraut et al. 1998; Leary 1990; Schachter 1977). Socially excluded individuals lose their self confidence and they show lower levels of self-esteem (Leary 1990; Leary et al. 1995; Rudman et al. 2007). They become more jealous (Leary 1990). Moreover, socially excluded individuals exhibit lower faith in the meaning of life, escapism from self awareness, distorted time perception and increased levels of detachment and laziness (Schachter 1977; Twenge et al. 2003).

Cognitive performances of socially excluded individuals are also reduced (Baumeister et al. 2002). Baumeister and his colleagues (2002) found that, when anticipating a lonely future, individuals show decrements in a range of their intellectual and cognitive abilities. They have lower scores in IQ and GRE tests and they fail in memory tests and reasoning tasks. Similarly, socially excluded individuals have a hard time making rational choices and they struggle with impulse control (Baumeister et al. 2005; Twenge et al. 2003). In other words, socially excluded individuals cannot resist temptations despite the risks and costs that are associated with these temptations. They fail to consider the long-term consequences of their actions (Baumeister et al 2005). These deconstructive consequences of social exclusion can be harmful. Twenge et al. (2002) demonstrated that people who anticipate social exclusion are more likely to engage in self defeating behaviors, such as taking self defeating and stress inducing risks, choosing unhealthy behaviors, and engaging in pleasurable, rather than rational, activities.

The negative consequences of social exclusion do not only affect the excluded individuals, but also other people. Prior research showed that socially

excluded individuals become less helpful and cooperative (Twenge et al. 2007) and more aggressive against others (Buckley et al. 2004; Twenge et al 2001). A case study examining the high school shootings in the U.S.A. demonstrated that aggression due to social exclusion can lead to such violent behaviors as shootings and crime (Leary et. al 2003).

The question remains: What are the underlying mechanisms of the social exclusion experience? The answer is simple: It is the isolation felt due to having been excluded and left out threatens people's need to belong (Schachter 1977; Williams and Zadro 2005; Baumeister and Leary 1995).

2.3. The Need to Belong

The need to belong and to have positive social contact are crucial for people. These are necessary for personal development, psychological and physical health. Frequent and ongoing contact with others, strong feelings of attachment, intimacy and commitment characterize the need to belong (Kurzban and Leary 2001). The belongingness hypothesis suggests that, "human beings have a pervasive drive' to form and maintain at least a minimum quantity of lasting, positive and significant interpersonal relationships" (Baumeister and Leary, 1995: 497). People try to maintain their relationships in order to satisfy their need to belong, and this need is threatened when one is socially excluded.

The need to belong was evolutionarily developed for the means of survival just like hunger and thirst. Yet, most people face exclusion or rejection from others at some point in their lives (Baumeister and Leary 1995; Kurzban and Leary 2001).

Being turned down in a romantic relationship, being sidelined in a study group or being uninvited to a party are all examples of social exclusion and they are very common in people's everyday lives. Since need to belong is fundamental for the well-being of individuals, just like other physiological and psychological needs there are mechanisms to detect when and if the need to belong is not satisfied or is threatened (e.g. Baumeister and Tice 1990; Leary 1990; Leary et al. 1995; Rudman et al. 2007; Schachter 1977).

In order to avoid the negative consequences of social exclusion, human psychological system developed a detection mechanism, which monitors the environmental and social cues that signal upcoming rejection and/or the possibility of social exclusion and provide cues for appropriate behaviors for inclusion (Pickett and Gardner 2005). Pickett and Gardner (2005) argue that the social monitoring system increases individuals' sensitivity to interpersonal cues (such as the appearance, mimics, voice tone and gestures of the others) when they are socially excluded so that the person can decipher norms of the groups, expected behaviors from group members, appropriate topics of conversation and the like. For example, by observing the in-group members clothing style or discussions, the individuals can understand the expected behavioral standards for that group and act accordingly.

Those people who fail to follow conventional rules and societal norms are socially excluded (Kurzban and Leary 2001) as such one of the main motives of self-regulation is gaining social acceptance (Baumeister and Heatherton 1996; Baumeister et al. 2005; Pickett and Gardner 2005). The need to belong is at the heart of self-regulatory behavior. Individuals try to control their behaviors, conform to the rules of their communities and act according to norms in order to maintain their

social relationships. Therefore, the need to belong motivates individuals to use their capacities for self regulation to protect themselves and promote their long term interests of well being. Individuals use the cues gathered from the social monitoring system, regulate their behaviors in accordance with these cues (Pickett and Gardner 2005; Williams et al. 2000; Williams and Zadro 2005) and try to find ways to satisfy their need to belong.

Although prior research showed that people can demonstrate antisocial behavior when they are socially excluded (Buckley et al 2004; Twenge et al. 2001; Twenge et al. 2007), there is strong evidence to suggest that individuals would eventually try to satisfy their need to belong by seeking opportunities to form social bonds and affiliate with other people (e.g. Maner et al. 2007; Williams et al. 2000). The need to belong stimulates goal-directed behavior, since people actively seek to form new relationships and try to conform to societal norms in order to maintain and enhance existing relationships. In other words, when the attainment of an important need (i.e. the need to belong) cannot be satisfied, people look for alternative means to satisfy that need, hence they seek affiliation.

The need to belong is related to two principles, satiation and substitution. These are important in understanding the tactics that individuals use for affiliating with others (Baumeister and Leary 1995). Satiation occurs when individuals have sufficient social bonds to satisfy their need to belong, so they have diminished motivation to affiliate and they are less interested in forming new relationships. People who feel that they have enough friends or strong family ties do not feel strong enthusiasm to engage in new relationships. Substitution is related to replacing one social bond with another. People who are excluded from one social circle can replace

the feelings of emptiness by establishing another group affiliation. According to these two principles a certain quantity of attachments and interactions should be maintained to satisfy the need to belong and when the optimal quantity of relationships is reached people become less interested in forming new social bonds. Upon breaking relationships, people try to replace the emptiness due to the ended relationship by forming a new relationship or by giving more importance to a previously formed relationship. These relationships can be broken down due to a wide range of reasons such as death (Beckman 1981), divorce (Spanier and Casto 1979) and breaking up romantic involvement (Milardo et al. 1983).

2.4. The Psychology of Affiliation

Social reconnection hypothesis posits, "Social exclusion stimulates a desire to affiliate and reconnect with others." (Maner et al 2007:42). Murray (1938) describes the desire for affiliation as "the tendency to receive gratification from harmonious relationships and from a sense of communion" (cited in Hill 1987:1009). Individuals may wish to be with others, simply for having an enjoyable time or for talking to someone about how his/her day went. But more importantly, people need others in order to maintain and enhance their well being (Beckman 1981; Schachter 1959; Hill 1987; Gump and Kulik 1977). More specifically, people need the presence of others in order to reduce the ambiguity and meaninglessness that they feel due to loneliness by comparing themselves with others. People need the consideration of others in order to feel worthy and important and they seek praise when they require emotional support and sympathy (Hill 1987). Similarly, people's needs for things such as approval, friendship, prestige, achievement, status, or help are satisfied to a great

extent through interpersonal relations (Schachter 1977). As a result, positive affect (happiness, joy, calm, excitement, satisfaction) follows from forming and solidifying social bonds, whereas negative affect (emotional distress, anxiety, jealousy, depression, sadness, anger, guilt, loneliness) follows from broken or threatened bonds and refusal (Schachter 1977). In other words, affiliation is a strong desire, which is heightened when the need to belong is threatened by social exclusion.

When the need for affiliation is induced, individuals seek affiliation with other individuals, particularly those with whom they share some kind of common ground, those who understand them and who have common characteristics, interests or experiences with them to reduce the experience of negative emotions (Gump and Kulik 1977; Schachter 1959, 1977). Gump and Kulik (1977) demonstrated that when individuals affiliate with others who they believed face the same threatening situation, as they show lower levels of stress and anxiety. Schachter (1977) further argues that isolated individuals like prisoners show lower levels of stress and aggression, when they share their loneliness with other individuals who live the same experience, even when there is no face to face communication.

Individuals do not want to just be a part of any group, but they want to have a meaningful group membership. Individuals want to bond with people whom they share their goals (Baumeister and Leary 1995). Consequently, people become fan of sports teams, sign up fan clubs or alumni associations. Note that, these structures do not provide intimate reciprocal relationships; nonetheless they are means of affiliation.

Therefore, even when there is little physical interaction, individuals seek affiliation, when they have just a few intimate relationships (Schachter 1977). In

other words, even if group affiliation cannot be truly attained, the social demonstration of one's affiliation is still desired. Many social institutions and behavioral patterns (such as reunions, or sending greeting cards) also serve the need to preserve a minimal level of social attachment in the absence of actual, continual interaction (Baumeister and Leary 1995). Regardless of the underlying reason, whether it is to demonstrate that one is part of a community or to project an image of belonging, individuals want to display their relationships.

Marketers that realize this need, created products that help people demonstrate their affiliation with different groups (i.e. environmental organizations, brands, sports teams, alumni associations, and etc.). The consumption or the avoidance of products that demonstrate affiliation with certain groups and communities is a very common practice.

CHAPTER 3

CONSUMPTION, SOCIAL EXCLUSION AND THE PSYCHOLOGY OF AFFILIATION

Products are not consumed just for their function, but they are also consumed because of their symbolic meanings (Levy 1959) and their ability to communicate symbolic and cultural meanings (e.g. McCracken 1986; Solomon 1983). Possessions are used as a means of defining one's individuality (Belk 1988). People make inferences about others based on their consumption practices (Belk, Bahn and Mayer 1982). Individuals strategically consume to be liked by others, gain positive feedback from their loved ones and socialize with their idealized ones (Belk, Ger and Askegaard 2003). This issue is not simply related to modernity or contemporary consumption but as mentioned by Veblen (1899), goods are always being used for identity enhancement, displaying wealth, status and distinction. Douglas and Isherwood (1979) also mention the communicative aspects of goods and how marker goods (such as large houses in fancy streets, designer outfits and etc.) create categories of discrimination among different cultural and economical classes and define group membership.

Today, in the face of weakening bonds in traditional communities, a brand, consumption object, or image may become the basis on which a group is formed

(Muniz Jr. and O'Guinn 2001). Some examples include the subculture of consumption formed around riders of Harley Davidson motorcycles (Schouten and McAlexander 1995), the culture of consumption formed around the TV series and movies of Star Trek (Kozinets 2001), the natural health micro culture centered around practices related to natural health and holistic medicine (Thompson and Troester 2002), and the community formed around the now-defunct Apple Newton PDA (Muniz Jr. and Schau 2005). In fact, the brands can be powerful means for bringing people together, Muniz Jr. and Schau (2005) demonstrate that after the Apple Newton PDA was abandoned by its producer, the users of the product formed a community and tried to maintain relationships with the other users of the product, not only to revitalize the brand but also to share their experiences with the product and their feelings about it (Muniz Jr. and Schau 2005).

Like consuming, avoiding certain products can be a focal characteristic of communities. More specifically, as seen in consumer movements, like anti-Starbucks (Thompson and Arsel 2004) anti-Nike or anti-genetically engineered food activists (Kozinets and Handelman 2004) consumption strategies are also used in showing opposition or disaffiliation with a certain group. These activist communities are formed by people who avoid Starbucks cafes and instead prefer local coffee houses (Thompson and Arsel 2004), by people who avoid using Nike products and by people who refuse to consume genetically engineered food (Kozinets and Handelman 2004). Members of all these communities do not engage in face-to-face interactions continuously; instead they try to communicate their membership by engaging in similar consumption practices, like wearing certain outfits, hanging out in similar places, consuming certain type of products while carefully avoiding the opposed products or actions.

Similar behaviors can be observed in friendships. Varenne (1982) suggests that peer group affiliations in schools are constantly replenished and group boundaries are reinforced through daily peer interactions, seating arrangements and in extracurricular activities. In this manner, certain consumption objects are used as constant reminders of group belongingness (or disbelongingness) as well as tools for such replenishment of group boundaries. In fact Muniz Jr. and O'Guinn (2001) argued that in communities, which are not geographically bound belonging is mediated through the ownership of related products and enactment of related consumption practices. Status within these communities depends on the commitment to a shared ethos, which can be manifested in and strengthened through the use of affiliating products (e.g. Kozinets 2001; Muniz Jr. and O'Guinn 2001; Muniz Jr. and Schau 2005; Schouten and McAlexander 1995; Thompson and Troester 2002).

Usage of affiliating products and employing consumption as an affiliation strategy is especially common in those groups that are excluded from mainstream social circles (Deshpande et al 1986; Emslie et al. 2007; Kates 2002, 2004). For instance, Deshpande, Hoyer and Donthu (1986) demonstrated that Hispanic consumers in the USA, who demonstrated strong affiliation with their ethnic group, were more likely to buy products that were advertised to their ethnic group. Emslie, Bent and Seaman (2007) also argue that ethnicity has a significant impact on consumption patterns and purchase decisions among consumers of minority groups such as Asian and Indian in United Kingdom. Similarly, Kates (2004) studied how gay consumers enact affiliation to their gay identity, and revealed that they consume those brands which they have legitimated as being aligned with their common value system. Members of the gay community shop from stores that are gay friendly and prefer brands that are legitimized by the gay community for their gay friendly

images, such as Levi's jeans, Absolut vodka and Body shop cosmetics; whereas they carefully avoid consuming brands that have homophobic images, such as Coors beer (Kates 2002, 2004). These studies provide evidence that people use consumption as a way to affiliate with similar people and cope with the negative consequences of social exclusion.

In other words, consumption or avoidance of products that demonstrate affiliation or belonging to groups, communities, teams, and any kind of collectivity, can be legitimate ways for consumers to negotiate social bonds. Therefore consumption practices are strongly related to people's desire for affiliation hence can be affected by the need to belong induced due to social exclusion.

3.1. Social Exclusion and Evaluations of Affiliating Products

The need to belong and the loneliness that is experienced due to social exclusion are very important to understand the dynamics of social exclusion, and its cognitive, psychological and behavioral consequences. Social exclusion increases the need to belong and in turn the desire for affiliation. Moreover, people want to affiliate with other people that they share common characteristics and values with. People try to at least preserve minimal levels of social attachment in the absence of continuous interaction. Hence, people become fan of sports teams, sign up members of societies, clubs or alumni associations. The need for affiliation can be satisfied via consumption. Consumption of certain products that demonstrate affiliation with can substitute for social bonds. Group affiliation can be negotiated through consumption strategies. Therefore, the purchase and consumption of products that demonstrate affiliation should be influenced by needs for belonging and affiliation.

Specifically we suggest that social exclusion will have a positive impact on behaviors related to consuming and evaluating affiliating products, which consumers see as relevant or successful in displaying their agenda for social belonging and affiliation. We predict that, socially excluded individuals will want to satisfy their increased need to belong by consuming affiliating products. Consequently their evaluations of affiliating products will be more positive.

Hypothesis 1: Socially excluded individuals will evaluate affiliating products more positively compared to those who are not socially excluded.

3.2. Social Exclusion and Self-Esteem

Responses to the feelings of social exclusion are related to self-esteem (Leary 1990; Leary et al. 1995). Although people have an enduring level of self-esteem, (trait self-esteem), research has shown that levels of self-esteem can vary in response to environmental and situational conditions (state self-esteem: Crocker and Major 1989; Crocker et al. 2003; Leary et al 1995; Markus and Kunda 1986).

Self-esteem is a monitoring system which alerts the mechanism in order to maintain social relationships (Leary 1990; Leary et al. 1995). People want to maintain a minimal level of social affiliations and their state self-esteem increases when their need to belong is satisfied (Leary 1990; Leary et al. 1995). Prior research has shown that individuals' state self-esteem is decreased when they fail to satisfy their need to belong and that social exclusion results in decreased state self-esteem (Leary 1990; Leary et al. 1995; Rudman et al. 2007). Individuals who feel socially excluded feel that they are not capable of enhancing and/or maintaining relationships

and so they feel unsuccessful in socializing. Consequently, their state self-esteem is lowered.

We argue that the effects of social exclusion on people's evaluations of affiliating products will be mediated by state self-esteem that is reduced by social exclusion. Specifically, we predict that individuals' state self-esteem will decrease when they anticipate social exclusion, because the anticipated social exclusion will lead to feelings of loneliness and an increased need to belong. These individuals, whose state self-esteem is lowered by social exclusion, will strive to satisfy their affiliating needs by evaluating affiliating products more favorably.

Hypothesis 2a: Individuals' state self-esteem will be lowered by anticipated social exclusion.

Hypothesis 2b: The lowered state self-esteem will mediate the effect of social exclusion on the evaluations of affiliating products.

Trait self-esteem is related to individuals' emotions about social exclusion. Leary et al. (1995) stated that people with lower levels of trait self-esteem are generally more likely to perceive themselves as being excluded from the social groups, while individuals with high levels of trait self-esteem perceive themselves as being accepted by others. Thereby, we suggest that the effects of social exclusion on affiliating product evaluations will be moderated by trait self-esteem. We argue that people's trait self-esteem will affect the degree to which they are influenced by social exclusion. In other words people who have high trait self-esteem will be affected less by social exclusion than those who have low trait self-esteem. Accordingly, high trait self-esteem participants will be less affected by anticipated social exclusion; they will have lower affiliating needs in response to social exclusion. Individuals' self-

esteem trait will moderate the effect of social exclusion on the evaluations of affiliating products.

Hypothesis 3: Trait self-esteem will moderate the effects of social exclusion on the evaluations of affiliating products.

Individuals who are low in trait self-esteem are more susceptible to the affect of social exclusion. When socially excluded, if trait self-esteem is low, then individuals should make more favorable evaluations of affiliating products compared to those individuals who are high in trait self-esteem.

3.3. Social Exclusion and Impulsivity

Research has shown that social exclusion reduce people's capacity to self regulate (Baumeister et al. 2005; Twenge et al. 2002, 2003). Self regulation is defined as "the capacity to alter one's own states and responses" (Baumeister 2002). Self regulation failures lead to impulsive behavior, "behavior that is unplanned and resulted by an activated stimulus" (Baumeister 2002). Impulse buying is a demonstration of a self regulatory failure. It is defined as "Sudden, powerful, persistent urge to buy something immediately" (Rook 1987; Rook and Hoch 1985). It is a "Spontaneous and unreflective desire to buy, without thoughtful consideration of why and for what reason a person should have the product" (Rook and Fisher 1995).

Impulse buying can be explained from the perspective of the Limited-resource model which suggests that there is a global and diverse resource of self-control which surpasses the power of impulse (Baumeister and Heatherton 1996; Baumeister et al. 1998; Baumeister 2002; Faber and Vohs 2004). In other words, self

regulatory resource consists of a wide range of behaviors across a variety of domains. This resource is finite. That is, performing any act of self-control depletes this resource (i.e. having a stressful day, dieting, solving difficult problems, making series of decisions, physical exhaustion and etc.) This concept is defined as “ego depletion” (Baumeister 2002; Faber and Vohs 2004). Anticipated social exclusion is a source of ego depletion (Baumeister et al. 2005). Vohs and Faber (2007) showed that self regulatory resource depletion leads to impulse buying.

Vohs and Faber (2007) pointed out that people are willing to pay more and purchase more items when they act on impulse. Similarly Rook and Hoch (1985) indicated that when acting on impulse, consumers’ cognitive capacity diminishes and they cannot regard the consequences of impulse buying. Therefore it is expected that people evaluate products more positively when they make decisions on impulse. Since anticipated social exclusion is shown to reduce cognitive processes (Baumeister et al. 2002) and diminish the capacity for self regulation (Baumeister et al. 2005); we suggest that social exclusion will induce impulsive behavior and lead people to evaluate affiliating products more favorably.

Hypothesis 4a: Anticipated social exclusion will cause individuals to become more impulsive.

Hypothesis 4b: The impulsivity induced by social exclusion will mediate the effect of social exclusion on the evaluations of affiliating products.

CHAPTER 4

STUDY 1

4.1. Overview

Study 1 tests the hypothesis that social exclusion causes people to evaluate affiliating products more positively. The study is a 2(future relationships: future loneliness, future belonging)X2(type of affiliation: university, neutral) between subjects experiment in which social exclusion was manipulated and evaluation of affiliating products were measured.

4.2. Method

4.2.1. Pretest:

The dependent variable was pretested prior to the study. A pretest was conducted with 20 undergraduate students to identify the type of affiliations that our student population has and to determine the products that are appealing to them. Eighty percent of the students indicated that they use mugs. Therefore, mug was chosen out of eight products (pen, car sticker, badge, organizer, mug, sweatshirt, teddy bear and keychain) to be used in the actual experiment. University affiliation, as the type of affiliation was also selected based on the same pretest. Students

indicated that they feel most attached to their university in terms of a social circle (85% of the students).

A second pretest was conducted with 22 undergraduate students in order to test the measures associated with the mug and the university affiliation for readability. Following the social exclusion manipulation, participants were asked to complete the questionnaire both for Bilkent and neutral mugs. The goal of this second pretest was to see whether the students understand the manipulation and the survey as it was conducted in English. As a result, none of the participants indicated any problem regarding the study.

4.2.2. Participants:

The study was conducted with 110 undergraduate and MBA students at Bilkent University in Ankara. Some data were eliminated due to missing information and 102 observations were included in the actual analyses (Males=52, Females=50). Their ages ranged from 17 to 28 ($M=21.23$). Participants were randomly assigned to conditions.

4.2.3. Materials and procedure:

4.2.3.1. Social exclusion manipulation:

Social exclusion was manipulated by using the technique developed by Twenge et al. (2001). As a cover scenario participants were asked to complete a personality test. The short version of extraversion scale of Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (Eysenck et al. 1985) was used as the personality test (see Appendix A). Participants were asked to complete the scale and then sum up their extraversion scores. Once each participants computed their personality score, they were provided

bogus personality feedback about their anticipated future (i.e. future loneliness, future belonging).

Following Twenge et al. (2001), we define social exclusion as not having stable, meaningful and close relationships and we operationalize it as being alone in the future. In the experimental condition (future loneliness) participants were told that the person will end up alone later in his/her life. Specifically, participants in the future loneliness condition were told *"You are the type who will end up alone later in life. You may have friend and relationships now, but by mid-20s most of these will have drifted away. You may even marry or have several marriages, but these are likely to be short lived and not continue in your 40s. Relationships do not last and when you are past the age where people constantly forming new relationships you will most likely end up being alone more and more."*

Participants in the positive comparison group (future belonging) were told that they will be surrounded by other people at all times. Specifically, participants in the future belonging condition were told *"Being an extravert (introvert) is a really good thing for relationships. You are type who has rewarding relationships throughout your life. You are likely to have a long and stable marriage and have friendships that will last into your later years. You will most likely spend the rest of your life surrounded by friends and people who care about you."*

4.2.3.2. Manipulation Check:

Although the social exclusion manipulation used in this study has been established (e.g. Baumeister et al. 2002; Baumeister et al. 2005; Maner et al. 2007; Twenge et al. 2001; Twenge et al. 2002, 2003; Twenge et al. 2007), a manipulation check was still included since this manipulation was never used with the Turkish

participants prior to this study. Specifically, participants were asked to indicate how representative of them the personality description that they read was. Participants indicated their responses on a seven-point Likert scale where 1 indicated not at all representative and 7 indicated extremely representative.

4.2.3.3. Product evaluations:

After the social exclusion manipulation, participants were told that the university's bookstore is conducting a survey to assess the appeal of their new product offerings. They were asked to evaluate a group of products that would be sold at the university bookstore. Each participant evaluated the focal product 'mug' along with filler products to maintain the face validity of the measure. Specifically, participants were shown pictures of either a white plain ceramic mug or a white ceramic mug with Bilkent's logo printed on it. Upon receiving the product pictures, participants rated the statements "*I find this product very appealing*", "*I would be happy to receive this product as a gift*" and "*Owning this product would make me feel like a part of something valuable*" each on a seven-point Likert scale where 1 indicated strongly disagree and 7 indicated strongly agree.

4.2.3.4. Covariates:

To control for the other variables that can affect the product appeals, participants indicated how Bilkent proud they are on a seven-point Likert scale where 1 indicated strongly disagree and 7 indicated strongly agree. Further, to make sure that the effect of social exclusion on the evaluations of affiliating products was not driven by the participants' actual loneliness, as opposed to the experimentally induced social exclusion (future loneliness), they were asked to indicate whether they

find themselves lonely or not by answering a yes/no question. Finally participants responded to demographics questions and they were debriefed.

4.3. Results

4.3.1. Manipulation Check:

As expected, participants in the future belonging condition indicated the personality description was more representative of them compared to participants in the future loneliness condition ($F(1,99)=14.980$, $p<.001$; $M_{Belonging}=5.27$, $M_{Loneliness}=4.21$). Overall, the average scores for each group were above the median of the scale (3.5). Thus we conclude that participants in both groups found the personality description to be representative of themselves. Hence the manipulation was successful.

4.3.2. How appealing was the Bilkent Mug?

A one way ANOVA on the appeal of the Bilkent mug revealed that participants in the future loneliness condition found the Bilkent mug more appealing compared to those participants in future belonging group ($F(1,46)=7.850$, $p<.01$; $M_{Loneliness}=3.74$, $M_{Belonging}=2.67$).

Furthermore, the neutral mug was not different in terms of how appealing it was to the participants across the two conditions, ($F(1,50)=.810$, $p>.30$; $M_{Loneliness}=2.58$, $M_{Belonging}=2.92$). Therefore, it can be concluded that participants who anticipate social exclusion evaluated only the affiliating product (i.e. Bilkent mug) more favorably than participants in the other condition.

In order to ensure that socially excluded participants make more favorable evaluations only for the affiliating products, we also compared the appeal of the mug as reported by participants in the two future loneliness groups in Bilkent and neutral conditions (neutral mug and Bilkent mug). The mean scores for the mug's appeal in Bilkent and neutral conditions were significantly different ($F(1,51)=10.697$, $p<.01$; $M_{Bilkent}=3.74$, $M_{Neutral}=2.58$). Specifically those participants who were in the future loneliness condition evaluated the Bilkent mug more positively than the neutral mug. The the increased product appeal is only for the affiliating product, but not for any other product.

4.3.3. *Would the participant like to receive the Bilkent mug as a gift?*

To further assess the product appeal we asked participants if they would like to receive the products as a gift. Participants' ratings of how happy they would be to receive the products as a gift further supported Hypothesis 1. A one way between subjects ANOVA showed a significant difference between the two conditions ($F(1,46)=5.380$; $p<.05$, $M_{Loneliness}=3.67$, $M_{Belonging}=2.57$). Participants in the future loneliness condition indicated that they would be happier than the participants in future belonging condition to receive the Bilkent mug as a gift. Again the neutral mug showed no difference across the two experimental conditions ($F(1,51)=.157$, $p>.70$; $M_{Loneliness}=2.42$, $M_{Belonging}=2.26$).

Once again, we compared future loneliness participants' (neutral and Bilkent conditions) to see how happy they would be to receive each mug (neutral and Bilkent) as a gift. A one-way ANOVA provided evidence that when social exclusion is anticipated, participants would be happier to receive a Bilkent mug as a gift than receiving a neutral mug ($F(1,51)=7.237$, $p<.01$; $M_{Bilkent}=3.67$, $M_{Neutral}=2.42$).

4.3.4. *Would the Bilkent mug make the participants feel like a part of something valuable?*

Participants indicated whether owning the Bilkent mug would make them feel like a part of something valuable. The results supported Hypothesis 1 ($F(1,46)=5.140$, $p < .05$; $M_{Loneliness}=3.59$, $M_{Belonging}=2.48$). More specifically those participants who anticipated future loneliness indicated that owning the Bilkent mug would make them feel like part of something valuable more than those participants who anticipated future belonging. Moreover, the neutral mug was also not evaluated differently across the two conditions ($F(1,51)=.045$, $p > .80$; $M_{Loneliness}=1.89$, $M_{Belonging}=1.82$).

Next we compared the mean scores of Bilkent and neutral mugs when participants anticipated future loneliness. The results revealed a significant difference. Participants who anticipated social exclusion indicated that they would feel like something part of valuable by owning a Bilkent mug more than they would feel by owning a neutral mug, ($F(1,51)=14.797$, $p < .001$; $M_{Bilkent}=3.59$, $M_{Neutral}=1.89$).

4.3.5. *Alternative Explanations:*

There was no difference among participants' ratings of product appeal in terms of gender ($F(1,46)=.000$, $p > .90$) and indications of whether owning the product makes them feel like a part of something valuable ($F(1,46)=3.625$, $p > .06$). There was significant gender difference in response to the question asking if

receiving the Bilkent mug as a gift would make them feel happy ($F(1,46)=5.502$, $p<.05$).

In order to eliminate any other alternative explanations that the difference in evaluation of the affiliating product was due to gender as opposed to social exclusion we conducted an ANCOVA controlling for the effects of gender and the difference among conditions remained significant ($F(1,45)=4.595$, $p<.05$). As such we concluded that gender does not affect the evaluations of affiliating products when socially excluded.

A one-way ANOVA on Bilkent pride showed no significant difference in terms of being Bilkent proud across the two conditions ($F(1,100)=2.174$, $p>.10$; $M_{Loneliness}=7.83$, $M_{Belonging}=7.12$). The participants in both groups were also similar in terms of how lonely they are ($\chi^2(1)=.201$, $p>.70$ (2-sided), Loneliness=14%, Belonging=17%)¹. Therefore, these variables were not analyzed further.

4.4. Discussion

The results of Study 1 showed that people's evaluations of affiliating products are different when they anticipated social exclusion or future belongingness. As predicted, anticipated social exclusion causes people to evaluate affiliating products more favorably, compared to an anticipated future life full of friends and loved ones. Participant's gender, self reports of loneliness or self-reports of university pride did not have an effect on the proposed relationship. Participants in

¹ Participants indicated whether they find themselves lonely or not in a Yes/No question. In the analyses "Yes" answers were coded as 1 and "No" answers were coded as 0.

the future loneliness condition found the affiliating product more appealing. Thus indicated that they would feel happier to receive the affiliating product as a gift and that they would feel more like part of something valuable by owning the affiliating product compared to those participants in the future belonging condition. The evaluations for the neutral product were not significantly different across two conditions. There was directional support that participants who anticipate future loneliness evaluated the affiliating product more favorably than the neutral product.

Therefore, the first study supports the hypothesis that social exclusion will lead to more favorable evaluations of affiliating products. Consumption is a way to satisfy people's affiliating needs; therefore participants who had an experimentally induced need to belong evaluate affiliating products more favorably to meet their need to belong.

Accordingly, Study 1 provides evidence that feelings of belonging and exclusion lead to different evaluations of affiliating products. However, it could not yield to decisive judgments on whether this difference is due to the increased need to belong in case of the anticipated exclusion or due to participants' a mood that transpire from the experimental manipulations. We focus mood in Study 2, and examine the mood induced by both exclusion and belonging.

CHAPTER 5

STUDY 2

5.1. Overview

Study 1 provided evidence that social exclusion causes people to evaluate affiliating products more positively. The goal of the second study was to replicate the findings of Study 1 with additional dependent variables and with different affiliations. Further we wanted to test the moderator and mediator variables and control for the mood effect.

Two control conditions were added to Study 2 with theoretical reasons. A 4(future relationships: future loneliness, future belonging, misfortune control group, success control group)X3(type of affiliation: university, team, neutral) between subjects experiment was conducted. The experimental design composed of the manipulation of social exclusion, followed by the test of the effect of social exclusion on people's evaluations about affiliating products, along with scales to test the moderator and mediator variables. Specifically, self-esteem and impulsivity were measured to test the hypothesized moderating and mediating variables. Again to eliminate any alternative explanations participants' moods were measured and demographic information was collected.

5.2. Method

5.2.1. *Participants:*

The study was conducted with 213 undergraduate and MBA students at Bilkent University in Ankara (Male=108, Female=105). The ages of the participants ranged from 18 to 32 ($M = 20.35$). Participants were randomly assigned to conditions.

5.2.2. *Materials and procedure:*

5.2.2.1. *Social exclusion manipulation:*

The same social exclusion manipulation as in Study 1 was used. Two more control groups were added to this design (negative control group and a positive control group). Studies that used this social exclusion manipulation (e.g. Baumeister et al. 2002; Baumeister et al. 2005; Maner et al. 2007; Twenge et al. 2001; Twenge et al. 2002, 2003; Twenge et al. 2007) included a negative control condition to control for the negative mood that could have been induced by the future loneliness condition. As such we also included a negative control group to control for the negative mood. This design allowed us to compare the effects of anticipated exclusion and belongingness as well as the difference between two anticipated unlikable futures (future loneliness vs. negative control).

In the negative control condition the bogus personality feedback stated that the person will be prone to accidents during their life (misfortune control group), which was an unpleasant future that was not related to social exclusion. Specifically, participants in misfortunate future group were told “*You scored high on a scale which is correlated with being accident prone later in life. You might break an arm*”

or a leg a few times, or may be injured in car accidents. Even if you haven't been accident prone before, these things will show up later in life and you will most likely have a lot of accidents."

In this design both misfortune and future loneliness compose negative conditions. In other words, they both provide forecasts of an unpleasant future. If the effects of future loneliness are due to having received negative feedback, but not due to the increased need to belong in case of anticipated social exclusion, then the responses of these two groups to the affiliating products should be similar. If the results of two groups are different, then we can conclude with more certainty that anticipated social exclusion leads to more favorable evaluations of affiliating products.

Studies that were conducted using Twenge et. al's technique (Baumeister et al. 2002; Baumeister et al. 2005; Baumeister et al. 2007; Twenge et al. 2001; Twenge et al. 2002) did not include a positive control group to examine potential positive mood induced by the future belonging group. Therefore, in addition to the negative control group (misfortune control), a positive control group (future success) was added to control for positive mood. Participants in the future success condition were told *"Being an extravert (introvert) is a really good thing for relationships. Also you have scored high on a scale which is correlated with being successful in your future life. Research has shown that people who score high on this scale have very successful careers. Even if you are not the top of your class in college, you will prosper at your job. You will probably be in a top managerial position and complete numerous important deals. You are likely to achieve everything that you want in your professional life."*

In this design future belonging and future success are both positive conditions. They provide forecasts of a pleasant future. Feelings of belonging are not expected to influence the evaluations of affiliating products (neither positive nor negative), similarly future success should not lead to more favorable evaluations of affiliating products. We also do not expect, anticipated accident proneness lead to more favorable evaluations of affiliating products. If the social exclusion manipulation induces mood (good mood in case of the future belonging condition and bad mood in case of the future loneliness condition), then the success and misfortune groups would control for the mood effects. So if the favorable product evaluations made by participants in future loneliness group is solely due to the effects of social exclusion, then future loneliness group should be significantly different from all other three conditions.

5.2.2. Manipulation Check:

As in Study 1, participants were asked to indicate how representative of them was the personality description that they read was on a 7 point Likert scale.

5.2.2.3.Types of Affiliation:

In Study 1, only university (Bilkent) affiliation was tested. As a different kind of affiliation, affiliation to one's favorite sports team was included in this study. Participants were asked to evaluate either neutral products, or products that had Bilkent's logo, or products that had their favorite teams' logo.

5.2.2.4.Product evaluations:

As in study 1, following the bogus personality feedback, participants were asked to complete a survey rating university bookstore's new product offerings. In

Study 1 only mug was used. In this study, in addition to the white ceramic mug, participants were asked to evaluate a grey cotton sweatshirt, a grey sports bag and a black laptop case. Participants either evaluated affiliating products (products of Bilkent University or their favorite sports team) or neutral products.

The first question measured willingness to pay. Participants responded to the text "*At a maximum I would payYTL for this product*". A meta-analysis showing the mean agreement ratio of actual buying behavior and willingness to pay reports illustrated that willingness to pay is a good predictor of actual buying behavior (Carson et al. 1996). Moreover, prior research demonstrated that people tend to undervalue a product when they do not intend to buy it (Rook and Hoch 1985) and higher willingness to pay scores indicate increased desire for a product whereas lower willingness to pay scores indicate lower desire for a product (Vohs and Faber 2007). Therefore, willingness to pay reports of consumers is a good measurement for testing individuals' preference for the products. We expect social exclusion to have a positive impact on consumers' monetary associations and appraisals about affiliating products. Next, participants evaluated the statements "*I find this product very appealing*", "*I would be happy to receive this product as a gift*", "*Owning this product would make me feel like a part of something valuable*" and "*If I owned this product everyone who sees it would have a clue about who I am*". Each statement was rated on a seven-point Likert scale changing from strongly disagree to strongly agree (1 for "strongly disagree", 7 for "strongly agree").

5.2.2.5.Measurement of State Self-esteem:

State Self-esteem Scale developed by Heatherton and Polivy (1991) was used to measure participants' state self-esteem. Participants evaluated 20 items measuring

state self-esteem on a seven point Likert scale where 1 indicated “strongly disagree” and 7 indicated “strongly agree” (see Appendix B).

5.2.2.6.Measurement of Trait Self-esteem:

The ten-item Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale (Rosenberg 1965) was used to measure trait self-esteem. In the scale participants are asked to evaluate the items again on seven point Likert scales where 1 indicated “strongly disagree” and 7 indicated “strongly agree” (see Appendix C).

5.2.2.7.Measurement of Impulsivity:

Impulsivity was measured using the Impulsivity Scale established by Puri (1996). The scale is composed of 12 items rated on seven point scale, where 1 indicates “does not describe how I feel now” and 7 indicates “definitely describes how I feel now” (see Appendix D).

5.2.2.8.Mood:

Participants’ mood was also measured. Although not documented in previous studies (Baumeister et al. 2002; Baumeister et al. 2005; Maner et al. 2002; Twenge et al. 2001; Twenge et al. 2002, 2003; Twenge et al. 2007), the social exclusion manipulation may elicit a bad mood. Likewise, after hearing that one would be surrounded by friends later in time may induce a good mood. As such it is important to measure and control for the mood that is induced by the experiment.

Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) (Watson et al. 1988) was used as the mood scale. PANAS consists of ten positive affects (interested, excited, strong, enthusiastic, proud, alert, inspired, determined, attentive, and active) and ten

negative affects (distressed, upset, guilty, scared, hostile, irritable, ashamed, nervous, jittery, and afraid). Participants were asked to rate the adjectives on seven point Likert scales, where 1 is “does not describe how I feel now” and 7 is “definitely describes how I feel now”.

5.2.2.9. Loneliness:

Loneliness can have an effect on the relationship between social exclusion and product evaluations. Since in the future conditions we manipulated social exclusion by loneliness, individuals' self reports of loneliness was collected. Specifically, participants were asked to indicate whether they consider themselves lonely on a seven point scale, where 1 indicates “not at all” and 7 indicates “very much”.

5.2.2.10. *Being Bilkent proud, degree of supporting the favorite team and considering being a member of the university/team as an achievement:*

In addition to the product evaluations four other measures of satisfying the need for belonging via affiliation were added. These questions asked participants to rate *how Bilkent proud they are, how much they support their favorite sports team, whether being a Bilkent student is an achievement for them and whether being a fan of their favorite team is an achievement for them*. Participants were asked to rate these questions on seven point Likert scale, where 1 indicates “not at all” and 7 indicates “very much”.

5.3. Results

5.3.1. Manipulation Check:

As in Study 1, participants in the future belonging and success control conditions found the personality descriptions more representative of themselves compared to those participants in future loneliness and misfortune control conditions. However, four groups were not significantly different from each other ($F(3,192)=1.445$, $p>.20$; $M_{Loneliness}=4.73$, $M_{Belonging}=5.02$, $M_{success}=5.27$, $M_{misfortune}=4.80$) in terms of the extent to which they found the personality descriptions representative of themselves. The mean scores were above the median of the scale (3.5). Therefore, we conclude that participants in the four groups found the personality description to be representative of themselves. Hence the manipulation was successful.

5.3.2. How much were the participants willing to pay for the affiliating products?

In support of Hypothesis 1, for the university (Bilkent) affiliation condition, participants in the future loneliness condition indicated higher willingness to pay for the affiliating products (i.e. mug, sweatshirt, sports bag and laptop case) than participants in the future belonging, misfortune control and success control conditions. Separate one way ANOVA's on participants' willingness to pay for the affiliating products revealed that the willingness to pay for the Bilkent mug ($F(3,65)=4.090$, $p<.01$), Bilkent sweatshirt ($F(3,67)=3.628$ $p<.05$) and Bilkent laptop case ($F(3,66)=3.187$, $p<.05$) were significantly higher. The trend for the willingness to pay for the Bilkent sports bag also supports the Hypothesis 1 ($F(3,67)=.860$ $p>.40$).

Contrast analyses comparing the mean differences among the future expectations conditions were conducted. The analyses revealed that future loneliness group differed significantly different from the three other groups in terms of willingness to pay for the Bilkent mug and Bilkent sweatshirt. The future loneliness group further differed significantly from future belonging and misfortune control groups for the Bilkent laptop case. So the increased willingness to pay of the future loneliness group for the Bilkent products was not solely due to receiving negative feedback. Please refer to Table 1 for the results. (see Appendix E for the results of contrast analyses.)

Table 1 Willingness to pay for the Bilkent products

	<i>M</i> (in YTL)				<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
	Future loneliness	Future belonging	Misfortune control	Success control			
Bilkent Mug	10.18	6.47	5.56	6.22	3,65	4.090**	.010
Bilkent Sweatshirt	47.94	28.35	29.84	26.39	3,67	3.628*	.017
Bilkent Sports bag	39.29	29.00	27.63	30.00	3,67	.860	.466
Bilkent Laptop case	52.18	23.56	29.63	34.83	3,66	3.187*	.029

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Four future expectations conditions' willingness to pay scores did not differ significantly in team affiliation condition (Appendix G).

5.3.3. How much were the participants willing to pay for the neutral products?

There were not any difference among the four experimental conditions for willingness to pay in any of the neutral products ($p > .05$, Appendix F). The

willingness to pay increases only for affiliating products, but not for non-affiliating products.

The comparison of the future loneliness groups in Bilkent and neutral conditions were not statistically significant ($p > .05$). However, there is directional support to suggest that when people anticipate social exclusion, they are willing to pay for a mug with the Bilkent logo as opposed to a neutral solid white mug ($F(1,31)=1.940$, $p < .20$; $M_{Bilkent}=10.18$, $M_{Neutral}=7.31$). The results were same for the laptop case ($F(1,32)=1.929$, $p < .20$; $M_{Bilkent}=52.18$, $M_{Neutral}=49.06$). To sum up, participants in the future loneliness conditions indicated a higher willingness to pay specifically for the Bilkent products, but they were not willing to pay higher amounts for the neutral products. We conclude that this is because the neutral products do not help the individual to satisfy their heightened need to belong.

5.3.4. How appealing were the affiliating products?

In support of Hypothesis 1, for the university (Bilkent) affiliation condition, participants in the future loneliness condition found the affiliating products (i.e. mug, sweatshirt, sports bag and laptop case) more appealing than participants who were in the future belonging, misfortune control and success control conditions. Separate one way ANOVA's on participants' evaluations of the appeals of the affiliating products revealed that the appeal of the Bilkent mug ($F(3,67)=4.365$, $p < .01$), the Bilkent sweatshirt ($F(3,67)=2.832$, $p < .05$) and the Bilkent sport bag ($F(3,67)=3.372$, $p < .05$) were significantly different across conditions. The trend for the appeal for the Bilkent laptop case also supports Hypothesis 1 ($F(3,67)=1.040$, $p > .30$).

Contrast analyses comparing the mean differences between future expectations conditions were also conducted. These analyses showed that the

increased appeal to the Bilkent products by the future loneliness group was not simply due to receiving negative feedback. Specifically, product appeal evaluations of the future loneliness group differed significantly from all other groups for the Bilkent mug ($p<.01$), Bilkent sweatshirt ($p<.05$) and Bilkent sports bag ($p<.01$). Table 2 depicts the ANOVA results. (Please refer to Appendix E for the results of contrast analyses.)

Table 2 “I find this product very appealing”

	<i>M</i>				<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
	Future loneliness	Future belonging	Misfortune control	Success control			
Bilkent Mug	4.29	2.88	3.11	3.00	3,67	4.365**	.007
Bilkent Sweatshirt	5.06	4.00	3.84	3.83	3,67	2.832*	.045
Bilkent Sports bag	4.47	3.53	2.89	3.56	3,67	3.372*	.023
Bilkent Laptop case	3.82	3.53	3.53	2.94	3,67	1.040	.381

* $p<.05$, ** $p<.01$

The mean ratings of the product appeal for four future expectations conditions did not differ significantly in team affiliation condition (Appendix G).

5.3.5. How appealing were the neutral products?

The neutral products were not evaluated differently across the four future conditions ($p>.05$, Appendix F). Within the future loneliness groups, Bilkent mug was evaluated more favorably to the neutral mug ($F(1,32)=3.372$, $p<.01$; $M_{Bilkent}=4.29$, $M_{Neutral}=2.53$). Specifically participants evaluated the Bilkent mug more positively than the neutral mug when they anticipate social exclusion. Anticipated social exclusion also increased the appeal of the Bilkent sports bag

compared to the neutral sports bag ($F(1,32)=3.191$, $p<.10$; $M_{Bilkent}=4.47$, $M_{Neutral}=3.59$). There is also directional support to suggest that when people anticipate social exclusion, they find the Bilkent laptop case more appealing than the neutral black laptop case ($F(1,32)=2.794$, $p<.20$; $M_{Bilkent}=3.82$, $M_{Neutral}=2.88$).

5.3.6. Would the participant like to receive the affiliating and neutral products as gifts?

Participants' ratings indicating how happy they would be to receive the products they evaluated as a gift were not different across the four conditions ($p>.05$). However, one way ANOVA on the Bilkent mug provided directional support to Hypothesis 1 as in Study 1 ($F(3,67)=1.808$, $p<.10$; $M_{Loneliness}=4.06$, $M_{Belonging}=3.00$, $M_{misfortune}=2.95$ and $M_{success}=2.89$). Specifically, participants in the future loneliness condition stated that they would be happier than the participants in the other conditions to receive the Bilkent mug as a gift. This trend was also observed for the other Bilkent products as shown by Table 3. Participants in the four future expectations conditions were not significantly different from each other in terms of feeling how happy they would feel if they received the products that demonstrate team affiliation (Appendix G) and neutral products (Appendix F) as gifts.

Table 3 “I would be happy to receive this product as a gift”

	<i>M</i>				<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
	Future loneliness	Future belonging	Misfortune control	Success control			
Bilkent Mug	4.06	3.00	2.95	2.89	3,67	1.808	.154
Bilkent Sweatshirt	4.47	4.18	4.00	4.00	3,67	.374	.772
Bilkent Sports bag	3.71	3.18	3.47	2.94	3,67	.782	.508
Bilkent Laptop case	3.59	2.94	3.37	2.78	3,67	.806	.495

5.3.7. Would owning the affiliating products make the participants feel like a part of something valuable?

Participants were asked to rate whether owning the products would make them feel like part of something valuable. The hypothesis that social exclusion results in increased need for affiliation hence more favorable evaluations of products that demonstrate university (Bilkent) affiliation is again supported by participants' answers to this question. Participants who were in the anticipate social exclusion condition indicated that they would more like part of something valuable by owning the affiliating products when compared to those participants in future belonging, misfortune control and success control conditions. Separate one way ANOVA's on participants' reports of feeling like part of something valuable by owning the affiliating products demonstrated significant differences between groups for all Bilkent products ($F(3,67)=2.921$, $p<.05$ for Bilkent mug, $F(3,66)=2.900$, $p<.05$ for Bilkent sweatshirt, $F(3,67)=3.010$, $p<.05$ for Bilkent sports bag and $F(3,67)=3.003$, $p<.05$ for Bilkent laptop case).

they would feel like part of something valuable by owning a Bilkent mug more than they would feel by owning a neutral mug ($F(1,32)=14.360$, $p<.01$; $M_{Bilkent}=4.35$, $M_{Neutral}=2.24$). The results were similar for the sweatshirt ($F(1,32)=5.232$, $p<.05$; $M_{Bilkent}=4.76$, $M_{Neutral}=3.65$), the sports bag ($F(1,32)=4.279$, $p<.05$; $M_{Bilkent}=4.18$, $M_{Neutral}=3.06$) and the laptop case ($F(1,32)=5.364$, $p<.05$; $M_{Bilkent}=4.24$, $M_{Neutral}=2.88$).

5.3.9. Did the affiliating products reflect the individuality of the person?

Based on the notion that possessions are extensions of the self (Belk 1988), whether the products support an individuals' identity was investigated. We asked participants whether the products represent who they are. Supporting Hypothesis 1, participants in future loneliness condition expressed that products that are university affiliated reflect who they are, more than participants in future belonging, misfortune control and success control conditions. Separate one way ANOVA's on participants' evaluations on how much the product reflect who they are were significant for all of the Bilkent products ($F(3,67)=2.773$, $p<.05$ for Bilkent mug, $F(3,67)=3.751$, $p<.05$ for Bilkent sweatshirt, $F(3,67)=3.794$, $p<.05$ for Bilkent sports bag and $F(3,67)=4.028$, $p<.05$ for Bilkent laptop case).

Contrast analyses comparing the mean differences between future expectation conditions also suggested that the higher ratings for the Bilkent products by the future loneliness group were not simply due to having received negative feedback. Specifically, future loneliness group differed significantly from all three groups in the way they evaluated the Bilkent mug, the Bilkent sweatshirt, the Bilkent laptop case ($p<.05$) and the Bilkent sports bag ($p<.01$). Table 5 depicts the ANOVA results. (Please refer to Appendix E for the results of contrast analyses.)

Table 5 “If I owned this product everyone who sees it would have a clue about who I am”

	<i>M</i>				<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
	Future loneliness	Future belonging	Misfortune control	Success control			
Bilkent Mug	4.59	2.76	3.21	3.11	3,67	2.773*	.048
Bilkent Sweatshirt	5.41	3.18	3.84	3.61	3,67	3.751*	.015
Bilkent Sports bag	4.53	2.94	2.84	2.83	3,67	3.794*	.014
Bilkent Laptop case	4.53	3.29	2.89	2.67	3,67	4.028*	.011

* $p < .05$

The participants in the four experimental conditions did not respond to this question differently with respect to the sports team affiliated products (Appendix G).

5.3.10. Did the neutral products reflect the individuality of the person?

The neutral products were also evaluated in terms of whether they reflect the individuality of the person. The mean differences were not significant for the neutral products among the four experimental conditions (Appendix F). Moreover, the comparison of the scores indicated by future loneliness groups in Bilkent and neutral conditions showed significant difference for the mug ($p < .001$), sweatshirt ($p < .001$), laptop case ($p < .01$) and sports bag ($p < .05$). Specifically participants who anticipate social exclusion mentioned that owing a Bilkent mug would give clue about who they are more than owning a neutral mug ($F(1,32)=30.684$, $p < .001$; $M_{Bilkent}=4.59$, $M_{Neutral}=1.71$). The results were the same for sweatshirt ($F(1,32)=14.272$, $p < .001$; $M_{Bilkent}=5.41$, $M_{Neutral}=3.41$), sports bag ($F(1,32)=5.532$, $p < .05$; $M_{Bilkent}=4.53$, $M_{Neutral}=3.12$) and laptop case ($F(1,32)=10.213$, $p < .01$; $M_{Bilkent}=4.53$, $M_{Neutral}=2.59$).

5.3.11. Social Exclusion and State Self-esteem:

The effect of self-esteem on the relationship between social exclusion, need for belonging and affiliation is twofold. We hypothesized that the effects of social exclusion on the evaluations of affiliating products will be mediated by state self-esteem of participants. We proposed that participants' state self-esteem will be reduced when they anticipate social exclusion (Hypothesis 2a). This in turn is expected to lead to more favorable evaluations of the affiliating products (Hypothesis 2b).

A one way ANOVA on state self-esteem showed no difference among the experimental groups ($F(3,191)=1.479$, $p>.20$; $M_{loneliness}=99.92$, $M_{belonging}=101.31$, $M_{misfortune}=99.77$, $M_{success}=106.16$). The social exclusion manipulation did not reduce the state self-esteem of the participants. As such we fail to support Hypothesis 2a. We conclude that the effect of the social exclusion on the evaluations of affiliating products is not due to reduced state self-esteem.

Nonetheless, the relationship between social exclusion and product evaluations could still have been mediated by state self-esteem. Following Baron and Kenny (1986) we look at the correlation between mediator and the dependent variable and expect that it should be significant. The Pearson correlations between state self-esteem and the dependent variables were not significant (see Appendix H). State self-esteem does not have any effect on product evaluations. Therefore, further mediation analyses were not conducted. Hypothesis 2b was not supported.

5.3.12. Social Exclusion and Trait Self-esteem:

We also hypothesized that the effects of social exclusion on affiliating product evaluations will be moderated by participants' trait self-esteem (Hypothesis 3). We expected that participants' with high levels of trait self-esteem would be affected less by the social exclusion manipulation. Thus we expect individuals who have low trait self-esteem to evaluate affiliating products more favorably compared to those individuals who are high in trait self-esteem.

A one way ANOVA was conducted to see whether the experimental groups differ from each other in terms of trait self-esteem. The results indicated a difference between groups ($F(3,196)=2.803$, $p<.05$; $M_{loneliness}=4.90$, $M_{belonging}=5.19$, $M_{misfortune}=5.03$, $M_{success}=5.34$)². Contrast analysis was conducted to see which groups were different from each other ($p<.05$). The analysis showed that participants in the success control group had significantly higher trait self-esteem than participants in future loneliness group. Future belonging and misfortune control groups were not significantly different from the other groups. The mean scores of the groups were not extremely above or below of the median (52). As such we conclude that none of the groups display significantly high levels of trait self-esteem. To rule out any alternative explanations we controlled for trait self-esteem and replicated the analyses. The results were not different (see Appendix I). Trait self esteem did not have an effect on how individuals responded to social exclusion manipulation.

Next we investigate the moderation hypothesis. We predicted that when socially excluded, if trait self-esteem is high, then individuals should make less

² Trait self esteem was measured by a ten item seven-point Likert scale (see Appendix C). The mean scores were computed by computing composite scores of each participant on the scale and then taking the average.

favorable evaluations of affiliating products compared to those individuals who are low in trait self-esteem. In other words, differences in self-esteem are expected to create differences among participants' evaluations who are in future loneliness group. To test this hypothesis, participants in future loneliness group were classified as high and low trait self-esteem participants by a median split. Then one way ANOVA's were conducted on product evaluations to see whether trait self-esteem had a significant effect. The results did not reveal a significant difference between the high and low trait self-esteem participants ($p > .05$). The analyses can be found in Appendix J.

Since trait self-esteem did not have a significant effect on the experimental groups, further moderation analyses were not conducted. We failed to support Hypothesis 3.

5.3.13. Social Exclusion and Impulsivity:

We predicted that social exclusion will make individuals more impulsive (Hypothesis 4a) and consequently it cause the individuals to evaluate the affiliating products more favorably (Hypothesis 4b). Specifically we expect that there will be differences between the experimental groups in terms of impulsivity. We also expect that the relationship between future expectations and product evaluations will be mediated by impulsivity induced by social exclusion. However, one way ANOVA on impulsivity did not show a significant difference between the groups ($F(3,183) = .510$, $p > .60$; $M_{loneliness} = 41.68$, $M_{belonging} = 42.33$, $M_{misfortune} = 40.48$, $M_{success} = 41.83$). The hypothesis that social exclusion will lead to increased impulsivity (Hypothesis 4a) was not supported.

Furthermore, contrast analyses also showed that the future loneliness group differed significantly from all other groups in Bilkent mug, Bilkent sweatshirt, Bilkent sports bag and Bilkent laptop case ($p < .05$). Table 4 depicts the ANOVA results. Please refer to Appendix E for the results of contrast analyses.

Table 4 “Owning this product would make me feel like a part of something valuable”

	<i>M</i>				<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
	Future loneliness	Future belonging	Misfortune control	Success control			
Bilkent Mug	4.35	2.82	3.05	3.11	3,67	2.921*	.040
Bilkent Sweatshirt	4.76	3.71	3.33	3.50	3,66	2.900*	.041
Bilkent Sports bag	4.18	2.88	3.05	2.83	3,67	3.010*	.036
Bilkent Laptop case	4.24	2.76	2.89	3.00	3,67	3.003*	.036

* $p < .05$

The participants in the four experimental conditions did not respond to this question differently with respect to the sports team affiliated products (Appendix G).

5.3.8. *Would owning the neutral products make the participants feel like a part of something valuable?*

The neutral products were also analyzed for how much they would make the participants feel like part of something valuable. The mean differences were not significant for the neutral products among the four conditions (Appendix F). The comparison of the future loneliness conditions in Bilkent and neutral conditions showed a significant difference for the mug ($p < .01$), sweatshirt, sports bag and laptop case ($p < .05$). Specifically participants who anticipated social exclusion denoted that

Still, in order to test that impulsivity will mediate the effects of social exclusion on the evaluation of the affiliating products, Pearson correlations were computed for each dependent variable and the impulsivity measure. Since, the Pearson correlations between impulsivity and the dependent variables were not significant (see Appendix H) and the groups were not significantly different from each other in terms of impulsivity, further mediation analyses were not conducted. We failed to support Hypothesis 4b.

5.3.14. Alternative Explanations:

5.3.14.1. Mood:

Previous studies on social exclusion suggests that the social exclusion manipulation does not induce a mood (Baumeister et al. 2002; Baumeister et al. 2005; Maner et al. 2002; Twenge et al. 2001; Twenge et al. 2002, 2003; Twenge et al. 2007). We measured mood using PANAS to eliminate any alternative explanations. The groups were not different from each other in terms of positive and negative mood. ($F(3,186)=.524$, $p=.666$, $M_{loneliness}=3.78$, $M_{belonging}=3.91$, $M_{misfortune}=3.97$, $M_{success}=4.04$ for PANAS positive; and $F(3,188)=1.818$, $p=.145$, $M_{loneliness}=2.65$, $M_{belonging}=2.65$, $M_{misfortune}=2.79$, $M_{success}=2.25$ for PANAS negative)³.

5.3.14.2. Gender:

There was no gender difference in the evaluations of the products (all $p>.05$). There was a significant difference in response to the question asking if owning the laptop case would make the participants feel like part of something valuable

³ Both PANAS positive and PANAS negative were measured by ten item seven point Likert scales. The mean scores were computed by computing composite scores of each participant on each scale and then taking the average.

($F(1,69)=4.630$, $p<.05$). As such, to eliminate any alternative explanations, an ANCOVA conducted controlling for gender. The difference among conditions remained significant ($F(3,66)=3.538$, $p<.05$) even when gender was controlled for.

5.3.14.3. Loneliness:

Participants were not significantly different in terms of how lonely they are ($F(3,207)=1.331$, $p>.20$; $M_{loneliness}=2.71$, $M_{belonging}=2.63$, $M_{misfortune}=2.87$, $M_{success}=2.30$). As a result, loneliness was not added further investigated as a covariate in the analyses.

5.3.15. Why were the university and team affiliated products evaluated differently?

5.3.15.1. Being university proud and degree of supporting favorite team:

Results of the second study showed that participants in different groups were not significantly different in terms of supporting their favorite teams ($F(3,164)=.322$, $p>.80$). An ANOVA also did not show a significant difference across the four conditions in terms of being Bilkent proud ($F(3,203)=2.320$, $p>.05$). However, there is directional support to indicate that people indicate more pride from affiliating with their universities in case of anticipated social exclusion. Participants who anticipated future loneliness specified that they are more proud of being a Bilkent student than participants who did not anticipate future loneliness ($F(3,203)=2.320$, $p<.10$; $M_{Loneliness}=5.58$, $M_{Belonging}=4.84$, $M_{Misfortune}=5.36$, $M_{Success}=5.15$). Since none of these results are statistically significant (all $p>.05$), these variables were not further investigated.

5.3.15.2. Considering being a member of the university/team as an achievement:

Participants also did not differ significantly in considering being a member of their favorite teams as achievement ($F(3,201)=.720, p>.50$). There is a trend that suggests participants who anticipated future loneliness reported that they consider being a Bilkent student as an achievement more than those participants who did not anticipate future loneliness ($F(3,207)=1.97, p<.20$; $M_{Loneliness}=5.54, M_{Belonging}=4.84, M_{Misfortune}=5.33, M_{Success}=5.23$). Since none of these results are statistically significant (all $p>.05$), these variables were not further investigated.

5.4. Discussion

The results of Study 2 demonstrated that people's evaluations of affiliating products are more positive after an anticipated social exclusion. Participants in the future loneliness condition were willing to pay more for the Bilkent products. They found the Bilkent products more appealing, indicated that they would feel like part of something valuable by owning the Bilkent products and stated that the Bilkent products reflect who they are compared to participants in the future belonging, misfortune control and success control conditions. We also demonstrated that the effect of anticipated social exclusion is not a mood effect by showing that the future loneliness and misfortune control groups were significantly different from each other.

The future belonging group was not different from the future success control group. An anticipated future belonging was not regarded differently than other positive feedback about one's future. This finding supports that only when the need

to belong is not satisfied, individuals seek ways to satisfy their need to belong by way of consumption. Participants' mood, self reports of loneliness, team and university pride, and considering being a member of their favorite sports team and university as an achievement did not show any significant differences across the groups. They also did not have an effect on the relationship between social exclusion and the product evaluations.

As expected, participants' evaluations did not show significant differences across the conditions in the neutral product evaluations. The comparison of future loneliness groups' mean scores for neutral and Bilkent products showed that participants who anticipate future loneliness evaluated affiliating products more favorably than the neutral products. In summary, when socially excluded, people evaluate affiliating products more favorably compared to any product.

Surprisingly, participants' evaluations for the team products were not different across the conditions. In case of anticipated social exclusion participants' evaluations became more positive for university affiliated products but not for team affiliated products. This suggests that the source of affiliation is a crucial factor in the relationship between social exclusion, the need to belong and consumption.

The moderation and mediation hypotheses were not supported. Neither state self-esteem, nor impulsivity showed any significant difference across the conditions. These variables also had no effect on the product evaluations.

CHAPTER 6

GENERAL DISCUSSION

This thesis tested the effects of social exclusion on people's evaluations of affiliating products. Within a social exclusion framework we argued that social exclusion increases people's need to belong and desire for affiliation. We predicted that people, to satisfy their heightened need to belong and to meet their desire for affiliation would consume affiliating products that reflect their membership to certain groups. Individuals strive to appear affiliated when they are socially excluded even if the affiliation or the group membership does not provide immediate contact between the group members.

In two studies we demonstrated that social exclusion leads to more favorable evaluations of affiliating products. We demonstrate this effect by examining participants' willingness to pay for affiliating products. Socially excluded individuals are more inclined to pay more for affiliating products than individuals who are not socially excluded.

We found that socially excluded individuals evaluate affiliating products more favorably even when the products can potentially be used in privacy (such as a mug) compared to individuals who are not socially excluded. We also found that socially excluded individuals evaluate affiliating products that are usually consumed

in public (such as sweatshirt, laptop case and sports bag) more favorably than individuals who are not socially excluded. Therefore we conclude that affiliating products are not only purchased to remind oneself that one is a part of a community; but they are also important to communicate one's individuality to the outside world and demonstrate that one is not alone. The two experiments we conducted also revealed that socially excluded people evaluate only affiliating products more favorably.

In addition, we demonstrated that social exclusion does not lead to a blind commitment to a group. When people's need to belong is increased, people's desire for affiliation increased specifically for their universities, but not for their favorite sports teams. The source of affiliation is a crucial factor in meeting people's needs to display their relationships and group memberships. The reason of this can be related to the processes by which people subscribe to certain groups in the first place. In Turkey, people attend universities after a very challenging and stressful preparation period followed by a nationwide examination. The studies presented here were conducted at Bilkent University, which is one of the top schools in the country. Bilkent University students worked very hard for the university entrance examination to get into this school. Students at Bilkent University perceive themselves to be high achievers and most of them are very proud of their school. Therefore, universities in Turkey are highly exclusive communities and being a student in a specific university means that one is part of an exclusive group that they earned membership to. The results of Study 2 revealed that participants are not as proud of their favorite sports teams as their university. They do not consider being a fan of their team as an achievement. This seems reasonable since anybody can be a fan of any sports team just by stating that he/she is one. Consequently, it is reasonable to argue that when

socially excluded, people are especially inclined to demonstrate their affiliation with the exclusive groups which they gained acceptance to by working for it and which they consider as an achievement.

In the current work we further examine the social exclusion effect and we show that the social exclusion effect is not due to a mood induced by the social exclusion manipulation. We suggest that people's reactions to social exclusion are different than their reactions to other negative feedback. We also found that positive feelings do not differ from each other in terms of creating a desire to affiliate with other people. We demonstrate that social exclusion does not decrease state self esteem or increase impulsivity of individuals. The social exclusion effect is not affected by trait self esteem of the individuals either.

To sum up, the current thesis contributes to the social exclusion literature by showing that the need to belong and desire to affiliate are increased in case of social exclusion. Social exclusion influences people's consumption practices. The results showed that people are more likely to purchase products that reflect one's group memberships. Consumption helps the person show oneself and the entire world that the person is not alone. Contrary to the previous suggestions that socially excluded participants do not attempt to engage in new relationships (Buckley et al. 2004; Twenge et al. 2001; Twenge et al. 2007), our results support the opposite view; i.e. people want to affiliate with others when their need to belong is heightened (Maner et al. 2007; Williams et al. 2000). Our results also support the Consumer Culture Theory findings suggesting that consumption is a powerful means for affiliation. Finally the current work further contributes to the research stream by adding a positive control condition to the manipulation of social exclusion.

6.1. Managerial Implications

People have become (and will continue to become) more individualized and lonely as their heavy dependence on computers and internet increases. Moreover, affiliating products have become a large and growing market. The current work makes the link between these two facts solid and visible. The need to belong is a fundamental need for the human beings. Then in our age when people feel the lack of intimate relationships, affiliating products serve for satisfying an important need. Because people feel like they satisfy their need to belong by at least showing their affiliation to certain groups and communities by purchasing and using affiliating products.

The fact that socially excluded people are more likely to consume affiliating products has several implications for strategic managerial planning. First, marketing managers should understand the effects of social exclusion on the choices of consumers in order to understand their potential customers and correctly define their target customer segment. This research showed that the target market of these products should not just be the popular group members, but more importantly the excluded individuals who strive to be one of the in-group members should also be targeted. Depending on the type of affiliation that a product represents and the importance of that affiliation for an individual, it is highly likely that when the person feels excluded, he/she will want to display their group affiliations by consuming products that display group membership.

The results of this research will be also influential in planning effective advertising strategies. Firms could benefit from focusing on individuals that consider themselves lonely and excluded in their advertisement campaigns. They should

emphasize that by using affiliating products consumers will satisfy their need to belong. Firms which produce affiliating products will be more likely to increase their sales by using loneliness theme in their advertisements. Besides, they can promote their products via internet, a portal which restricts physical interactions and makes people feel lonelier and more individualized.

One may at this point question how ethical the proposed strategies are. We believe that offering affiliating products to those people who are already lonely and socially excluded is not unethical. We are not suggesting that companies should manipulate social exclusion. Instead we are urging the companies to realize the need that they are satisfying and offer better and more useful products to help lonely and excluded individuals meet their fundamental need to belong.

In conclusion, it is very crucial for marketing managers to understand the effects of social exclusion on consumers' psychology and purchasing behavior. Only by this way they can plan effective and efficient marketing strategies.

6.2. Limitations and Future Directions

This work has some limitations that can be improved by further research. First, in order to enhance construct validity and refine social exclusion manipulation, the difference between the dependent and independent variables should be stated more clearly and these variables should be defined more clearly. As such, the difference between belonging to a group and individual's social identity should be stated. The difference between chosen solitariness and forced loneliness (being left alone) should also be defined.

One limitation of this thesis is that it involves only hypothetical consumption practices. The current work can be extended by conducting the studies in a different scenario, where participants are engaged in a consumption situation where they are spending their own money. Moreover our studies, like other studies of social exclusion, employ manipulation of social exclusion. However, the effects of actual social exclusion, such as being ignored by close friends or losing a romantic partner, can be much more severe compared to the experimental induction. Nevertheless, we do not expect that this would change the direction of our results. We can expect the same results to be obtained with greater magnitude, but no conclusive judgments can be made without further research. In order to approach real life experience of social exclusion, future research manipulations can be conducted by a scenario in which people are being rejected by someone they know and love.

Using a social exclusion manipulation in which people are being rejected by their loved ones can also reveal the effects of social exclusion on other features of affiliating products. For instance, Williams et al. (2000) found that excluded participants are more likely to conform to the groups' judgments, even when the decision is not correct. Similarly, it may be possible that when people are being excluded specifically by persons who they know and love, then they may try to reconnect with them by consuming in a way that they will approve. For instance, a girl may purchase a football team's jersey in order to show her ex-boyfriend that they have many things in common.

Although we use different products that can be consumed in public and/or private in our research, this research did not specifically target public versus private consumption situations. Our research suggests that socially excluded people prefer

affiliating products that can be consumed both in private and public. In order to define boundary conditions of the relationship between social exclusion and consumption of affiliating products, future research can focus on different consumption scenarios, in which people are making their choices with people around them or when they are alone.

Besides, socially excluded people can find certain affiliating products more favorable. In other words, the type of the affiliating product may also have an effect on people's evaluations. People may find certain products more appropriate for signaling group membership; hence they may prefer to purchase specific affiliating products rather than any other affiliating product. It can be interesting to see whether such categorization is actually made and to understand the criteria behind that categorization.

Likewise, it seems that type and source of affiliation is an important aspect in satisfying people's need to belong. Future research can examine why people want to demonstrate their affiliation with certain groups but not with others in case of an anticipated social exclusion. Moreover this research employed team and school affiliations but other affiliation types, such as nationality, ethnic origin, sexual orientation, job/occupation or affiliation with particular activities (like basketball, soccer, motorcycling, etc.) could also provide important insights about the effects of social exclusion on consumption behavior.

Finally, this research can be replicated in different contexts in order to see the effects of different cultural and situational factors on the relationship between social exclusion and affiliating product evaluations.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ainsworth, Mary D.S. 1989. "Attachments Beyond Infancy," *American Psychologist* 44(4):709-716.
- Appadurai, Arjun (1996). "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy" in *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minenapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 27-47.
- Baron, Reuben M. and David A. Kenny. 1986. "The Moderator- Mediator Variable Distinction in Social Psychological Research: Conceptual, Strategic and Statistical Considerations," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(6): 1173-1182.
- Baumeister, Roy F. and Dianne M. Tice. 1990. "Anxiety and Social Exclusion," *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology* 9(2): 165-195.
- and Mark R. Leary. 1995. "The Need to Belong: Desire for Interpersonal Attachments as a Fundamental Human Motivation," *Psychological Bulletin* 117(3): 497-529.
- and Todd H. Heatherton. 1996. "Self Regulation Failure: An Overview," *Psychological Inquiry* 7(1): 1-15.
- , Ellen Bratslavsky, Mark Muraven, and Dianne M. Tice. 1998. "Ego Depletion: Is the Active Self a Limited Resource?" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 74(June): 1252-1265.
- , 2002. "Reflections and Reviews; Yielding to Temptation: Self Control Failure, Impulsive Purchasing and Consumer Behavior," *Journal of Consumer Research* 28(March): 670-676.
- , Jean M. Twenge, and Christopher K. Nuss. 2002. "Effects of Social Exclusion on Cognitive Processes: Anticipated Aloneness Reduces Intelligent Thought," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 83(4): 817-827.
- , Nathan DeWall, Nathalie Ciarocco, and Jean M. Twenge. 2005. "Social Exclusion Impairs Self Regulation," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 88(4): 589-604.
- Beckman, Linda J. (1981). "Effects of Social Interaction and Children's Relative Inputs on Older Women's Psychological Well-being," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 41(6): 1075-1086.

- Belk, Russell W. 1988. "Possessions and the Extended Self," *Journal of Consumer Research* 15(September): 139-168.
- , Güliz Ger, Soren Askegaard. 2003. "The Fire of Desire: A Multisited Inquiry into Consumer Passion," *Journal of Consumer Research* 30(December): 326-351.
- , Kenneth D. Bahn, and Robert N. Mayer. 1982. "Developmental Recognition of Consumption Symbolism," *Journal of Consumer Research* 9 (June): 4-17.
- Beşiktaş Spor Kulübü. 2008. *Kartal Yuvası Store Sales Data*. Unpublished store information. İstanbul.
- Bhalla, Ajit and Frederic Lapeyre. 1997. "Social Exclusion: Towards an Analytical and Operational Framework," *Development and Change* 28: 413-433.
- Buckley, Katherine E., Rachel E. Winkel, and Mark R. Leary. 2004. "Reactions to Acceptance and Rejection: Effects of Level and Sequence of Relational Evaluation," *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 40(1): 14-28.
- Burchardt, Tania, Julian Le Grand, and David Piachaud. 1999. "Social exclusion in Britain 1991-1995," *Social Policy and Administration* 33(3): 227-244.
- Cacioppo, John T., Louise C. Hawkley, and Gary G. Bernston. 2003. "The Anatomy of Loneliness," *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 12(3): 71-74.
- Carson, Richrd T., Nicholas E. Flores, Kerry, M. Martin and Jennifer L. Wright. 1996. "Contingent Valuation and Revealed Preference Methodologies Comparing the Estimates for Quasi-Public Goods," *Land Economics*, 72(1): 80-99.
- Crocker, Jennifer and Brenda Major. 1989. "Social Stigma and Self-esteem," *Psychological Review* 96(4): 608-630.
- Crocker, Jennifer, Rija K. Luhtanen, M. Lynne Cooper, and Alexandra Bouvrette. 2003. "Contingencies of Self-worth in College Students: Theory and Measurement," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 85(5): 894-908.
- Deshpande, Rohit, Wayne D. Hoyer, and Naveen Donthu. 1986. "The Intensity of Ethnic Affiliation: A Study of the Sociology of Hispanic Consumption," *Journal of Consumer Research* 13(2): 214-220.
- Douglas, Mary and Baron Isherwood .1979. *The World of Goods: Towards an Anthropology of Consumption*. New York: Norton.
- Eisenberger, Naomi I., Matthew D. Liberman, and Kipling D. Williams. 2003. "Does Rejection Hurt? An fMRI Study of Social Exclusion," *Science* 302(October): 290-292.
- , Johanna M. Jarchbo, Matthew D. Liberman and Bruce D. Naliboff. 2006. "An Experimental Study of Shared Sensitivity to Physical Pain and Social Rejection," *Pain* 126: 132-138.

- Emslie, Lisa, Richard Bent, and Claire Seaman. 2007. "Missed Opportunities: Reaching the Ethnic Consumer Market," *International Journal of Consumer Studies* 31(2): 168-173.
- Eysenck, Sybil B.G., Hans J. Eysenck and Paul Barrett. 1985. "A Revised Version of the Psychoticism Scale," *Personality and Individual Differences* 6(1): 21-29.
- Facebook. 2009. *Facebook Statistics*. Retrieved March 3, 2009 from <http://www.facebook.com/press/info.php?statistics=#/press/info.php?statistics>
- Faber, Ronald J. and Kathleen D. Vohs. 2004. "To Buy or Not to Buy? Self Control and Self Regulatory Failure in Purchase Behavior" In Roy F. Baumeister and Kathleen D. Vohs, eds., *Handbook of Self Regulation: Research, Theory and Applications*. New York: Guilford Press, 509-524.
- Gump, Brooks B. and James A. Kulik. 1997. "Stress, Affiliation, and Emotional Contagion," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 72(2): 305-319.
- Heatherton, Todd H. and Janet Polivy. 1991. "Development and Validation of a Scale for Measuring State Self-esteem," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 60(6): 895-910.
- Hill, Craig A. 1987. "Affiliation Motivation: People Who Need People... But in Different Ways," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(5): 1008-1018.
- Kates, Steven. 2002. "The Protean Quality of Subcultural Consumption: An Ethnographic Account of Gay Consumers," *Journal of Consumer Research* 29(December): 383-399.
- . 2004. "The Dynamics of Brand Legitimacy: An Interpretive Study in the Gay Men's Community," *Journal of Consumer Research* 31(September): 455-464.
- Kozinets, Robert V. 2001. "Utopian Enterprise: Articulating the Meanings of *Star Trek's* Culture of Consumption," *Journal of Consumer Research* 28(June): 67-88.
- Kozinets, Robert V. and Jay M. Handelman. 2004. "Adversaries of Consumption: Consumer Movements, Activism, and Ideology," *Journal of Consumer Research* 31(December): 691-704.
- Kraut, R., Patterson, M., Lundmark, V., Kiesler, S. Mukopadhyay, T. and Scherlis, W. (1998). "Internet Paradox: A Social Technology that Reduces Social Involvement and Psychological Well Being". *American Psychologist*, 53, 9, 1017-1031.
- Kurzban, Robert and Mark R. Leary .2001. "Evolutionary Origins of Stigmatization: The Functions of Social Exclusion," *Psychological Bulletin* 127(2): 187-208.
- Lancaster, Jane B. 1986. "Primate Social Behavior of Ostracism," *Ethology and Sociobiology* 7: 215-225.

- Leary, Mark R. 1990. "Responses to Social Exclusion: Social Anxiety, Jealousy, Loneliness, Depression and Low Self-esteem," *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology* 9(2): 221-229.
- , Ellen S. Tambor, Sonja K. Terdal, Deborah, L. Downs. 1995. "Self-esteem as an Interpersonal Monitor: The Sociometer Hypothesis," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 68(3): 518-530.
- , Robin M. Kowalski, Laura Smith, and Stephen Phillips. 2003. "Teasing, Rejection, and Violence: Case Studies of the School Shootings," *Aggressive Behavior* 29(3): 202-214.
- Levy, Sidney. 1959. "Symbols for Sale," *Harvard Business Review* 37(July-August): 117-124.
- MacDonald, Geoff. 2005. "Why Does Social Exclusion Hurt? The Relationship Between Social and Physical Pain," *Psychological Bulletin* 131(2): 202-223.
- Maner, Jon K., Nathan DeWall, Roy F. Baumeister and Mark Shaller. 2007. "Does Social Exclusion Motivate Interpersonal Reconnection? Resolving the Porcupine Problem," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 92(1): 42-55.
- Markus, Hazel and Ziva Kunda. 1986. "Stability and Malleability of the Self-Concept," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 51(4): 858-866.
- McCracken, Grant. 1986. "Culture and Consumption: A Theoretical Account of the Structure and Movement of the Cultural Meaning of Consumer Goods," *Journal of Consumer Research* 13(June): 71-84.
- Meteksan. 2008. *Meteksan Bookstore Store Sales Data*. Unpublished store information. Ankara.
- Milardo, Robert M., Michael P. Johnson, and Ted L. Huston. 1983. "Developing Close Relationships: Changing Patterns of Interaction between Pair Members and Social Networks," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 44(5): 964-976.
- Muniz Jr., Albert M., and Hope J. Schau. 2005. "Religiosity in the Abandoned Apple Newton Brand Community," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31(4):737-747.
- Muniz, Albert M. Jr and Thomas C. O'Guinn. 2001. "Brand Community," *Journal of Consumer Research* 27(March): 412-432.
- Murray, Henry A. 1938. *Explorations in Personality*. In Craig A. Hill, 1987. "Affiliation Motivation: People Who Need People... But in Different Ways," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 52(5): 1008-1018.
- Pickett, Cynthia L. and Wendi L. Gardner. 2005. "The Social Monitoring System: Enhanced Sensitivity to Social Cues and Information as an Adaptive Response to Social Exclusion and Belonging Need." In Kipling D. Williams, Joseph P. Forgas, and William von Hippel, eds., *The Social Outcast:*

- Ostracism, Social Exclusion, Rejection and Bullying*. New York: Psychology Press, 213-226.
- Puri, Radhika. 1996. "Measuring and Modifying Consumer Impulsivity: A Cost-Benefit Accessibility Framework," *Journal of Consumer Psychology* 5(2): 87-113.
- Rook, Dennis W. 1987. "The Buying Impulse," *Journal of Consumer Research* 14(September): 189-199.
- and Stephan Hoch. 1985. "Consuming Impulses," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 12: 23-27.
- and Robert J. Fisher. 1995. "Normative Influences on Impulsive Buying Behavior," *Journal of Consumer Research* 22(December):305-313.
- Rosenberg, Morris. 1965. *Society and Adolescent Self Image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rudman, Laurie A., Matthew C. Dohn and Kimberly Fairchild. 2007. "Implicit Self-esteem Compensation: Automatic Threat Defense," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 93(5): 798-813.
- Schouten, John W. and James H. McAlexander. 1995. "Subcultures of Consumption: An Ethnography of New Bikers," *Journal of Consumer Research* 22(1): 43-61.
- Schachter, Stanley. 1959. *The Psychology of Affiliation*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- , 1977. *The Psychology of Affiliation: Experimental Studies of the Sources of Gregariousness*. (4th ed.). Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Solomon, Michael R. 1983. "The Role of Products as Social Stimuli: A Symbolic Interactionism Perspective," *Journal of Consumer Research* 10(December): 319-329.
- Spanier, Graham B. and Robert F. Casto. 1979. "Adjustment to Separation and Divorce: An Analysis of 50 Case Studies," *Journal of Divorce* 2(3): 241-253.
- Thompson, Craig J. and Maura Troester. 2002. "Consumer Value Systems in the Age of Postmodern Fragmentation: The Case of the Natural Health Microculture," *Journal of Consumer Research* 28:550-571.
- and Zeynep Arsel. 2004. "The Starbucks Brandscape and Consumers' (Anticorporate) Experiences of Glocalization," *Journal of Consumer Research* 31: 631-642.
- Twenge, Jean M., Roy Baumeister, Dianne Tice and Tanja S. Stucke. 2001. "If You Can't Join Them, Beat Them: Effects of Social Exclusion on Aggressive Behavior," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 81(6): 1058-1069.

- , Kathleen Catanese and Roy F. Baumeister. 2002. "Social Exclusion Causes Self Defeating Behavior," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 83(3): 606-615.
- , Kathleen Catanese and Roy F. Baumeister. 2003. "Social Exclusion and the Deconstructed State: Meaninglessness, Lethargy, Lack of Emotion, and Self-Awareness," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 85(3): 409-423.
- , Roy F. Baumeister, Nathan DeWall, Nathalie Ciarocco and Michael J. Bartels. 2007. "Social Exclusion Decreases Prosocial Behavior," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 92(1): 56-66.
- Varenne, Harve. 1982. "Jocks and freaks: The symbolic structure of the expression of social interaction among American senior high school students" In George. Spindler, eds, *Doing the ethnography of schooling*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 213-235.
- Veblen, Thorstein (1994) *The Theory of Leisure Class: An Economic Theory of Institutions*. New York: Macmillan 1899. (Reprint).
- Vohs, Kathleen D. and Ronald J. Faber. 2007. "Spent Resources: Self-Regulatory Resource Availability Affects Impulse Buying," *Journal of Consumer Research* 33(March): 537-547.
- Watson, David, Lee Anna Clark, and Auke Tellegen. 1988. "Development and Validation of Brief Measures of Positive and Negative Affect: The PANAS Scales," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 54(6): 1063-1070.
- Williams, Kipling D., Christopher K.T. Cheung, and Wilma Choi. 2000. "Cyberostracism: Effects of Being Ignored Over the Internet," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 79(5): 748-762.
- Williams, Kipling D. and Lisa Zadro. 2005. "Ostracism: The Indiscriminate Early Detection System". In Kipling D. Williams, Joseph P. Forgas, and William von Hippel, eds., *The Social Outcast: Ostracism, Social Exclusion, Rejection and Bullying*. New York: Psychology Press, 19-31.

APPENDIX A

Social Exclusion Manipulation: Extraversion Scale of Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire

The scale below was established in the USA. It measures personality traits. We are currently working on adopting this scale to the Turkish culture. Please answer each question by putting a circle around "YES" or "NO". There are no right or wrong answers, and no trick questions. Please work through the questions quickly without thinking too long about the exact meaning of the questions. Again, there are no right or wrong answers so please answer each question as it applies to you in general.

PLEASE REMEMBER TO ANSWER EACH QUESTION

- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| 1. Are you a talkative person?..... | YES | NO |
| 2. Are you lively? | YES | NO |
| 3. Do you enjoy meeting new people?..... | YES | NO |
| 4. Do you usually take the first step in making new friends? | YES | NO |
| 5. Can you usually let yourself go and enjoy yourself at a lively party?.... | YES | NO |
| 6. Can you easily get some life into a boring party? | YES | NO |
| 7. Are you at the heart of social occasions? | YES | NO |
| 8. Do you like mixing with people? | YES | NO |
| 9. Do you like plenty of excitement around you?..... | YES | NO |
| 10. Are you mostly talkative when you are with other people? | YES | NO |
| 11. Do other people think of you as being very lively? | YES | NO |
| 12. Can you get a party going? | YES | NO |
| 13. Do you have many different hobbies? | YES | NO |
| 14. Do you like going out a lot? | YES | NO |
| 15. Do you prefer meeting with people to reading? | YES | NO |
| 16. Do you have many friends? | YES | NO |
| 17. Have people said that you sometimes act too quickly? | YES | NO |
| 18. Do you nearly always have a "ready answer" when people talk to you?YES | YES | NO |
| 19. Do you like doing things in which you have to act quickly? | YES | NO |
| 20. Do you often make decisions on the spur of the moment? | YES | NO |
| 21. Do you often take on more activities than you have time for? | YES | NO |
| 22. Do you like telling jokes and funny stories to your friends? | YES | NO |
| 23. Are <i>all</i> your habits are good and desirable ones? | YES | NO |

APPENDIX B

State Self-Esteem Scale (Heatherton And Polivy, 1991)

For the following questions please circle the number that is appropriate for you (1 for “strongly disagree”, 7 for “strongly agree”). Please answer all of the questions.

1. I feel confident about my abilities.

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

2. I am worried about whether I am regarded as success or failure.

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

3. I feel satisfied with the way my body looks now.

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

4. I feel frustrated about my performance.

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

5. I feel that I am having trouble understanding things that I read.

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

6. I feel that others respect and admire me.

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

7. I am dissatisfied with my weight.

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

8. I feel self-conscious (kendimi çok sorguluyorum)

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

9. I feel as smart as others.

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

10. I feel displeased with myself

- Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
11. I feel good about myself
- Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
12. I am pleased with my appearance right now
- Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
13. I am worried about what other people think of me
- Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
14. I feel confident that I understand things
- Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
15. I feel inferior to others at this moment. (Şu anda kendimi diğer insanlardan daha aşağıda görüyorum)
- Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
16. I feel unattractive.
- Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
17. I feel concerned about the impression I am making.
- Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
18. I feel that I have less scholastic (*akademik*) ability right now than others
- Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
19. I feel that I am not doing well.
- Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
20. I am worried about looking foolish.
- Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

APPENDIX C

Trait Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965)

For the following questions please circle the number that is appropriate for you (1 for “strongly disagree”, 7 for “strongly agree”). Please answer all of the questions.

1. On the whole I am satisfied with myself.
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
2. At times I think I am no good at all.
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
3. I feel I have a number of good qualities.
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
6. I certainly feel useless at times.
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
7. I feel that I am a person of worth, or at least on an equal plane with others.
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
9. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
10. I take positive attitude toward myself.
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

APPENDIX D

Impulsivity Scale (Puri, 1996)

Please read each of the following adjectives carefully and indicate how well they describe how you feel **right now, at this moment**, on a scale from 1 to 7 where 1 is *does not at all describe how I feel now* and 7 is *definitely describes exactly how I feel now*. Please indicate your response by circling the appropriate number.

	Does not at all describe how I feel now				Definitely describes exactly how I feel now		
a. Impulsive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Careless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Self-Controlled	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Extravagant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
e. Farsighted	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
f. Responsible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
g. Restrained	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
h. Easily tempted	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
i. Rational	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
j. Methodological	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
k. Enjoy spending	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
l. A planner	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

APPENDIX E

Study 2: Results for Contrast Analyses

Summary of Study 2's Post Hoc LSD Analyses Examining the Significance of Mean Differences between Future Loneliness and Other Future Expectations Conditions

	<i>Mean Differences</i>		
	Future loneliness- Future Belonging	Future loneliness- Misfortune control	Future loneliness- Success control
1. Willingness to pay			
Bilkent Mug	3.71*	4.62**	3.95**
Bilkent Sweatshirt	19.59*	18.10*	21.55**
Bilkent Laptop case	28.61**	22.54*	17.34
2. Product appeal			
Bilkent Mug	1.41**	1.19**	1.29**
Bilkent Sweatshirt	1.06*	1.22*	1.23*
Bilkent Sports bag	.94	1.58**	.92
3. Feeling part of something valuable			
Bilkent Mug	1.53**	1.30*	1.24*
Bilkent Sweatshirt	1.06*	1.43**	1.26*
Bilkent Sports bag	1.29*	1.12*	1.34*
Bilkent Laptop case	1.47*	1.34*	1.24*
4. Product gives clue about the person			
Bilkent Mug	1.82**	1.38*	1.48*
Bilkent Sweatshirt	2.24**	1.57*	1.80*
Bilkent Sports bag	1.59**	1.69**	1.70**
Bilkent Laptop case	1.24*	1.63**	1.86**

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

APPENDIX F

Study 2: Summary of the ANOVA on Future Expectations and Neutral Product Evaluations

	M				df	F		p
	Future loneliness	Future belonging	Misfortune control	Success control				
1. Willingness to pay								
Neutral Mug	7.31	7.76	7.39	5.81	3,67	.516		.672
Neutral Sweatshirt	49.06	39.44	37.56	39.68	3,65	.767		.516
Neutral Sports bag	48.75	30.88	42.65	38.53	3,63	1.101		.355
Neutral Laptop case	36.25	37.31	54.83	44.22	3,64	1.102		.355
2. Product appeal								
Neutral Mug	2.53	2.95	2.67	2.50	3,68	.310		.818
Neutral Sweatshirt	4.53	3.74	3.56	3.72	3,68	1.247		.300
Neutral Sports bag	3.59	3.11	2.89	3.56	3,68	.786		.506
Neutral Laptop case	2.88	3.47	3.61	3.22	3,68	.710		.549
3. Feeling happy when receive the product as gift								
Neutral Mug	2.59	2.58	2.39	2.33	3,68	.116		.950
Neutral Sweatshirt	4.35	4.05	3.78	3.89	3,68	.447		.720
Neutral Sports bag	3.24	3.11	2.78	3.28	3,68	.411		.746
Neutral Laptop case	2.82	3.21	3.56	2.89	3,68	.657		.581
4. Feeling part of something valuable								
Neutral Mug	2.24	2.47	2.11	2.28	3,68	.175		.913
Neutral Sweatshirt	3.65	3.00	3.39	2.72	3,68	1.186		.322
Neutral Sports bag	3.06	2.37	2.39	3.22	3,68	1.214		.311
Neutral Laptop case	2.88	3.00	3.06	2.78	3,68	.084		.969
5. Product gives clue about the person								
Neutral Mug	1.71	1.74	2.17	2.50	3,68	.951		.421
Neutral Sweatshirt	3.41	2.95	3.22	3.00	3,68	.238		.870
Neutral Sports bag	3.12	2.74	2.89	3.33	3,68	.441		.724
Neutral Laptop case	2.59	2.63	2.67	2.83	3,68	.066		.978

APPENDIX G

Study 2: Summary of the ANOVA on Future Expectations and Evaluations of Products that Demonstrate Team Affiliation

	M				df	F	P
	Future loneliness	Future belonging	Misfortune control	Success control			
1. Willingness to pay							
Favorite Team's Mug	7.29	11.57	8.33	7.28	3,64	.848	.473
Favorite Team's Sweatshirt	38.06	29.00	29.17	34.79	3,64	.982	.482
Favorite Team's Sports bag	41.39	34.87	26.72	34.34	3,64	1.371	.260
Favorite Team's Laptop case	33.82	31.00	27.22	37.12	3,63	.474	.702
2. Product appeal							
Favorite Team's Mug	3.11	3.38	3.28	3.41	3,65	.147	.931
Favorite Team's Sweatshirt	4.06	3.81	4.17	4.33	3,66	.302	.824
Favorite Team's Sports bag	3.89	3.50	3.83	3.50	3,66	.284	.837
Favorite Team's Laptop case	2.78	3.00	3.11	2.78	3,66	.215	.886
3. Feeling happy when receive the product as gift							
Favorite Team's Mug	3.39	2.94	3.33	4.11	3,66	1.303	.281
Favorite Team's Sweatshirt	4.44	3.69	4.28	4.72	3,66	.930	.431
Favorite Team's Sports bag	3.78	3.13	3.47	2.94	3,66	.509	.677
Favorite Team's Laptop case	2.78	2.88	3.11	3.06	3,66	.139	.936
4. Feeling part of something valuable							
Favorite Team's Mug	2.94	3.00	2.56	2.89	3,66	.217	.884
Favorite Team's Sweatshirt	3.67	3.25	4.06	4.22	3,66	.966	.414
Favorite Team's Sports bag	3.06	3.13	3.06	2.94	3,65	.032	.992
Favorite Team's Laptop case	2.67	2.38	2.94	2.50	3,66	.362	.780
5. Product gives clue about the person							
Favorite Team's Mug	2.72	3.19	2.72	3.83	3,66	1.302	.281
Favorite Team's Sweatshirt	3.67	3.56	3.56	4.17	3,66	.413	.744
Favorite Team's Sports bag	3.17	3.19	2.94	3.28	3,66	.104	.957
Favorite Team's Laptop case	2.50	3.00	2.89	2.89	3,66	.275	.843

APPENDIX H

Study 2: Summary of the Pearson Correlations among Proposed Mediators and Product Evaluations

	Pearson Correlations (<i>r</i>)	
	State Self-esteem	Impulsivity
1. Willingness to pay		
Bilkent Mug	-.198	.168
Bilkent Sweatshirt	.080	-.025
Bilkent Sports bag	.069	.068
Bilkent Laptop case	.141	-.030
2. Product appeal		
Bilkent Mug	.039	-.015
Bilkent Sweatshirt	.109	.005
Bilkent Sports bag	.024	-.035
Bilkent Laptop case	-.150	-.024
3. Feeling part of something valuable		
Bilkent Mug	.076	.033
Bilkent Sweatshirt	.049	.029
Bilkent Sports bag	-.011	-.048
Bilkent Laptop case	-.114	-.137
4. Product gives clue about the person		
Bilkent Mug	.124	.004
Bilkent Sweatshirt	.117	-.117
Bilkent Sports bag	-.062	-.120
Bilkent Laptop case	.145	-.065

None of the correlations were significant at $p < .05$

APPENDIX I

Study 2: Summary of the ANCOVA on Future Expectations and Product Evaluations when Trait Self-Esteem is Controlled

	<i>M</i>				<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
	Future loneliness	Future belonging	Misfortune control	Success control			
1. Willingness to pay							
Bilkent Mug	10.19	6.23	5.29	6.69	3,59	3.754*	.016
Bilkent Sweatshirt	49.06	28.25	30.11	27.81	3,61	3.626*	.018
Bilkent Sports bag	40.81	29.25	28.33	31.56	3,61	1.035	.383
Bilkent Laptop case	53.88	23.80	30.44	37.63	3,60	3.803*	.015
2. Product appeal							
Bilkent Mug	4.31	2.94	3.17	3.06	3,61	4.656**	.005
Bilkent Sweatshirt	5.06	4.00	3.89	4.00	3,61	2.959*	.039
Bilkent Sports bag	4.50	3.63	2.89	3.63	3,61	3.442*	.022
Bilkent Laptop case	3.88	3.50	3.56	3.00	3,61	.863	.465
3. Feeling part of something valuable							
Bilkent Mug	4.31	2.88	3.06	3.31	3,61	2.771*	.049
Bilkent Sweatshirt	4.75	3.75	3.24	3.63	3,60	3.027*	.036
Bilkent Sports bag	4.19	2.94	3.11	2.88	3,61	2.891*	.043
Bilkent Laptop case	4.19	2.75	3.00	3.06	3,61	2.641	.057
4. Product gives clue about the person							
Bilkent Mug	4.56	2.69	3.06	3.31	3,61	3.104*	.033
Bilkent Sweatshirt	5.44	3.00	3.72	3.75	3,61	5.004**	.004
Bilkent Sports bag	4.63	2.81	2.78	2.88	3,61	4.090**	.010
Bilkent Laptop case	4.44	3.19	2.89	2.75	3,61	5.309**	.003

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

APPENDIX J

Study 2: Summary of ANOVA on High and Low Levels of Trait Self-Esteem and Product Evaluations in Future Loneliness Group

Variables	Bilkent Mug			Bilkent Sweatshirt			Bilkent Sports Bag			Bilkent Laptop Case		
	<i>M</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
1. Willingness to pay												
Low Self-esteem	11.36	1.285	.275	46.82	.046	.833	37.09	.211	.653	52.91	.018	.894
High Self-esteem	8.00			50.00			43.33			50.83		
2. Product appeal												
Low Self-esteem	4.27	.008	.928	4.91	.371	.552	4.18	1.802	.199	4.00	.410	.532
High Self-esteem	4.33			5.33			5.00			3.50		
3. Feeling part of something valuable												
Low Self-esteem	4.00	1.618	.223	4.45	1.603	.225	3.73	3.603	.077	4.27	.020	.890
High Self-esteem	5.00			5.33			5.00			4.17		
4. Product gives clue about the person												
Low Self-esteem	4.09	3.176	.095	5.00	4.209	.058	3.91	4.259	.057	4.09	2.972	.105
High Self-esteem	5.50			6.17			5.67			5.33		