

The Conceptualization and Development of Advertisement-Evoked Imagination Scale

Ike Janita Dewi*
Swee-Hoon Ang**

This research aims to understand consumers' imagination as a subjective experience which can be evoked by marketing stimuli. The characteristics and types of imagination are identified, upon which an imagination scale was developed. Results of the scale development suggest that there are four imagination types, namely, benefit-anticipatory imagination, emotional-bonding imagination, symbolic imagination, and mind-wandering imagination. The scale demonstrated reliability, as well stability for application across product types. The scale development also includes discussion on imagination-related but distinctive concepts of product symbolism and tendency to imagine.

Key words: imagination scale, advertising, hedonic products

I. Introduction

A study of imagination transcends many disciplines and has been of philosophical debates for centuries. Dating back to the 17th and 18th century, Thomas Hobbes and Walter Harte pointed out that imagination is an important part of the general human process of dealing with information. However, while imagination has generated widespread interest in psychol-

ogy, this construct has been neglected in understanding consumers' subjective experiences which can be stimulated by advertisements or other marketing stimuli. This study aims at understanding consumers' imagination, as a subjective experience which can be evoked by marketing stimuli. We attempt to identify characteristics and types of imagination and develop a multi-item scale to measure this construct. The scale is developed drawing from *a priori* imagination constructs based on the

* Faculty of Economics, Sanata Dharma University Yogyakarta-Indonesia (ikejdewi@gmail.com)

** Business School National University of Singapore (bizangsh@nus.edu.sg)

literature which suggests that imagination can be categorized into four types, that is, benefit-anticipatory imagination, emotional-bonding imagination, symbolic imagination, and mind-wandering imagination. The scale development process which employed a Multitrait-Multimethod procedure confirmed the existence of the four imagination types.

Understanding and measuring imagination is important for at least two reasons. First, whether the goal is to improve marketing communication's effectiveness or advertising creative strategy, an understanding of consumers' imagination which contains a creative process or a generation of many interpretations built upon one's experience, wishes, and desires, can be insightful. The present study offers a perspective on the nature of information which can elicit more imagination and result in more affect-based attitude. While Alesandrini and Sheikh (1993) suggest that concrete stimulus elicit imagery (for it is easier to be replicated in working memory and easier to retrieve), the present research proposes and empirically demonstrates that "incomplete information" (which gives them freedom for interpretation) is beneficial for imagination elicitation. As consumers elicit imagination, they will involve in anticipating benefits of the product advertised, creating emotional bond as well as attributing symbolic meanings to the product. On the role of imagination in the creation of a product's symbolic meanings, this research shows that imagination

contributes to evaluation of a product's hedonic or symbolic benefits. Therefore, the present study offers several possibilities or practical application of the imagination construct and the imagination scale pertaining particularly to ad executions strategy and communication of hedonic products.

We also seek to relate imagination to other concepts in marketing literature. This serves as an assessment of the validity of the imagination scale as well as an extension of studies surrounding the hedonic-utilitarian concepts proposed by Hirschman and Holbrook (1982) and Holbrook and Hirschman (1982). We extend Kempf's (1999) and Mano and Oliver's (1993) empirical research on relationships between hedonic product and affective responses, and between utilitarian product and cognitive responses by including imagination as responses elicited by hedonic products.

A second reason is the field's interests in the measurement of subjective experience (e.g., Unger and Kernan, 1983) in particular as well as complex responses of consumers towards advertising or other marketing stimuli (e.g., Edell and Burke, 1987; Hirschman and Holbrook, 1982). With much advertising expenditure wasted in ineffective campaigns (Abraham and Lodish, 1990), advertisers should be concerned with the complex relationships which exist between consumers and advertisements or other marketing stimuli.

II. Literature Review and Hypotheses Formulation

2.1 Defining Imagination: Its Characteristics and Types

In attempt to define imagination, we first identify the characteristics of imagination. A review of the imagination literature suggests unclear concepts in the definition of imagination. It is sometimes referred to fantasy, imagery, creativity, and/or intellectual skills. It once also stood for a state of mind given over to the contemplation of unrealities and to the creation of fancies, to delusions and extravagant romancing (Singer, 1981-82). However, neither unravelling the jumble of imagination's definitions nor its philosophical debate is the main interest of this study. Instead, this study is more concerned with identifying the characteristics and the content of imagination, rather than trying to define imagination in an explicit, absolute way.

2.1.1 Characteristics of Imagination: Absorptive, Transcendental, and Future Oriented

We identify imagination as an experience which is absorptive, transcendental, and future oriented. Such characteristics are distinctive but not mutually exclusive. It means that we

can classify and label each characteristic of imagination but an individual can experience all the three - at different intensities - while s/he is imagining.

Absorptive experience occurs when one is "immersed" and "very much involved" in the stimulus objects. Swanson (1978) speaks of imagination as an absorbing experience where an individual "loses his/herself" in the experience or where s/he "gives his/herself" to the experience and indulges in it.

In an absorptive experience, one is reflecting on the stimulus objects, relating the objects with his/her past experience, emotional desires, and current concerns. Absorption will take place when one is involved personally with the objects. His/her own personal thoughts will be incorporated in the experience. The absorptive experience includes a construction of past experience, emotional desires, and current wishes built upn or centered on the stimulus objects. For example, when one is absorbed in a stimulus object, s/he will project him/herself as a part of the stimulus object. The stimulus object can also prompt a recall of his/her past experience similar to that of the stimulus object as well as bring forth current desires related to the stimulus object. For instance, if the stimulus object is a mountainous landscape, s/he can "see" his/herself in the picture, recall his/her related-to-mountain experience, and evoke desires to become (for example) a famous biker. Such an "imaginative construction," although

unreal, is perceived as if it were real. Swanson (1978) calls this phenomenon "reality absorption", that is, treating the imagined objects as real. An important aspect of such absorbing experience is that it arouses emotion (Giorgi, 1987; Murray, 1987).

Imagination is also characterized by its transcendental experience. Transcendental experience occurs when one shifts his/her attention away from the actual stimulus objects and "look" beyond them (Murray, 1987; Weisskopf, 1950). The distinctive property of such a transcendental experience is that it can have no reference to the actual stimulus object so that can emerge as stimulus-independent thoughts. Such a transcendental characteristic of imagination has two aspects. The first aspect is its "deviation" from the stimulus objects. Instead of focusing on the stimulus objects, one's thoughts drift away from them. It is a kind of daydreaming experience where one's thoughts simply wander off and are overwhelmed by other things (totally) unrelated to the stimulus objects (Singer, 1975). The second aspect of transcendental experience is its "looking beyond" the stimulus' pure description for symbolic associations. "Looking beyond means that one takes a distance away from the object for not being overwhelmed by its objective appearance. This enables one to create a symbolic meaning to the object. Weisskopf (1950) argues that "going away" from the actual object can lead to symbolic interpretation of it. This symbolic

meaning seems unrelated to the objective quality of the product, but this association does not come from nowhere. It is imagination's capability to construct past impressions and recall them at an appropriate time (Sutherland, 1971).

Lastly, imagination's future orientation pertains to imagination's ability to act *as if* - getting beyond the constraints of reality (Sarbin and Juhazs, 1970) and creating a motivation to attain whatever is imagined (Murray, 1987). Imagination's capacity to act *as if* contains two important aspects, that is, of surpassing the constraint of reality and of creating hypothetical instances. It is an ability to generate many different interpretations out of stimulus objects (Sutherland, 1971; Valkenburg and van der Voort, 1994). It is also capable of creating original ideas, for example, by constructing something which is not (at all) a replica of something seen before. Therefore, acting *as if* is not a reflection of one's past experience which is evoked by the stimulus objects. Rather, it focuses on the future and involves an anticipation of the future (Murray, 1987). In one's imagination, s/he can act as if s/he were in the imagined situation and experience it. S/he can also anticipate the future situation of s/he undertakes the imagined actions. In this instance, the *as if* activity involves making-believe activities with therefore makes it - to some extent - overlapping with imagination's absorptive experience. However, the important difference is that imagination is future oriented. It in-

duces one to project to him/herself to the future and gives some inspiration to think about the potential. It leads one to alternative ways of seeing things related to him/herself or the situation occurring in the present and future time. In this instance, the involvement of emotion is also pronounced due to both the making-believe activity and “the empowerment” that imagination contains (Giorgi, 1987; Sutherland, 1971). In the making-believe activity, one perceives the imaginative experience as real and that imagination provides a sense of fulfillment of one’s future desires. And the empowerment that imagination creates suggests personal relevance which also contains emotional involvement.


2.1.2 Types of Imagination

Types of imagination pertain to the *contents* of imagination as drawn from the character-

istics of imagination. The characteristics of imagination contribute to how the contents of imagination can be categorized into different types of imagination (refer to Figure 1). This categorization is made with a focus on consumer’s imagination in relation to the product depicted in an ad. The stimulus objects are therefore the ads, while the types of imagination pertain to the contents of consumers’ imagination elicited by the ad. The types of imagination are labeled to best describe types of imagination contents which were drawn from the characteristics of imagination.

Even though the types of imagination can be distinctively identified, they are not mutually exclusive. This means that one’s imagination can contain more than one type of imagination. Yet, a type of imagination may more dominantly exist in response to a particular type of advertising and/or product advertised. The

<Figure 1> How Characteristics of Imagination Contribute to the Types of Imagination



types of imagination as well as how the types of ads would influence the elicitation of the different types of imagination are discussed in the following.

(1) Benefit-anticipatory imagination

Imagination's characteristic of future orientation suggests that the role of imagination is benefit-anticipatory. Since this characteristic of imagination contains an anticipation of future situation (if the imagination is undertaken) as well as a motivation to achieve the imagined, one conducts an (mental) examination of what might happen and their consequences (White, 1990). If a consumer is induced by an ad to elicit this type of imagination, s/he will project her/himself using the product and consider the consequences of using it. These will further involve a kind of (mental) analysis of the product benefits, how the benefits are relevant to him/her and what aspects of him/her can be improved by using the products.

This type of imagination is inclined towards utilitarian imagination in that it involves anticipation and consideration about taking an action (Sutherland, 1971). Such an activity is regarded as rather utilitarian since to be able to conduct such a cost-benefit analysis of whether or not to consume a product, consumers will inevitably take into account the "consequences of actions." In this instance, the benefit-anticipatory imagination involves a secondary process thinking *similar to* that occurring in a utili-

tarian product evaluation (Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982). That is, consumers do not consume a product for merely enjoyment or pleasure, but would also consider the product's functional benefits as well as the consequences in consuming the product. In other words, consumers' imagination contains not just affective reasons of pleasure or enjoyment from consuming a product, but also the costs and benefits of consuming the product. This decreases the role of emotion in benefit-anticipatory imagination while increasing the role of cognition. Emotions are involved in the making-believe activity where a consumer imagines him/herself consuming the product. Yet, as imagination contains also considerations about the "costs and benefits" of using the product and how the product can be beneficial to him/her, this activity involves cognition.

Based on our identification of the existence of benefit-anticipatory imagination in imagination, we formulate Hypothesis 1: Benefit-anticipatory imagination is a type of imagination.

(2) Emotional-bonding imagination

The imagination's characteristics of absorptive experience and future orientation suggest that imagination contains emotions. Emotions are involved when consumers are engaged in an absorbing experience constructing make-believe situations built upon past experiences, current impressions, and/or imagined future happenings (Sutherland, 1971). Emotions occupy a very dominant share in the imaginative experience.

There are particular aspects of imagination suggesting such involvement of emotions. Central to the involvement of emotions is the make-believe situations in imagination. Pertaining to the creation of the make-believe situations in which are shaped in accord with one's own desires -- containing one's past/current experience and desires, these make imagination emotionally significant (Giorgi, 1987; Singer, 1975).

In such making-believe, one can feel a fulfilment of his/her concerns, desires, wishes, and dreams. Sartre (1940/72) describes it as a "quasi-presence" which can serve as a *substitution role* for one's desires or concerns. Although its benefits are not as real as the actual experience, such a "quasi-presence" involves a lot of emotions. Giorgi's (1987) phenomenological study showed that indulgence in making believe can make one feel better, despite the imagined presence of fulfilment of one's desires. The future orientation characteristic of imagination also suggests involvement of emotions. Imagination's future orientation induces one to project him/herself to the future and gives some inspiration and motivation to achieve whatever s/he imagines (Murray, 1987). Besides serving a substitution role which gives comfort and good feelings while imagining, this has future implication. Giorgi (1987) contends that when one realizes that the imagined situation is not real, it gives motivation to obtain the real. Such inspirations evoke one's emotions.

Based on the above lines of reasoning, we pre-

dict the presence of emotional-bonding imagination in imagination, as stated in Hypothesis 2: Emotional-bonding imagination is a type of imagination.

(3) Symbolic imagination

The transcendental characteristic of imagination contributes to the symbolic meaning of a product (Weisskopf, 1950). Symbolic imagination refers to the labelling of the content of imagination where ascriptions of a symbolic meaning to a product occur. A meaning ascribed to a product is a result of an organization of past sense impressions which is then recalled at appropriate times. This is an activity which imagination does and is able to do (Sutherland, 1971).

White (1990) describes a "vivid" imagination not as the one which reproduces objective stimuli. Rather, it contains varied, unusual and perhaps unthought-of possibilities. In other words, it seeks the alternatives. This activity depends neither on the inclusion of imagery nor formation of imageable features. While illustrating content of imagination, White (1990) re-emphasizes the point that imagination differs from imagery in terms of this feature. Unlike imagery which contains reproductions of stimuli, imagination does not. Neither is imagery necessarily contained in imagination.

Hence, an essential aspect of the symbolic imagination is that one should look beyond the product as such to be able to "see" the prod-

uct's meaning - what the product signifies or what the product symbolizes. While such meanings cannot be based (merely) on the product's objective appearance, imagination's transcendental characteristic can transcend the actual stimulus objects and "see" what underlies the product (Sutherland, 1971; Weisskopf, 1950). In this instance, imagination's future orientation also contributes to symbolic imagination in that it opens up the alternative criteria for evaluating a product.

Based on the above discussion, we formulate Hypothesis 3: Symbolic imagination is a type of imagination.

(4) Mind-wandering imagination

Another aspect of the transcendental characteristic of imagination is its mind-wandering consequence. This occurs if a consumer pays minimal attention to the advertisement and the product it depicts. Instead, s/he has thoughts which are not related to the product. While this content of imagination is not desirable and therefore should be minimized (if not avoided), such a shift of attention from actual stimuli is also a condition for imagination elicitation. Jager (1987) contends that some "distance" from the stimulus object stimulates imagination. Wittgenstein (cited in Warnock, 1976, p. 183-195) is more explicit in describing it when he writes: "*while I am looking at an object I cannot imagine it.*"

Therefore, mind-wandering imagination has two sides of the same coin of shifting of attention.

In order to imagine, one has to shift his/her attention from the actual stimulus. However, shifting attention can also result in a state of "lost in thought" (Singer, 1975). Therefore, our view of mind-wandering imagination is that its role is rather ambiguous for it can be considered beneficial or detrimental for ad evaluation. A detrimental effect occurs if mind-wandering imagination leads to a consumer being lost in thought and results in one's disinterest in the ad. Yet, it is beneficial if it can lead to imagining the product advertised. This point suggests that we should capture both aspects of mind-wandering imagination in its measure.

There are conditions which induce a state of daydreaming (which is a state where mind-wandering occurs). Singer (1975) contends that daydreams occur when one is left much channel space for attending his/her private thoughts. In other words, when consumers experience a "too relaxed" state, they tend to turn inward and daydream. However, it is important to note that such a relaxed condition is also desirable for imagination elicitation as too demanding an external stimulus can inhibit imagination (Lindaeur, 1983).

We therefore predict the existence of mind-wandering imagination in imagination, as stated in Hypothesis 4: Mind-wandering imagination is a type of imagination.

III. Development of Advertisement-Evoked Imagination Scale

3.1 Methods

The scale development consists of a three-stage study. First, there was a preliminary editing on the initial pool of forty scale items. An expert and a sample of 30 students participated in such editing and checking for clarity of item wording. This screened out redundant, double-barrelled, ambiguous, and leading statements and reduced the pool of items to 23 statements. Subsequently, the 23 items were administered to another sample of 40 respondents. The data collected were subjected to a PCA aiming at attaining a simpler structure and assessing reliability of the scale items. Last, two main studies involving 206 and 211 respondents respectively were conducted. The first sample evaluated the first product set (hedonic product) while the second sample evaluated the second product set (utilitarian product). The two product sets were used to test whether the imagination scale is applicable to be used across product sets. For this purpose, the MTMM (Multi Traits Multi Methods) approach was employed.

3.2 Item Development and Purification

The theoretical (literature) sources of the four imagination types (Lindaeur, 1983, Giorgi, 1987;

Puto and Wells, 1984, Sutherland, 1971, Swanson, 1978, Valkenburg and van der Voort, 1994, Weisskopf, 1950, White, 1990) were used to generate 5 to 7 items describing each type imagination, for a total of 23 items (see Table 1). Items were written in the first person because of their subjective nature. A seven-point Likert scale (“disagree” to “agree”) was used to measure intensity of response on each item. The stimulus ads used depict hedonic products (the product set #1) and utilitarian products (the product set #2). All the stimulus and product selection of hedonic and utilitarian products were priorly pretested.

Prior to administration of the first stage questionnaire, the items were subjected to preliminary editing by a panel of three judges (marketing faculty and doctoral students) who were provided with background information and asked to indicate which of the four imagination types each item represented and check the scale’s wording clarity.

3.3 Principal Component Analyses and Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was conducted on the scale items within the first data set to verify the underlying assumption of four imagination types. Oblique rotation ($\delta = 0$) was used because the literature suggests that the imagination types are related. This analysis serves to reduce the data and to attain

<Table 1> Imagination Scale Item Generation

Imagination Type	Scale Items	
<i>Benefit- Anticipatory Imagination</i>	BA1 (IMG4).	The ad induces me to imagine how I would think about myself if I were using the product.
	BA2 (IMG5)	Looking at the ad, I can imagine how the product can fit my lifestyle.
	BA3 (IMG6)	The ad makes me imagine the things I can achieve if I use the product.
	BA4 (IMG7)	While I see the ad, I think of how the product might be useful for me.
	BA5*	The ad encourages me to imagine the qualities of the advertised product.
<i>Emotional- Bonding Imagination</i>	EB1	When I look at the ad, I can relate myself to the product advertised.
	EB2 (IMG8)	The ad reminds me of any experience or feelings I've had in my own life.
	EB3 (IMG9)	I think the ad somehow inspires me to try out alternative ways to express myself with the product.
	EB4 (IMG10)	It is hard to give a specific reason but I think the product is for me.
	EB5*	The ad is meaningful to me.
	EB6*	It's hard to put into words, but this ad leaves me with a good feeling about the product.
<i>Symbolic Imagination</i>	S1*	The ad makes me think that there is a symbolic meaning to the product
	S2*	The ad makes me think that people can have different criteria for evaluating the product.
	S3 (IMG11)	I feel the ad conveys that the product has benefits other than those I usually think of.
	S4*	The ad induces me to think that there is an underlying value of the product which cannot be judged based only on its functional benefits.
	S5 (IMG12)	The ad suggests that the product symbolizes alternative ways of seeing and behaving.
	S6 (IMG13)	The ad gives me room to think of the underlying meaning of the product advertised.
<i>Mind- Wandering Imagination</i>	MW1*	When I look at the ad, I switch my thinking to something else.
	MW2*	When I look at the ad, thoughts unrelated to the product can easily creep in.
	MW3 (IMG14)	When I look at the ad, I can dissociate myself and think of the meanings of the products other than those stated in the ad.
	MW4 (IMG15)	The ad does not seem to be speaking directly to me.
	MW5 (IMG16)	When I look at the ad, I think of other things unrelated to the product.
	MW6 (IMG17)	When I look at the ad, I feel distracted by thoughts unrelated to the product.


Note: * item was eliminated based on the first PCA

a simpler structure. Even though a PCA does not identify an existence of a model (thus indicating an infinite number of possible solutions), it provides a useful first step leading to the CFA undertaken subsequently in the scale development process (Maruyama, 1997). There were 6 factors emerging from the data which accounted for 70.8% of the data variance. We dropped items which were not loaded into these four factors. Therefore, included EB2, EB3, and EB4 (Factor 1): MW3, MW4, MW5, and MW6 (Factor 2): BA1, BA2, BA3, and BA4 (Factor 3): and S3, S5, and S6 (Factor 4). Reliability testing of these four factors showed

cronbach alphas of 0.70 to 0.82. Based on the first-stage PCA, the scale items were therefore refined and reduced into a pool of 14 items. This scale was administered in the main study involving 340 student subjects. Each subject rated three products (either belonging to product set #1 or product set #2). The data were then subjected to a second-stage PCA and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA).

Results of the second-stage PCA suggested the emergence of four factors. Two items (BA4 and MW6) whose factor loadings were less than 0.40 were dropped and not included in the CFA. Figure 2 depicts our hypothesized factor model

<Figure 2> Confirmatory Factor Analysis: A Baseline Model



Note:
 F1 = Benefit-anticipatory Imagination
 F2 = Emotional-bonding Imagination
 F3 = Symbolic Imagination
 F4 = Mind-wandering Imagination

and displays graphically the four intercorrelated latent factors of imagination types. Such a baseline model demonstrated a good fit with GFI = 0.991, NFI = 0.994, chi-square value of 53.558 (df = 48), and $p > 0.1$. The regression scores of each path of scale items to respective factor were positive and significant. The correlations across factors were also positive and significant. The squared multiple correlations of the observed variable are also higher than a rule of thumb of 0.4 (see Table 2).

3.4 The Scale's Convergent, Discriminant, and Construct Validity Testing

Though the imagination scale factor structure was confirmed by the CFA model, we conducted more rigorous analyses to assess the scale's convergent and discriminant validity. Particularly, as the scale should be valid to be used across product sets, we scrutinized the data to test whether there was a systematic error caused by different product sets. For this purpose, we

<Table 2> Results of Baseline Confirmatory Factor Analysis: Regression Coefficient and Covariances

Variable	Standardized Regression/Covariance Estimates and Variance Extracted
IMG 4	0.899***
IMG 5	0.868***
IMG 6	0.964***
IMG 8	0.939***
IMG 9	0.952***
IMG 10	0.882***
IMG 11	0.904***
IMG 12	0.855***
IMG 13	0.879***
IMG 14	0.850***
IMG 15	0.845***
IMG 16	0.881***
F1 - F2	0.153***
F1 - F3	0.380***
F1 - F4	0.216***
F2 - F3	0.256***
F2 - F4	0.164***
F3 - F4	0.304***
Variance extracted by F1	0.742
Variance extracted by F2	0.758
Variance extracted by F3	0.876
Variance extracted by F4	0.820

Note:*** = the regression/covariance coefficient is significant at 0.01 level


conducted a further analysis adopting MTMM procedures. This mode of analysis addresses issues of convergent validity in that all of the variation and covariation of data are attributable to traits alone, except for random errors.

The procedure undertaken to conduct such an assessment entails two steps. First, we modeled hypothesized relationships without taking into account the sources of systematic error, that is, the different product sets (see Figure 3). Responses on product set #1 were separated from those on product set #2 (for example, IMG4#1 and IMG 4#2 represent respondents' responses on scale item #4 on product set #1 and product set #2 respectively). Such a model should demonstrate an acceptable model fit of 0.90 and/or p value > 0.1 (Bentler and Bonnet, 1980). Otherwise, the lack of fit may indicate the presence of systematic errors.

The CFA results indicate an adequate fit of 0.917, chi-square = 4165.385 (df = 250), $p = 0.00$. Regression paths between latent variables

and observed variables are all positive and significant. Similarly, covariances among four imagination types are positive and mostly significant (see Table 3). Only the covariance between F1 and F4 was found marginally significant ($p < 0.1$). Such a low correlation may indicate that benefit-anticipatory imagination can reduce a tendency to drift away from the stimuli. This is intuitively plausible since mind-wandering imagination contains thoughts that are completely unrelated to the stimulus objects, but benefit-anticipatory imagination requires making-believe activities surrounding product benefits. A higher correlation between F3 and F4 (compared to that between F1 and F4) is expected since "seeing beyond" the actual stimulus or its objective benefits occurring in symbolic imagination induces one to drift away from the product, more than if one is engaged in benefit-anticipatory imagination. Smaller yet significant covariances between mind-wandering imagination and the other three types of imag-

<Figure 3> Confirmatory Factor Analysis Without Product Type Control



〈Table 3〉 Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis Without Product Type Control:
Regression Coefficient and Covariances

Variable	Standardized Regression/Covariance Estimates
IMG 4 #1	0.805***
IMG 5 #1	0.791***
IMG 6 #1	0.851***
IMG 8 #1	0.928***
IMG 9 #1	0.929***
IMG 10 #1	0.940***
IMG 11 #1	0.498***
IMG 12 #1	0.866***
IMG 13 #1	0.690***
IMG 14 #1	0.729***
IMG 15 #1	0.725***
IMG 16 #1	0.543***
IMG 4 #2	0.652***
IMG 5 #2	0.459***
IMG 6 #2	0.750***
IMG 8 #2	0.672***
IMG 9 #2	0.485***
IMG 10 #2	0.489***
IMG 11 #2	0.623***
IMG 12 #2	0.745***
IMG 13 #2	0.746***
IMG 14 #2	0.644***
IMG 15 #2	0.718***
IMG 16 #2	0.777***
F1 - F2	0.249***
F1 - F3	0.285***
F1 - F4	0.084*
F2 - F3	0.375***
F2 - F4	0.147***
F3 - F4	0.211***

Note: *** = the regression/covariance coefficient is significant at 0.01 level

* = the regression/covariance coefficient is significant at 0.1 level

ination suggest positive, but less stronger relationships compared to those among the other three imagination types. In other words, all the imagination types contain some wandering-off

or some drifting-away from the actual stimuli which may lead to a contention that one takes some “distance” from the stimuli while engaging in imagination.


Since the model without the multimethod structure does not demonstrate a good model fit, we constructed a CFA model which explicitly modeled the product type controls (see Figure 4). By doing so, we examined whether the scales were applicable across product sets. Hence, Product set #1 and Product set #2 were modeled as potential source of systematic error.

This model showed an adequate fit of 0.900, chi-square value = 4162.798 (df = 226), p = 0.000. Such fit measures indicate that this model is acceptable. However, if compared with the earlier model, the without-product-type-control model is more parsimonious as it significantly improves model fit because a decrease of 24 in degree of freedom results in an increase of 2,404 in chi-square value. Therefore, the earlier

model is favored compared to this with-product-type-control model. Based on the comparison of the two models, the convergent validity of the scales is established, meaning that the scales are applicable for various products.

Nevertheless, we conducted a correlation analysis to complement the analysis and re(check) the scale's convergent and discriminant validity. For this purpose, we calculated correlations between scale items (see Table 4) and adopt Campbell and Fiske's (1959) and Maruyama's (1997) guidelines for criteria for a model to achieve convergent and discriminant validity. They suggest three criteria. First, highest correlations should be demonstrated by the same traits measured on the same product types (the "monotrait-monomethod" correlations; that is,

<Figure 4> Confirmatory Factor analysis with Product Type Control



the highlighted figures on Table 4). This first rule was fulfilled. Second, the correlations of the same traits measured on different product sets “*should be significantly different from zero and sufficiently large to encourage further examination of validity*” (Campbell and Fiske, 1959). Such a validity diagonal addresses the trait variance independent of method variance. In other words, if this criterion is met, the potential source of systematic bias can be ruled out. Results on Table 4 was fulfilled. Further, the correlations within the validity diagonals should be higher than those lying within blocks on either side of the validity diagonal (or the “heterotrait-heteromethod” correlations). Such a criterion is also met. To illustrate, correlation between IMG 11 #2 and IMG 11 #1 was higher than those between IMG 10 #2 and 11 #1 and between IMG 14 #2 and 11 #2.

Lastly, on the “heterotrait” block, the correlations should show a rank which is maintained across blocks. For the “heterotrait-monomethod” blocks (that is, correlations between different traits measured on the same product set), product set #1 and product set #2 showed almost similar ranks. Whereas, for the “heterotrait-heteromethod” block - that is, correlations between different traits measured on different product sets - a consistency of ranks was shared by two triangles (on either side of the validity diagonals). Referring to Table 4, such requirements were fulfilled (except for some inconsistency if the ranks found in correlation

elements on the “heterotrait-monomethod” block). Therefore, the imagination scales (see Table 8 for the final version of the scale) seemed to satisfy almost all of the criteria for achieving convergent and discriminant validity.

3.5 Imagination and Product Symbolism: Imagination and Tendency To Imagine

Product symbolism is a construct which has a meaningful relationship with the four imagination types. We proposed that elicitation of the four imagination types would result in a product being perceived to convey more symbolic benefits (Belk, Ger, and Askegaard, 1997; Hogg and Michell, 1997; Hyatt, 1992; and Wright, Clairborne, and Sirgy, 1992).


We constructed a path model to assess the relationship between the four imagination types and product symbolism (see Figure 5). Results showed that the hypothesized positive relations between the four imagination types and product symbolism were not rejected. The model has an overall fit of 0.988 (GFI), 0.993 (NFI), chi-square value = 91.197 (df = 80), $p > 0.10$. Covariances among four imagination types and product symbolism are significantly positive (see Table 5). Such results indicate that imagination contributes to product symbolism. Both imagination and product symbolism see beyond the actual stimuli and beyond the functional benefits of the products.

<Table 4> Correlation between Imagination Scale Items

	4#1	5#1	6#1	8#1	9#1	10#1	11#1	12#1	13#1	14#1	15#1	16#1	4#2	5#2	6#2	8#2	9#2	10#2	11#2	12#2	13#2	14#2	15#2	16#2		
5#1	.741 ***	1.00																								
6#1	.762 ***	.766 ***	1.00																							
8#1	.128 ***	.184 ***	.131 ***	1.00																						
9#1	.149 ***	.168 ***	.136 ***	.901 ***	1.00																					
10#1	.138 ***	.169 ***	.147 ***	.913 ***	.890 ***	1.00																				
11#1	.333 ***	.347 ***	.316 ***	.180 ***	.154 ***	.179 ***	1.00																			
12#1	.331 ***	.376 ***	.300 ***	.200 ***	.179 ***	.188 ***	.792 ***	1.00																		
13#1	.358 ***	.347 ***	.342 ***	.166 ***	.131 ***	.151 ***	.798 ***	.770 ***	1.00																	
14#1	.076 *	.064 ***	.060 ***	.033 ***	.027 ***	.022 ***	.154 ***	.176 ***	.115 **	1.00																
15#1	.060 ***	.071 ***	.071 ***	.032 ***	.040 ***	.021 ***	.187 ***	.192 ***	.150 ***	.669 ***	1.00															
16#1	.122 ***	.136 ***	.101 ***	.012 ***	.001 ***	-.313 ***	.196 ***	.196 ***	.181 ***	.651 ***	.751 ***	1.00														
4#2	.374 ***	.223 ***	.274 ***	.049 ***	.051 ***	.053 ***	.097 ***	.092 ***	.154 ***	.004 ***	.003 ***	-.003 ***	1.00													
5#2	.236 ***	.330 ***	.264 ***	.036 ***	.024 ***	.046 ***	.072 ***	.081 ***	.124 ***	.008 ***	-.011 ***	.016 ***	.790 ***	1.00												
6#2	.244 ***	.241 ***	.378 ***	.042 ***	.075 ***	.041 ***	.057 ***	.128 ***	.130 ***	-.051 ***	-.022 ***	-.017 ***	.771 ***	.760 ***	1.00											
#2	.022 ***	.091 ***	.036 ***	.306 ***	.240 ***	.256 ***	.100 ***	.112 ***	.116 ***	.050 ***	.028 ***	.009 ***	.101 ***	.106 ***	.062 ***	1.00										
9#2	.041 ***	.028 ***	.030 ***	.242 ***	.294 ***	.247 ***	.069 ***	.121 ***	.102 ***	.024 ***	.041 ***	.012 ***	.119 ***	.074 ***	.075 ***	.902 ***	1.00									
10#2	.051 ***	.090 ***	.067 ***	.248 ***	.247 ***	.298 ***	.128 ***	.111 ***	.120 ***	.010 ***	-.030 ***	-.011 ***	.158 ***	.126 ***	.131 ***	.896 ***	.875 ***	1.00								
11#2	.021 ***	.097 ***	.098 ***	.116 ***	.112 ***	.098 ***	.280 ***	.212 ***	.215 ***	-.012 ***	.008 ***	.022 ***	.372 ***	.390 ***	.382 ***	.210 ***	.207 ***	.251 ***	1.00							
12#2	.034 ***	.081 ***	.074 ***	.147 ***	.147 ***	.118 ***	.143 ***	.257 ***	.200 ***	-.010 ***	.022 ***	.021 ***	.411 ***	.300 ***	.312 ***	.247 ***	.270 ***	.270 ***	.784 ***	1.00						
13#2	.114 ***	.075 ***	.128 ***	.138 ***	.138 ***	.137 ***	.140 ***	.175 ***	.281 ***	-.011 ***	-.071 ***	-.004 ***	.390 ***	.412 ***	.393 ***	.246 ***	.261 ***	.261 ***	.772 ***	.784 ***	1.00					
14#2	.005 ***	.002 ***	.008 ***	.071 ***	.081 ***	.081 ***	.054 ***	.018 ***	.038 ***	.521 ***	.386 ***	.384 ***	.098 ***	.040 ***	.052 ***	.181 ***	.141 ***	.113 ***	.161 ***	.137 ***	.151 ***	1.00				
15#2	-.041 ***	.009 ***	-.012 ***	.040 ***	.051 ***	.031 ***	.031 ***	.032 ***	.004 ***	.328 ***	.524 ***	.411 ***	.071 ***	.074 ***	.038 ***	.114 ***	.151 ***	.112 ***	.121 ***	.168 ***	.121 ***	.168 ***	.706 ***	1.00		
16#2	.004 ***	.019 ***	.026 ***	.034 ***	.011 ***	.041 ***	.041 ***	.091 ***	.054 ***	.394 ***	.394 ***	.533 ***	.125 ***	.122 ***	.081 ***	.091 ***	.112 ***	.132 ***	.191 ***	.191 ***	.114 ***	.114 ***	.704 ***	.770 ***	1.00	

Note:
 In Campbell and Fiske's (1959) terms:
 • The 8 (eight) "triangles" under the diagonal highlight *monotrait-monomethod* correlations, that is, correlations between the same scale items, which are measured using the same method (in this study: belonging to the same product type).
 • The 4 (four) "boxes" highlight *monotrait-heteromethod* correlations, that is, correlations between the same scale items which are measured using different method (in this study: belonging to different product sets). These four boxes are also called the validity diagonal.
 • The correlations within blocks on either side of the validity diagonal highlight *heterotrait-monomethod* correlations.
 • **** = the correlations are significant at $p < 0.001$; ** = the correlations are significant at $p < 0.05$; * = the correlations are significant at $p < 0.1$.

<Figure 5> Imagination Scale's Construct Validity Testing: Imagination Types and Tendency to Imagine



(Table 5) Covariances Between Imagination Types and Product Symbolism

Pairs of Variables	Covariances
Benefit-anticipatory Imagination ↔ Product Symbolism	0.343***
Emotional-bonding Imagination ↔ Product Symbolism	0.482***
Symbolic Imagination ↔ Product Symbolism	0.805***
Mind-wandering Imagination ↔ Product Symbolism	0.250***

Note: *** = the covariance is significant at the 0.01 level


Swanson (1978) identified several individual characteristics, such as family background, that may account for their differences in “tendency to imagine.” A tendency to imagine is characterized by “openness to experience” -- that is, an eagerness to get beyond the world of logic and reason. This makes some individuals more inclined or prone to imaginative experience. Therefore, individuals with higher tendency to imagine are more responsive to situational factors that stimulate imagination. Thus, there is

a positive relation between tendency to imagine and imagination elicitation. Measurement of tendency to imagine adopts Swanson’s (1978) absorbing experience scale (see Table 6). A model constructed to assess the relationships between tendency to imagine and the four types of imagination was found to fit the data well with GFI = 0.983, NFI = 0.985, chi-square value = 160.819 (df = 109), $p < 0.05$ (see Figure 6). The model also showed that tendency to imagine correlates positively with the

<Table 6> Tendency to Imagine Scale

1. When watching a movie, I often feel carried off into it as if I were a part of the movie.
 2. I have the experience of telling a story with elaborations to make it sound better, and make the elaborations seem as real to me as the actual incidents.
 3. I have some flair of acting as I were someone else - a character in a story or a person I've seen or heard before.
 4. I like to try out new roles, play new parts, and really get into a different way of seeing and behaving.
 5. I often recollect past experience in my life with such a clarity and vitality that it is almost like living it again.
 6. I often focus at something so hard that I go into a kind of a state of extraordinary calm.
- (Subjects responded to such statements by circling the numbers of 1 (disagree) to 7 (agree).)

<Figure 6> Imagination Scale's Construct Validity Testing: Imagination Types and Product Symbolism



<Table 7> Covariances Between Imagination Types and Tendency to Imagine

Pairs of Variables	Covariances
Benefit-anticipatory Imagination ↔ Tendency to Imagine	0.089***
Emotional-bonding Imagination ↔ Tendency to Imagine	0.171***
Symbolic Imagination ↔ Tendency to Imagine	0.182***
Mind-wandering Imagination ↔ Tendency to Imagine	0.160***

Note: *** = the covariance is significant at the 0,01 level

four imagination types (see Table 7). This supports the contention that individual traits do

account for differences in imagination elicitation (Swanson, 1978).

IV. Conclusion And Implications For Further Research

Results of this study suggest that there appears to be four types of imagination (see Table 8 for the Final Scale). Benefit-anticipatory, emotional-bonding, symbolic, and mind-wandering imaginations are present as responses to a variety of ads depicting various products. The Multitrait-multimethod procedure demonstrated that such a categorization of imagination qualifies as more than tentative in which there

was no systematic bias caused by different product types.

The potential study includes examining differential imagination elicitation in response to hedonic-utilitarian stimuli. The scale development procedure established a positive relationship between four types of imagination and product symbolism. This implies imagination's role in creating product symbolism. Product symbolism pertains to meaning construction, which goes beyond a product's objective performance. What is "seen" in a product depends on meanings attached to the product which oftentimes

<Table 8> The Advertisement-Evoked Imagination Scale (Final Version)

Imagination Type	Scale Items
Benefit-anticipatory Imagination	<p>The ad induces me to imagine how I would think about myself if I were using the product.</p> <p>Looking at the ad, I can imagine how the product can fit my lifestyle.</p> <p>The ad makes me imagine the things I can achieve if I use the product.</p>
Emotional-bonding Imagination	<p>The ad reminds me of any experience or feelings I've had in my own life.</p> <p>I think the ad somehow inspires me to try out alternative ways to express myself with the product.</p> <p>It is hard to give specific reason but I think the product is for me.</p>
Symbolic Imagination	<p>I feel the ad conveys that the product has benefits other than those I usually think of.</p> <p>The ad suggests that the product symbolizes alternative ways of seeing and behaving.</p> <p>The ad induces me to think that there is an underlying value of the product which cannot be judged based only on its functional benefits.</p>
Mind-wandering Imagination	<p>When I look at the ad, I can dissociate myself and think of the meanings of the products other than those stated in the ad.</p> <p>The ad does not seem to be speaking directly to me.</p> <p>When I look at the ad, thoughts unrelated to the product can easily creep in.</p>

are not reflected by its objective performance (Belk, Ger, and Askegaard, 1997; Hogg and Michell, 1997; Hyatt, 1992; and Wright, Clairborne, and Sirgy, 1992). This implies another potential study of the distinctiveness of the nature of imaginative experience versus imagery. Imagery is a widely studied construct in psychology and marketing as a subjective experience where one creates a “picture-in-the-head” as a reproduction of stimuli (Alesandrini and Sheikh, 1983; MacInnis and Price, 1987). Imagination differs from imagery because the way it “treats” stimulus objects brings about a different nature of experience. That is, while imagery replicates objective stimuli, imagination transcends and/or constructs new perceptions of stimuli (Murray, 1987).

Further nomological testing as well as application studies can be undertaken by examining various ad execution strategies and their comparative effectiveness in eliciting imagination. The potential ad execution strategies to be studied are the abstract versus concrete, transformational versus informational, conclusion versus non-conclusion, and expected versus unexpected ads.

Refinements, replications, and extensions of these studies but with new stimuli, subject variables, and/or new methods would be interesting and insightful. The present study grasped one facet of imagination. Therefore, most of the “who, what, where, how, and how much” of imagination still remain to be further researched. Several future possibilities for refining, replicating and extending current research can be ad-

vanced by identifying and proposing other situational factors (that is, various marketing stimuli) under which imagination is elicited, the antecedents to imagination and use of other research methods.

⟨Received February 16, 2015⟩

⟨Revised July 24, 2015⟩

⟨Accepted July 29, 2015⟩

References

- Abraham, Magid M. and Leonard M. Lodish. 1990. Getting the Most Out of Advertising and Promotions. *Harvard Business Review*, 3 (May/June), 50-63.
- Alesandrini, Kathryn Lutz and Anees A. Sheikh. 1983. Research on Imagery: Applications for Advertising (in: Anees A. Sheikh - Ed, *Imagery: Current Theory, Research, and Application*, New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Belk, Russel W. 1988. Possessions and the Extended Self. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15 (September), 139-168.
- Belk, Russel W., Güliz Ger, and Sren Askegaard. 1997. Consumer Desire in Three Cultures: Results from Projective Research. (in: Merrie Brucks and Deborah MacInnis-Eds, *Advances in Consumer Research*), Vol. 24, Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.

- Bentler, P. M and Bonnet, Douglas G. 1980. Significance Tests and Goodness of Fit in the Analysis of Covariance Structures. *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 88, No. 3, pp. 588-606.
- Campbell, D. T. and D. W. Fiske. 1959. Convergent and Discriminant Validation by the Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix, *Psychological Bulletin*, 56, 81-105.
- Edell, Julie A. and Marian Chapman Burke. 1987. The Power of Feelings in Understanding Advertising Effects. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 14 (December), 421-433.
- Giorgi, A. P., and P. F. Colaizzi. 1966. Completion of Simple Forms as a Function of Varied Degrees of Incomplete Presentation. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 23, 1303-1309.
- Hirschman, Elizabeth C and Morris B. Holbrook. 1982. Hedonic Consumption: Emerging Concepts, Methods and Propositions. *Journal of Marketing*, 46 (Summer), 92-101.
- Hogg, Margaret K. and Paul C. N. Michell. 1997. Constellations, Configurations and Consumption: Exploring Patterns of Consumer Behaviour Amongst U.K. Shoppers. (in: Merrie Brucks and Deborah MacInnis-Eds, *Advances in Consumer Research*), Vol. 24, Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 551-558.
- Holbrook, Morris B. and Elizabeth C. Hirschman. 1982. The Experiential Aspects of Consumption: Consumer Fantasies, Feelings, and Fun. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9 (September), 132-40.
- Hyatt, Eva M. 1992. Consumer Stereotyping: The Cognitive Bases of the Social Symbolism of Products. (in: John F. Sherry, Jr and Brian Sternthal-Eds, *Advances in Consumer Research*), Vol.19, Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 299-303.
- Jager, Bernd. 1987. Imagination and Inhabitation: From Nietzsche via Heidegger to Freud. (in: Edward L. Murray-Ed, *Imagination and Phenomenological Psychology*), Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.
- Lindaeur, Martin. 1983. Imagery and the Arts (in: Anees A. Sheikh-Ed., *Imagery: Current Theory, Research, and Application*), New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- MacInnis, Deborah J. and Bernard J. Jaworski. 1989. Information Processing from Advertisements: Toward an Integrative Framework. *Journal of Marketing*, 53 (October), 1-23.
- Maruyama, Geoffrey M. 1997. *Basics of Structural Equation Modeling*, London: Sage Publication.
- Murray, Edward L. 1987. Imagination Theory and Phenomenological Thought (in: Edward L. Murray-Ed., *Imagination and Phenomenological Psychology*), Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.
- Phillips, Lynn W. 1981. Assessing Measurement Error in Key Informant Reports: A Methodological Note on Organizational Analysis in Marketing. *Journal of Marketing Re-*

- search, 18, 395-415.
- Puto, Christopher P. and William D. Wells. 1984. Informational and Transformational Advertising: The Differential Effects of Time. (in: Thomas C. Kinnear-Ed, *Advances in Consumer Research*), Vol. 11, Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 638-643.
- Sarbin, R. and J. Juhasz. 1970. Towards a Theory of Imagination. *Journal of Personality*, 38, 52-76.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. 1940/1972. *The Psychology of Imagination*, London: Methuen & Co. Ltd.
- Singer, Jerome L. 1975. *The Inner World of Daydreaming*, New York: Harper and Row Publishers.
- _____, 1981-82. Towards the Scientific Study of Imagination. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*, Vol. 1 (1), 5-27.
- Sutherland, Margaret B. 1971. *Everyday Imagining and Education*, London: Routledge.
- Swanson, Guy E. 1978. Travels through Inner Space: Family Structures and Openness to Absorbing Experiences. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83 (4), 890-919.
- Swanson, Guy E. 1978. Travels through Inner Space: Family Structures and Openness to Absorbing Experiences. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83 (4), 890-919.
- Unger, Lynette S. and Jerome B. Kernan. 1983. On the Meaning of Leisure: An Investigation of Some Determinants of the Subjective Experience. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9 (March), 381- 392.
- Valkenburg, Patti M. and Tom H. A. van der Voort. 1994. Influence of TV on Daydreaming and Creative Imagination: A Review of Research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 116 (2), 316-339.
- Warnock, May. 1976. *Imagination*, London: Faber and Faber.
- Weisskopf, Edith A. 1950. A Transcendence Index As A Proposed Measure in The TAT. *Journal of Psychology*, 29, 379-390.
- White, Alan R. 1990. *The Language of Imagination*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Wright, Newell D., C. B. Clairbone, and M. Joseph Sirgy. 1992. The Effects of Product Symbolism on Consumer Self-Concept. (in: John F. Sherry, Jr and Brian Sternthal-Eds, *Advances in Consumer Research*), Vol. 19, Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 311-318.