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ABSTRACT
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Celebrity endorsers are featured in 10 to 20 percent of commercials in the United States (Agrawal and Kamakura, 1995). While firms have invested significant capital in celebrity endorsers, they traditionally shy away from those who have been involved in illegal or immoral acts (Briggs, 2009; Creswell, 2008). However, the rules of endorser selection appear to be changing. Recently, a new type of endorser whose celebrity is built in part upon criminal activity or violent history has emerged. These celebrities, often rappers, successfully endorse major brands such as Vitamin Water and Chrysler. They are frequently described as having another form of credibility—street credibility (Spiegler, 1996). Patrick (2005) suggests that the street credible celebrities will replace athletes as the most important product endorsers. Therefore, it is important to determine the nature
of street credibility, who has it, and how is it gained. As well, we need to understand how diverse consumer groups relate to these endorsers.

The first essay of this dissertation develops a definition for the construct of street credibility, outlines its antecedents, and investigates its attraction to different consumer groups. To do so, existing ethnographic, anthropological and sociological studies regarding street culture (i.e. Bourgois, 2003; LeBlanc, 2003) are consulted. A modified form of grounded theory using “extant theory and ethnographic studies” is employed to build a foundation for this emerging construct (Burton, Cherlin, Winn, Estacion, and Holder-Taylor, 2009). Next, theoretical sampling (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) is used to select interview respondents in two U.S. communities. The first community represented inner-city consumers and the second represented consumers outside the inner city. The results from this study indicate that street credibility is based on one’s ability to thrive within the streets’ culture of terror with street smarts and the creation of a tough persona. This form of credibility is increased as one gains financial, physical, and sexual power within street culture’s context. This study suggests that the inner-city consumers’ affinity toward the street credible celebrity is rooted in their similarity to the endorser while non-inner city consumers’ affinity is based on the celebrities' ability to evoke fantasy. A second set of in-depth interviews with respondents who were inner-city minorities, inner-city non-minorities, non-inner city minorities, and non-inner city non-minorities were conducted. The purpose of this study was to buttress the findings from the earlier studies, further delineate how diverse populations view street credibility, and to gain insight as to which products and brands are best represented by these endorsers. The findings here were in line with the previous interviews and also indicated that non-inner city minorities
are attracted to these endorsers based on their shared histories as minorities. Additionally, in terms of product match, street credible celebrities were reported as being able to endorse non profits as well as low priced “street” themed or high price-premium products, but not those products that are mid-tier. This is due to these endorsers associations with origins of poverty and their consumption of high end products as a symbol of their success.

The second essay of this dissertation provides a review of literature on endorser credibility, endorsers as reference group members and source persuasion. This essay then provides evidence that consumer affinity for the street credible endorser, in spite of his or her association with negative information, is inconsistent with the “traditional” models of credibility and endorser effectiveness. Building on McCracken’s (1989) Meaning Transfer Model, this essay posits that consumer affinity for the street credible endorser is based on the endorser’s meanings and uses. This is further delineated in a proposed model of “Relationship, Feelings and Fantasy and Experiential Consumption Model.” This model posits that consumer affinity for street credible endorsers is based on the endorser's ability to provide the consumer escape from the stress of daily life through transformational fantasy. Here, street credible endorser’s association with certain scandals authenticates their street credibility and in doing so adds to the fantasy these celebrities evoke. This model resolves the anomaly of affinity for endorsers tied to negative information. Moreover, this model answers Amos, Holmes, and Strutton’s (2008) call for research that provides insight into attraction to celebrities who are bankable endorsers despite their negative actions.
The purpose of the third essay of this dissertation is to provide further understanding the role that fantasy plays in consumers' affinity for street credible endorsers. This is explored through the Relationships, Feelings, and Fantasy and Experiential Consumption Model as outlined in Essay 2. More specifically, this essay explores the relationship that consumers’ similarity to the endorser plays in street credible and traditionally credible endorsers' ability to evoke transportation and identity fantasy.

As scale measures for neither the construct of street credibility nor that of fantasy, type has yet to be developed, a series of studies using Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor Analysis are first conducted. These studies yield two separate reliable and valid scales, one for each construct. Further, to test the validity of using existing brand personality scales to measure celebrities, as human brands, additional Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor Analysis are conduct, which indicates that the brand personality scale (Aaker 1987) can be used to accurately measures celebrity brand personalities. Next, the basic assumptions of the Relationships, Feelings, and Fantasy and Experiential Consumption Model are tested. The relationships between celebrity type and fantasy generation are explored using MANOVA. Results from these studies indicate that street credibility and cool are different constructs. In addition, an analysis of the data suggests that street credible endorsers are less cool and hold brand personalities that are less sincere and exciting than traditional endorsers. However, street credible endorsers are more able to evoke transportation fantasies and less able to evoke identification fantasies than their traditional counterparts. We find that each endorser group's ability to evoke fantasy is mediated by the consumer similarity to the endorser. In agreement with the model, these
findings suggest that the exotic nature of street credible endorsers do indeed contribute to his or her ability to evoke transportation fantasies.
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CHAPTER 1:

STREET CREDIBILITY: CONSTRUCT DEFINITION, ANTECEDENTS, AND RESULTS

1.1 Introduction

Celebrity endorsements are currently featured in an estimated 10 to 20% of the televised commercials in the United States (Agrawal and Kamakura 1995; Creswell 2008; Elberse and Verleun 2012). Furthermore, it is estimated that marketers spend over $50 billion annually on endorsements and sponsorships that feature celebrities (Crutchfield 2010). Within this field, the celebrity endorsers who are termed as “street credible” are projected to replace athletes as the most important endorsement group (McCarthy 2005a; McCarthy 2005b). However, little is known about what provides these endorsers with their street credibility or how consumers relate to these endorsers. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to empirically define the construct of the term “street credibility,” to identify its antecedents, and to explore the effect of street credible endorsers on different populations. To this end, we conduct three studies. In Study 1, we apply the grounded theory analysis used in anthropological and sociological ethnographic works to gain an understanding of street culture. In Study 2, we use our findings from Study 1 to build an interview guide, which we then use to interview members of both the inner-city and the non-inner city populations. From these findings, we construct a definition of street credibility and explain the attraction of the street credible endorser for each population. In Study 3, we use photo elicitation techniques with students from different racial and socioeconomic backgrounds to gain further insights into how people...
relate to the street credible endorser and what products they feel are most appropriate for these celebrities to endorse.

1.1.1 The Paradox of the New Endorsers

For close to a century, celebrity product endorsements have been a ubiquitous marketing strategy in Western societies. From the 1930s and Jack Benny’s radio greeting, "Jell-O, everybody, this is Jack Benny" (O'Neill 1991) to the 1990s and Michael Jordan’s ads promoting the Nike Air Jordan brand (Rovell 2009), marketers have continuously sought highly visible endorsers whose credibility translates into consumer purchases (McCracken 1989; Ohanian 1990). Celebrity endorsers are featured in an estimated 10 to 20 percent of the commercials televised in the United States (Agrawal and Kamakura 1995; Creswell 2008; Elberse and Verleun 2012). Crutchfield (2010) estimates that over 50 billion marketing dollars are spent annually on endorsements and sponsorships featuring celebrities.

Previous research has suggested that while marketing firms have invested significant capital in celebrity endorsers, they typically shy away from using endorsers who have a history of involvement in illegal or immoral acts (Amos, Holmes, and Strutton 2008; Briggs 2009; Creswell 2008). Moreover, if a celebrity endorser’s criminal or moral history changes while under contract, marketing firms often quickly dismiss them. For example, Tiger Woods lost an estimated $20 million in endorsement revenue after being removed from Accenture, AT&T, TAG Heuer, Gatorade, and Gillette’s commercial platforms as a result of his extra-marital affairs (Goldstick 2010). Similarly, supermodel Kate Moss lost endorsement deals with Chanel, H&M, and Burberry after being photographed sniffing cocaine (Silverman 2005).
However, the rules of endorser selection based on criminal and moral behavior appear to be changing. In recent years, several firms have sought product endorsements from celebrities who are well known for having a history of crime and violence. Celebrities with well-documented histories of drug dealing and other street crimes, such as 50 Cent, Jay-Z, and Eminem, have been awarded lucrative endorsement contracts from Vitamin Water, Reebok, and Chrysler, respectively (Howard 2007; Kaufman 2003; Stanley 2011). However, the existing endorsement literature offers little insight into why consumers and marketing practitioners are attracted to endorsers who do not fit the traditional “squeaky clean” characterization of endorser credibility.

These nontraditional endorsers, who are often rappers or hip-hop artists, have often been described as having another form of credibility—street credibility (Spiegler 1996). Patrick (2005) suggests that these nontraditional celebrities will soon replace sports figures as the most important segment of product endorsers. Spiegler (1996) agrees, noting that rap stars provide a “street credibility that many sports stars lack.” Moreover, Devaney (2004) reports that “Street credible hip hop artists influence what people wear, drink, and even drive.” Surprisingly, the marketing literature has devoted little attention to the construct of street credibility and its relationship to the traditional models of endorser credibility.
1.1.2 Research Questions

While prior lines of research on celebrity endorsers and source persuasion have identified measures of endorser credibility, they neglect to explain the popularity of the street credible endorsers whose criminal behavior contradicts the prior research’s definitions of trustworthiness, attractiveness, or expertise—the traditional criteria for credibility. This contradiction in practice and theory raises the following questions: What is street credibility? Why are street credible endorsers attractive to consumers? Who exemplifies street credibility? How is street credibility acquired? Will these findings be consistent across different populations?

The purpose of this paper is to identify the parameters of street credibility and to discuss its relationship to endorser credibility. The specific goals of this paper are to define the emergent construct of street credibility, delineate its antecedents and domains by providing exemplars, empirically assess the level of attraction of street credible endorsers for diverse teen and young adult consumer groups and gain insight into which products these celebrities are the most effective at endorsing. Through our efforts, we hope to expand the research and theory on credibility by introducing a new construct that both incorporates and challenges the boundaries of the prevailing research.

We present our research in line with Kohli and Jaworski’s (1990) work on emerging constructs. We begin with a review of the literature on celebrity endorsers’ credibility and integrate insights from research in anthropology and sociology that are relevant to the construct of street credibility. Specifically, we consulted existing anthropological and sociological ethnographies on topics such as “street respect” to determine whether they could inform our understanding of the latent dimensions of street
credibility. Next, we report findings from a series of empirical studies designed to explore the construct of street credibility. The studies include (1) exploratory qualitative field interviews with inner-city teens to identify the definitions and meanings that they attach to street credibility; and (2) a second set of field interviews with a group of non-inner city teens to determine if the findings from the initial study were consistent across populations. Drawing on this data, we construct propositions to explain why consumers across different demographic backgrounds are attracted to street credible endorsers and the relevance of our research within the stream endorsement literature. We then conduct a study using photo elicitation to gain further insight into how different populations relate to street credibility and what products are best represented by the street credible endorser. We conclude with a discussion of the implications of this work for future research.

1.2 A Summary of the Traditional Literature on Endorser Persuasiveness and Source Credibility

1.2.1. Trustworthiness and Expertise

Some of the earliest scholarly work in the study of endorsement credibility focuses on the moderators of source effectiveness with an audience. Seminal studies by Hovland and Weiss (1951) find that the effect of communication on attitude formation is moderated by the trustworthiness of the sources. These studies conclude that the amount of information one learned is the same whether it is communicated by a highly or a minimally trustworthy source. However, the subjects’ initial attitude about the topic changed to agree with the source’s attitude, and when the source was highly credible, this change in agreement was much stronger. Subsequent works by Hovland, Janis, and
Kelley (1953) expand on these findings and conclude that attractiveness, expertise, and likeability are additional determinants of source credibility. In agreement, Aaker and Myers (1987) find that an endorser’s expertise is strongly correlated to his or her persuasiveness.

1.2.2 Attractiveness

Building on the foundation established by Hovland and Weiss (1951) and Hovland et al. (1953), several scholars have researched the effect of endorser attractiveness. Baker and Churchill (1977) focus on the effect of physically attractive models on consumers’ ratings of advertisements. They find that the use of attractive models increases the consumers’ affective ratings of both romantic (perfume) and nonromantic (coffee) products. In addition, Patzer (1983) finds that when the attributes of trust, likeability, and expertise are held constant, endorser credibility is moderated by physical attractiveness. McGuire (1985) also expounds on the characteristic of attractiveness in his Source Attractiveness Model, which states that consumers are more likely to hold positive opinions of attractive people than unattractive people.

1.2.3 Likeability

Among the determinants of source credibility, likeability has been characterized in recent research as a measure of trustworthiness or attractiveness. Friedman and Friedman (1979) propose that likeability is the most important antecedent of trust. In addition, McGuire (1985) posits that attractiveness takes on larger connotations than just physical appearance and includes source likeability, the consumers’ similarity to the
source, and the consumers’ familiarity with the source. Further attempts to create scale measures for endorser credibility have included likeability in the measurement of trustworthiness and attractiveness (Ohanian 1990).

1.2.4 The Match-Up Hypothesis

The Match-Up Hypothesis (Kamins 1990; Kamins and Gupta 1994; Till and Busler 1998; Till and Busler 2000) suggests that endorsers will be more persuasive when they endorse products that are related to their level of attractiveness or expertise. Erdogan and Drollinger (2008) suggest that the use of expert endorsers creates persuasive arguments by increasing the consumer’s perception of the endorsed product’s quality. These works are all grounded in the argument that the actual level of expertise is not as important as the perceived level of expertise (Hovland et al. 1953).

1.2.5 Combining the Elements of Credibility

Drawing on the previous literature, Ohanian (1990) created a scale for endorser credibility that included measures for trustworthiness, attractiveness, and expertise. In his research, he defines trustworthiness as the consumers’ acceptance of and confidence in the endorser. Trustworthiness is measured as a composite of scores for the terms “dependable, reliable, honest, sincere, and trustworthy” (Ohanian 1990). Intuitively, attractiveness suggests “physical beauty” as an important heuristic in the judgment of another person (Ohanian 1990). The terms “attractive, classy, handsome/beautiful, and elegant” are used to measure this dimension in Ohanian’s scale. Ohanian describes expertise as the measure of the endorser’s education or work in the appropriate field.
Here, the perceived expertise has a positive impact on attitude change and behavioral intent (Ohanian 1990). To this end, “expert, experienced, knowledgeable, qualified, and skilled” are common terms used to measure the dimension of expertise (Ohanian 1990).

1.2.6 The Effects of Negative Information

While trustworthiness, expertise, and attractiveness lead to credibility, this credibility is diminished when the celebrity endorser is associated with negative information. Negative information includes the celebrity’s association with criminal, immoral, or unethical acts. Amos, Holmes, and Strutton (2008) conducted a meta-analysis of 32 essays on endorser effectiveness. This work suggests that negative information has the strongest source effect related to endorser credibility, followed by trustworthiness, expertise, and attractiveness.

1.2.7 The Paradox of Street Credibility

While this line of research has identified measures of endorser credibility, it neglects to explain the popularity of the street credible endorsers whose criminal behavior contradicts prior research’s definitions of trustworthiness, attractiveness, or expertise—the traditional criteria for credibility. To better understand street credibility, we next explore some related work within several fields of study.
1.3 Literature Review: Street Credibility

Within the literature, street credibility, or “street cred,” does not have a clear or consistent meaning. At times, the use of the term suggests respect or simply credibility (Beavers 2011; Quayle 1997). However, in several instances, the use of the term suggests a more specific meaning. Davey and Harwood (2002), Podoshen (2008), Ward (2008), and Smith and Christou’s (2009) applications suggest that street credibility is different from the traditional notations of credibility. Podoshen (2008) indicates that this form of credibility is disassociated from the pedigree or status inherent in a privileged background. More notably, researchers in the areas of sociology, and criminology use the term “street credibility” in the context of a reputation gained through acts of street crime and adherence to street codes and street culture in poor urban settings (Brunson and Stewart 2006; Grint and Case 1998; Matsueda 2006). While these works suggest some uses of the term, they stop short of providing a concrete definition of street credibility.

1.4 Study 1: A Grounded Theory Analysis of Ethnographic Work Related to Street Credibility

In an effort to look more deeply at the notion of street credibility, we consulted the existing ethnographic anthropological and sociological studies of street culture. In doing so, we adopted a modified version of grounded theory, performing a content analysis of these ethnographies to determine whether the respondents in these studies discussed attributes that might help us to define the parameters of street credibility (Glaser and Strauss 1967; Taylor and Bogdan 1984). Following the works of Burton, Cherlin, Winn, Estacion, and Holder-Taylor (2009) and Charmaz (2006), our approach
was not completely based on inductive grounded theory; rather we used “extant theory and ethnographic studies” to build a foundation for an emerging construct. In particular, we drew upon the works of Anderson (1990), Bourgois (2003), LeBlanc (2003), and Venkatesh (2000; 2006; 2008). This collection of studies includes over 25 years of field research and an analysis of the historical and social-economic backgrounds of poor inner-city communities in East Harlem, the Bronx, South and Central Chicago, and Philadelphia. These works were selected based on their insight into the street culture that exists in these communities and that often produces street credible personas (Brunson and Stewart 2006; Grint and Case 1998). Street culture, as Bourgois (2003) describes it, is the “complex and conflictual world of beliefs, symbols, models of interaction, values, and ideologies that have emerged in opposition to exclusion from mainstream society” (page 8). Our grounded theory analysis of the ethnographic studies resulted in our discovery of five areas of experience that produce respect within street culture: (1) ability to thrive within a culture of terror and the underground economy; (2) acquisition of street smarts; (3) displayed toughness; (4) acquisition of material possessions and sexual conquest; and (5) the ability to achieve “cross-over dreams.” Next, we will examine each of these areas.

1.4.1 Ability to Thrive

The most important source of respect given to characters within the ethnographies is gained by those who thrive within a “culture of terror” through employment in the underground economy. Bourgois (2003) explains that the poor inner-city environment creates a culture of terror and a community that is impacted by widespread crime and violence. Bourgois (2003) further explains that the men from these cultures are
unprepared for entry-level work in the service sector and too proud to accept minimum wage employment. When these men search for the “American Dream” of independence and success through legitimate employment in the mainstream economy, they are left feeling marginalized and humiliated. As a result, they turn to the underground economy in search of income and positions of respect.

This underground economy consists of transactions and employment within the street culture of the urban poor that are unreported and, in several instances, illegal (Venkatesh 2006; Venkatesh 2008). As Bourgois (2003) states, within this culture, employment in the underground economy is a “common sense” alternative to mainstream employment. Anderson (1990) suggests that people living within these communities simply accept crime as a part of everyday life. Crime is seen as a legitimate means to an end, a way to provide for one’s family and, thus, receive the positive attention associated with being the man of the house (LeBlanc 2003). This coupling of crime and manhood begins early because committing petty crime within the culture of terror is a rite of passage for school-aged boys (Bourgois 2003; LeBlanc 2003; Venkatesh 2006).

1.4.2 Acquisition of Street Smarts

Another consequence of growing up within the culture of terror is the acquisition of culture-specific tacit knowledge and skills that are commonly termed as street smarts (Anderson 1990; Bourgois 2003; LeBlanc 2003; Venkatesh 2006; Venkatesh 2008). Anderson (1990) describes street smarts, also known as being “streetwise,” as wisdom that “is gained through a long and sometimes arduous process,” “recognizes that street life involves situations that require selective and individual responses,” and “allows
individuals to become proactive and to some degree authors of public actions.” In agreement, Bourgois (2003) depicts streetwise characters as being the opposite of those that are preyed upon due to an “unawareness” of the norms that are unique to poor urban neighborhoods. Across the studies, we see that street smarts provide a system of identifying and assessing situations within the streets and strategies for the acquisition and protection of possessions (Anderson 1990; Bourgois 2003; LeBlanc 2003; Venkatesh 2006). This knowledge provides a means of projecting the appropriate image (Bourgois 2003; LeBlanc 2003), avoiding arrest (Bourgois 2003; LeBlanc 2003; Venkatesh 2006; Venkatesh 2008), avoiding jail sentences (Bourgois 2003; LeBlanc 2003), and avoiding death (LeBlanc 2003) or victimization (Anderson 1990; Bourgois 2003; LeBlanc 2003; Venkatesh 2006; Venkatesh 2008). Thus, street smarts are essential for survival within the culture of terror.

1.4.3 Toughness

Another way to both project an appropriate image and to protect one’s person and possessions is to be seen as tough (LeBlanc 2003). Being tough is a learned skill that begins with children “acting tough” by showing no fear or forgiveness; these children emulate older males who are admired or respected (LeBlanc 2003). Being tough is fully achieved when an actor takes violent action against offenders (Bourgois 2003; LeBlanc 2003; Venkatesh 2006; Venkatesh 2008). That is, within the street culture, acts of violence are associated with creating a tough persona that provides one with a level of respect, or at least a determinant for being disrespected. This type of reputation provides
security within the culture of terror, especially for those involved in street crimes such as drug dealing (Anderson 1990; Bourgois 2003; LeBlanc 2003; Venkatesh 2008).

1.4.4 Acquisition of Material Possessions and Sexual Conquest

Within the street culture, both men and women admire those with access to material goods and sex (Anderson 1990; Bourgois 2003; LeBlanc 2003; Venkatesh 2006; Venkatesh 2008). Material possessions and sexual conquest are grouped together here because the two usually coexist across the multiple studies. For example, Venkatesh (2008) posits that the respect given to gang leaders is due chiefly to their having “sex, power, and money.” This connection is further evident within Bourgois’ (2003) interview with a drug dealer named Willie as he refers to another drug dealer, Caesar, whom he looked up to and ultimately followed into the world of drug dealing: ‘I was so jealous,…he was a nice dresser because he had money, and he used to have sex and everything.’ While some women within the ethnographic studies wielded sexual power to acquire favor, goods, and security and to exact revenge (LeBlanc 2003; Venkatesh 2000; Venkatesh 2006; Venkatesh 2008), respect for those engaging in sexual encounters was more typically reserved for men who, as Bourgois (2003) put it, competed in “sexual belt-notching.” That is, within the poverty-based culture of terror, the possession of conspicuous goods is a symbol of success, and male heterosexual achievements are a form of “social currency” (LeBlanc 2003).
1.4.5 Cross-Over Dreams

Throughout the ethnographies, we find evidence of street credible characters attempting to successfully reenter the mainstream economy. To achieve this new status, even at the most modest level, is what Bourgois (2003) refers to as “going legit” or achieving “cross-over dreams”: wielding both street credibility within the street and being accepted and deemed credible within the mainstream. Bourgois (2003), LeBlanc (2003), and Venkatesh (2008) depict high-level drug dealers who attempt to use their entrepreneurial skills and street credibility to open legitimate businesses. In these cases, the attempts only resulted in failure. Bourgois (2003) and Venkatesh (2008) attribute the failure to a lack of “cultural capital” or a “cultural understanding” of how to succeed within the two worlds.

In all, these works provide both theoretical grounding and secondary data for our understanding of street credibility and its antecedents. Following the works of Kohli and Jaworski (1990), we next looked for common interpretations from these studies and in our own fieldwork. The next sections will describe our in-field interview procedure.

1.5 Study 2: Field Interviews

We used theoretical sampling (Glaser and Strauss 1967; Taylor and Bogdan 1984) as a guide for selecting our interview respondents. We conducted 34 interviews in two U.S. communities, one inner-city sample, where street credibility originates (Grint and Case 1998; Brunson and Stewart 2006), and a non-inner city sample to represent the broader population where the products endorsed by the street credible endorsers are consumed (Spiegler 1996; Devaney 2004; Patrick 2005).
1.5.1 Sample One: Inner-city Interviews

We initially interviewed 21 college students (11 males and 10 females) who grew up and attended high school in Harlem, N.Y. These students were all African-American, Latino, or first-generation African immigrants. They were enrolled in a diverse mix of two-year and four-year private and public institutions. At the time of the interviews, the students were enrolled in a college skills enrichment workshop that took place over the winter school break. To gain access to the students, the lead author took a position as a business skills instructor at the workshop during the 2009–2010 and the 2010–2011 winter breaks. During the 2009-2010 sessions, the researcher spent time observing students and establishing a rapport with them. Student interviews took place during the 2010-2011 winter sessions. Students who participated in this first set of interviews were compensated for their participation through entry in a lottery to win $50.

The preliminary interview script had only a few questions. However, after the first two interviews, a broader and more flexible set of questions was employed. While the semi-structured interviews were not rigidly scripted, the following seven questions were generally explored: 1) Can you define street credibility? 2) How does one gain street credibility? 3) How does one lose street credibility? 4) Can street credibility be transferred? 5) Why do you think people are attracted to those with street credibility? 6) Who has street credibility? 7) Is having street credibility the same as being cool?

The interviews concluded with an inquiry about the students' ethnicity and where they grew up. In the tradition of semi-structured interviews (Taylor and Bogdan 1984), these questions made up the general format of the interviews. Additional questions and
discussions were explored depending on the respondent’s input. The interviews lasted an average of 23 minutes in length and were recorded using a video recording device.

1.5.2 Sample Two: Non-inner City Interviews

The purpose of the second set of interviews was to build upon our findings by developing an understanding of how mainstream, non-inner city consumers think about street credibility. We interviewed 13 college students (5 males and 8 females) on the campus of a major public university in the northeast. This sample consisted of Caucasian and Asian students who grew up in mid- to small-sized towns in middle class to lower-upper class families. The students were compensated for their participation with extra credit points in their marketing class.

These interviews also followed the semi-structured preliminary interview script that was developed for the first sample. However, after the first interview, an alternative set of questions was developed for the students who either could not define street credibility or could not differentiate it from credibility. This line of questioning was included to determine if these students had another way of identifying street credibility and its antecedents. The set included the following eleven questions: 1) What is your favorite type of music? 2) Who are your favorite artists? 3) Are these artists the same? 4) Can you define street credibility? 5) Do any of the artists you mentioned have street credibility? 6) How does one gain street credibility? 7) How does one lose street credibility? 8) Can street credibility be transferred? 9) Why do you think people are attracted to those with street credibility? 10) Who else has street credibility? 11) Is having street credibility the same as being cool?
As in the sample one interviews, additional questions and discussions were explored depending on each respondent’s input. Some of the students in this sample appeared to be hesitant to discuss poverty and race. To gain better insights into their thoughts on these subjects, we employed a more projective style of interviewing that allowed the student to discuss how their peers felt about the issue at hand. The interviews lasted an average of 31 minutes in length and were recorded using a video recording device. Following the directions of Taylor and Bogdan (1984) for qualitative data analysis, all of the interview recordings were later transcribed and analyzed for re-emerging key terms and themes to apply to our construction of the street credibility construct.

1.5.3 Results and Analysis: Defining the Construct

To define street credibility, we followed the work of Kohli and Jaworski (1990) and Burton et al. (2009) on using data analysis for construct development. In doing so, we drew from the ethnographic studies on street culture and from our fieldwork within the inner-city to identify the antecedents of street credibility. We also reviewed and coded our initial interview data for evidence of how street credibility is lost, exemplars of street credibility, and the source of the attraction to street credible endorsers. We next reviewed the list of street credible exemplars provided by our inner-city interviews to determine if these exemplars’ personal histories were consistent with our findings on the antecedents of street credibility. Our next step was to compare these findings to our second interview sample to determine the constructs’ meaning and interest to a broader
set of consumers. Finally, we synthesized and condensed these findings to produce an empirically grounded definition of street credibility.

Following the work of Kohli and Jaworski (1990) on construct development, we integrated our findings from the ethnographic studies in Study 1 and the two interview samples from Study 2 to create an empirically based definition of this emerging construct. In aggregate, our findings result in the following definition of street credibility.

Street credibility, or “street cred,” is the respect and status given to individuals from poor and dangerous origins who, through experiences unique to their environments, have acquired street smarts. Moreover, these individuals have suffered through unique street life experiences that include crime and violence, and a pursuit of power. Here power is displayed in the form of physical dominance, favor from the opposite sex, and material possessions. Those individuals who are talented enough to gain the highest levels of such power by their own means are endowed with the largest amount of street credibility.

Overall, the construct is masculine. Several of the key variables that compose the construct are identified within the reviewed ethnographies as being part of a “gender-based definition of male adolescents” (Bourgois 2003). In agreement, while our field interviews resulted in a list of dozens of exemplars of street credibility, only three female exemplars were ever named, one of whom was named in a joking manner. Also, within the inner-city interviews, several students listed fathers, brothers, male cousins or male friends as exemplars of those with street credibility. These students’ reference to only male family members leads to our defining street credibility as a masculine trait.
Moreover, the crime, anger, and violence associated with the antecedent of street
toughness are also associated with masculinity within street culture (Bourgois 2003;
LeBlanc 2003; Venkatesh 2008).

We also find that street credibility and the construct of “cool” differ in both their
meanings and their measures. Similar to street credibility, the modern use of “cool” has
roots in urban settings, as it has been traced to the basic concept of the grace that African
Americans showed under pressure during the 1930s (Nancarrow, Nancarrow, and Page
2002). The dominant difference is that street credibility can only be gained via real
experiences. As such, street credibility is reserved for people of a defined origin with
very specific accomplishments. That is, one cannot easily break into the caste system that
has, in effect, created street credibility without falsifying one’s credentials, which, in
turn, illegitimatizes the credibility being sought. “Cool,” however, refers to a state of
being, not of origin. As Belk (2006) explains, “cool” refers to a person who is admired
because she or he exhibits a nonchalant control of emotions, a rebellious trickster
demeanor, or an ironic detachment in his or her regard of others and a cool style of
talking, walking, gesturing, and grooming. In short, our interviews indicated that street
credibility is determined by where one comes from and what one has seen and
understands, while cool reflects a state of being or something that is neat or exciting.
Unlike cool, which fades with time, changes in trends, or over-popularity, street
credibility can only be diminished through the loss or reversal of its antecedents.
1.5.4 Analysis of Inner-city Field Interviews

Our grounded theory analysis of the ethnographies provided insights into five components of street credibility. We utilized these findings while coding the interviews and observations from our inner-city field work. This synthesis resulted in the identification of three primary antecedents of street credibility: “street life,” “power,” and the “width of the gap between street origins and current possessions and power.”

1.5.4.1 Antecedent 1: Street Life

The antecedent of street life refers to an authentic personal history, street smarts, and street toughness. We grouped these three characteristics together because they are interrelated and, in aggregate, are required for even a baseline level of street credibility. Furthermore, the antecedent of street life forms a higher order factor that the other antecedents are built upon. These aspects of street life are recurring themes in both the ethnographic studies on street culture and in our field work within the inner-city.

The authentic personal history of the individual includes origins in the inner-city or other areas that exhibit the culture of terror (Bourgois 2003). The unique life experiences within these cultures of terror are a mandatory ingredient for street credibility. That is, street credibility is exclusively endowed to those who have an authentic history of extensive experiences in dangerous or abusive environments or situations, such as those found in poor inner-city neighborhoods. The respondents from the inner-city interview sample all agreed that street credibility is a form of respect that can only be given to individuals who live in neighborhoods that host the culture of terror. This agreement is reflected in the following interview excerpts:
A.A. (Parents from Senegal and Gambia, Female, Bronx Towers, Bronx, NY)

“Most people who I consider having street credibility are from a rough neighborhood. Yeah, it has to do with where you come from.”

S.U. (Ghanaian-American Male, Harlem, NY)

“I think it’s (street credibility is), like, when you have respect from everybody in the hood. It has to be, like, a ghetto. It has to be like a place where everybody has weapons and all that type of stuff…”

Consistent with the ethnographic studies, being street smart provides further evidence of one’s authentic personal history. As individuals grow up in impoverished neighborhoods, they gain knowledge and an understanding of events that are unique to the culture of terror. Our findings reflected that being street smart is necessary for navigating dangerous situations. These comments are reflected in the inner-city interviews.

Y.A. (Dominican Female, Harlem/Upper West Side, NY)

You just know what’s going on. Like, if you see something fishy, you know what’s going on. Like, oh yeah, they are making a drug transaction. Or… like, on 125th you see people selling, like, fake things, stuff like that. Just knowing it off the bat that, oh yeah, they’re just trying to make a hustle.

Our interviews also highlighted that, while some level of street smarts can be acquired through movies, narratives, or occupancy in larger urban settings, it is ingrained in the individuals who are street credible.

All of the research related to the inner-city identified crime, anger, and violence as characteristics that are embodied by those with street credibility. Crime, anger, and violence exist within the culture of terror found in street life (Anderson 1990; Bourgois 2003; LeBlanc 2003; Venkatesh 2006; Venkatesh 2008). While each term has a separate meaning, we categorized the three terms as one factor, street toughness, because they
tend to be interwoven, one within the other, in both the ethnographies and in our field work. Evidence of street toughness was provided by several of the inner-city interview respondents:

**M.A. (Puerto Rican and African-American Female, Harlem, NY)**

Like, they were born and raised in the hood or what people consider the ghetto or the hood, and you know, they have been through a lot so they have probably once in their lives sold drugs. You know, they’ve held a gun, or they’ve actually killed somebody or been somewhere involved with violence.

**S.U. (Ghanaian-American Male, Harlem, NY)**

“You get respect from like gangsters and stuff. And, I guess, that goes into knowing what gangsters and thugs are. But you have to have respect from those, like, people and you get it by doing, like, crime. Crime pays with street cred.”

Unlike authentic personal history or street smarts, street toughness is not necessary for street credibility, but it appears to be part of the personal histories of those who are endowed with the greatest amounts of street credibility. This connection might be, in part, because the elements of street toughness, crime, anger, and violence are seen as means to achieve levels of power and respect within the context of street culture (Bourgois 2003; LeBlanc 2003; Venkatesh 2008).

**1.5.4.2 Antecedent 2: Power**

In terms of power, our findings address more than the physical acts of crime or violence or the states of anger exemplified by street toughness; rather, they include the respect, fear, or admiration that others have for one’s ability to translate street toughness into a position that yields physical power, financial power, and sexual power. An analysis of our interviews in the inner-city adds additional insight to the importance of
physical, sexual and financial power. Simply put, our respondents indicate that physical power is not only the ability to fight but also the ability to achieve one’s desires by acts of physical force, if necessary. Financial power refers to gains in wealth and the acquisition of material goods, and sexual power refers to the ability to attract members of the opposite sex. All of these forms of power increase one’s reputation and street credibility.

This conclusion is exemplified by the following comments that typified the views of our interview respondents:

Y.A. (Dominican Female, Harlem/Upper West Side, NY)

You know, like, the street cred of how much money you have or how many cars you have or this. I think street cred is based on that…How do you get street cred? It’s like I said. It has to deal with your reputation in the streets, so I'm thinking that it depends on how much money you have and let’s say… I mean, like, in my neighborhood there are a lot of fights. No there is. I mean, like, so if you fought a lot of people, that means you’re stronger than a lot of people. You got street cred because you’re more powerful. You have more strength in terms of fighting wise and then in terms of money, like I said drug dealers.

D.L. (Male, Harlem - 127th St, NY)

Perfect example, he can be a drug dealer, a rapper, someone who does illegal crimes. Not necessarily sells drugs but hustling someone, making non-legit money basically. And he's known for it and he's known throughout the community for it. And uh, a specific person, uh, a perfect example is Rick Ross {How does Rick Ross get his street credibility} Ah, personally I think he does illegal things. We don't need to mention those. He has a lot of power. He has a lot of power because he has a lot of money. With money comes power. In the street, his name is not mentioned among people. There is the code of no snitching and um, that's basically what street credibility is.

C.Y. (Dominican Male, Harlem, NY)

“If I had money, power, respect, however I make that, I would have street cred… For a guy it’s about what you are wearing, do you have all this money, do you get all the girls.”
A.A. (Parents from Senegal and Gambia, born in the U.S., Female, Bronx, NY)

Because of street credibility, it all goes back to street credibility. It's, so this young man, he is only, like 16 or 17 and it breaks my heart because he is so young, and he wants to follow my other, the other friend who has street credibility...because of street credibility. It all goes back to street credibility. It's the fact that the guy has girls; the guy has so many people following him. Everywhere he goes people know him for this, know him for that. It is another way to feel important. It’s feeling important; it’s opening doors for other things. For people who care about street credibility, if all they know is the place we live in, which we call the hood or whatever you want to call it.

1.5.4.3 Antecedent 3: Width of the Gap Between Street Origins and Current Possessions and Power

While the antecedent of “street” represents an individual’s origin and “power” represents his or her current status, our findings indicate that the individuals who have, through their own means, moved from their impoverished origins to higher levels of physical, financial, and sexual power are endowed with greater amounts of street credibility. It is this rare ability to rise from these humble and dangerous origins to a place of power and credibility within the mainstream that result in admiration and respect from the individuals who reside in both worlds. That is, even if one is enriched with street credibility, most cannot maintain what Du Bois (1903) referred to as dual consciousness—in this case, the ability to thrive in both the street and the mainstream culture. This ultimate level of street credibility is typified in our interviews:

Q.Y. (African-American Male, Harlem, NY)

It (street credibility) is respect; you are that middle man between the streets and the professional world if you come from the streets, an urban community. I look at street credibility as you are that middle man if you made it out to be in a whole different setting now...there is a separation now between you and the hood. He or she may have some unfortunate events growing up in this community. He or she is getting street
smarts…and they can carry that into the professional world and if you can make it good there in the professional world where people frown on where you came from, then you have street credibility.

Y.A. (Dominican Female, Harlem/Upper West Side, NY)

I mean, because of the power and like where he (Jay-Z) is at. I mean, obviously he started with (selling) drugs. So he was getting respect from that and he went on and took it to the next level and he got credibility from the power and the respect; the money he has, the cars, and the materialistic things.

1.5.4.4 How Street Credibility is Lost

The diminishment of one’s street credibility will occur when it is publicly known that the street credible person has undergone a significant decrease or reversal in the antecedents of the construct (see Table 1.1). In terms of authentic personal history, street credibility is lost if one’s claims of personal history or acts of crime, anger, or violence are proven to be false. The early 90s rapper Vanilla Ice, who lost street credibility when it was discovered his claims of inner-city origins were false, was mentioned as an exemplar of this by several respondents. In addition if the person denies or is deemed as rejecting his authentic street origin he or she will lose their street credibility. Evidence of this phenomenon came from the students in Harlem, who felt that the exemplars from their area lose street cred when they “don’t come around much anymore” as opposed to those who “you always see around here” and who are considered to be “still in the streets.” The following statements reflect this sentiment.
Q.N. (African-American Male from Harlem, NY)

Yes, you can lose street credibility like Jay-Z he was losing street credibility. Why? Because he has all this money but locals are not seeing him in his own community. He raps about his hood, he says I’m from here, I used to do this over here, whatever. But now that he made it out he’s nowhere near. You can lose street credibility like that.

The opposite of street smarts is to commit acts that are, as several respondents reported, “stupid.” Our interviews indicate that these acts include being caught committing a criminal act. While the disdain felt for those who get caught appears to be in contradiction with street culture and the underground economy where some crimes are acceptable, the line between street smarts and being “stupid” is clear. As stated earlier, to be street smart is to know what is going on to protect or improve one’s position. This ability would include effectively both dealing in crime and stopping when such involvement cannot be maintained but rather jeopardizes the level of power that has been achieved. NFL super star Michael Vick was cited in our interviews as an example of a street credible figure who lost his credibility from “being stupid” because he jeopardized his multimillion dollar NFL contract along with his Coke and Nike endorsements due to his involvement in an illegal dog fighting ring. The counter to having street toughness was “snitching” or “punking out.” Snitching refers to reporting the perpetrators of criminal activity to the police (LeBlanc 2003; Venkatesh 2006). “Punking out” refers to an individual not fighting back when confronted by anger or violence (Bourgois 2003). In terms of financial, physical, or sexual power, both the ethnographic works and our interviews indicate that a decrease in wealth, being physically overpowered, and participating in male homosexual activities are considered to be detriments to street credibility.
1.5.4.5 Inner-city Consumers’ Exemplars of Street Credibility

To gain a better understanding of street credibility’s definition, appeal, and exemplars, the interview respondents provided exemplars of people who were street credible, cool, both street credible and cool, street credible but not cool and, finally, cool but not street credible. The following celebrities were most often cited; 50 Cent as street credible, Jay-Z and Eminem as street credible and cool, Suge Knight as street credible but not cool, and Usher as cool but not street credible. Sports figures were also often depicted as street credible but with much less frequency than rappers. While sports figures and other celebrities were proposed as street credible individuals, rappers were most often cited as exemplars. The rappers’ over-representation as exemplars of street credibility does not mean that all rappers are street credible. On the contrary, several rappers were listed only as “cool” because they lacked the antecedents of street credibility. Moreover, a rapper’s street credibility can be much more salient than that of other celebrities because the narratives that rappers express through their lyrics provide examples of their street life, power, and the gap between the two. An overview of the life histories of the exemplars most mentioned by the inner-city students indicates that the street credible figures have the antecedents associated with street credibility while those figures described only as cool did not (see Table 1.2).

1.5.4.6 How Inner-city Consumers Relate to Street Credible Endorsers

We find that the inner-city consumer is attracted to the street credible endorser based on their shared experiences within the culture of terror and their shared goal to
escape this culture. That is, these consumers feel that this type of endorser represents and understands their current socioeconomic status and unique life experiences as well as their aspirations. Moreover, these consumers view the street credible endorser’s ability to bridge the gap between the street and mainstream culture as a unique skill that places these endorsers in a position of cultural leadership. These findings are expressed within our interviews:

D.L. (African and Hispanic-American Male, Harlem, NY)

This is what kids want. Kids want this lifestyle. They want to have the money to have the jewelry, have the girls chasing them. And um, males especially because a lot of us grow up without any father figures so we chase, we chase what we look like. We chase what, what we think a father should look like. And that is the guy who is selling drugs, pants sagging, not going to school, selling drugs or what have you. So now this whole community is chasing one dream of being a rap drug dealer.

R.L. (African-American Male, Harlem, NY)

Basically, I think people from the streets like them more because that is what they’re living and that’s what, so when they hear that music they just embrace it more because it’s, like, oh he really knows what we’re going through. He, he’s rapping for people like us.

C.Y. (Dominican Male, Harlem, NY)

“Anybody. I could call myself a rapper right now. I’m not going to get any street cred with that, but, am I talented enough and can I do something with that talent to make it big?”

T.Y. (African-American Female from Harlem, NY)

Well, like ‘em, I know that for my school they were, like, telling us to vote and then they did a block party and Jay-Z came and then everybody was like, oh yeah, I’m definitely voting now. Jay-Z is here telling you to (laughter)...even though that shouldn’t be the reason why.

All of the students in the inner-city interview sample (n=21) were able to provide definitions and exemplars of street credibility. These findings paralleled the results from our grounded theory analysis of the ethnographic work on inner-city street culture. The
consistency of the findings within both the ethnographies and the interviews, which together span over 30 years, suggests the reliability and validity of our findings. To gain a further understanding of street credibility’s meaning and attraction to a broader population, a set of interviews was next held with non-inner city respondents.

1.5.5 Analysis of the Non-inner City Field Interviews

The majority of the non-inner city students (3 males, 4 females) defined street credibility in a manner that was consistent with the students from sample one (inner-city) and the ethnographic studies. The remaining non-inner city respondents (2 males, 2 females) defined the term as “credibility” or (1 female) could not define the term at all. To determine if these five students might have an understanding of street credibility but refer to it by another term, these students were asked the alternative interview questions. This line of questioning resulted in these students listing several of the same celebrities listed by others within the non-inner city sample or listed by the inner-city interview sample. These students described only hip hop or rap celebrities from the inner-city as being “hard core,” “gangster,” or more “about sex, money, and drugs.” Thus, while the non-inner city students’ definition of street credibility was different, these students separated the street credible celebrity exemplars from other celebrities based on descriptors that were consistent with the larger group’s definition and with the findings from the ethnographic studies. This consistency suggests that although the construct of street credibility exists, the term “street credibility” is not as salient with the non-inner city youths and that the strengths of the term becomes diluted in populations that are
further removed from the inner-city. This dilution through distance is further exemplified in the list of exemplars given by both population samples.

While street credible celebrities were cited by both samples, only the students from the inner-city sample named infamous criminals, such as Tookie Williams, the co-founder of the notorious Crips gang, and Frank Lucas, the organized crime boss whose life story is depicted in the film “American Gangster,” as being street credible exemplars. In addition, only the students from the inner-city sample often included their fathers, brothers, and male cousins as street credible exemplars. The inability of the non-inner city sample to produce any examples of street credible entities outside of entertainment is indicative of their distance from the street culture that produces street credibility. To gain further insight on this population’s interpretation of street credibility, we coded the interview transcripts for references to the antecedents of street credibility.

The three antecedents of street credibility: 1) authentic life experiences in the inner-city and street culture (Street Life); 2) the acquisition of power (Power); and 3) the width of the gap between street origins and current possessions and power (The Gap), were depicted in reports of street credible individuals during the non-inner city respondent interviews. Thus, we find that both populations recognized all three antecedents and validated their importance. We will now discuss the non-inner city respondents’ reports on each antecedent in detail.

1.5.5.1 Antecedent 1: Street Life

In terms of street life, we find that the majority of the non-inner city respondents refer to street life as an antecedent of street credibility in a manner that parallels our
previous findings. Students from the non-inner city interview sample identified authentic personal history, street smarts, and street toughness as being included in the personas of those that they deemed to be street credible. As in our previous analysis, an authentic personal history was depicted as an integral part of street credibility:

**L.N. (Caucasian Female, Leominster, MA)**

“I guess it (street credibility) is your, um, reputation among, I guess, a more urban population…street population is how I would think of it…when I think of it, I think of it more in, like, an inner-city urban setting.”

In addition, the respondents identified street smarts as an ingredient of street credibility. An interview with P.R. as he differentiated street smarts from knowledge gained through formal education provides a very simple example of this definition.

**P.R. (Caucasian Male, Ludlow, MA)**

“Um, so they say that people are book smart, some people are street smart, while being book smart, GPA shows that…Street smarts kind of shows that you know your way around (the streets).”

The respondents from the second interview group also reflected on street toughness as a part of the street credible persona. These students indicated that acts of crime, anger, and violence were committed by characters that they portrayed as being “gangsters” or “bad ass.” In agreement with the respondents from the inner-city interview group, some of these respondents felt that these characters’ actions of crime, anger, and violence were unattractive.

**L.N. (Caucasian Female, Leominster, MA)**

It (Eminem’s lyrics) sometimes is a little too much for me, too much violence and too much anger.

The difference in the level of offense, however, was that the non-inner city respondents discussed their lack of enjoyment in hearing about the violent behavior of
these characters while the inner-city respondents reflected on how they did not like seeing or being personally affected by violence in the streets. This difference provides further evidence of the distance between the non-inner city population and the culture that produces street credibility.

1.5.5.2 Antecedents 2 and 3: Power and the Width of the Gap Between Street Origins and Current Possessions:

Non-inner city students discussed the levels of power only in relation to those that have already bridged the gap and achieved cross-over dreams. That is, this population is more familiar with the individuals who achieved the highest levels of street credibility and not with those who have yet to surmount the large gap to celebrity. In agreement with our previous findings regarding the gap between humble origins and a position of power, the non-inner city population indicated that the amount of street credibility given to an individual is related to the size of the gap that the individual has transversed between poverty and power.

**P.R. (Caucasian, Male, Ludlow, MA)**

“I’d go with any of the rappers’ stuff like that. 50 Cent would probably be the one with the most street cred… he looks like he’s from the hood and has been through all the suffering and everything and came from nothing.”

**J.E. (Caucasian Female, Hull, MA)**

“…like, people will just respect him (Jay-Z) more from coming from such a bad situation to being so successful.”
1.5.5.3 How Non-inner City Consumers Relate to Street Credible Endorsers

Non-inner city consumers are drawn to street credible endorsers out of a fascination with the elements of street culture. That is, these consumers are attracted to hearing about the unique life experiences of those who have thrived in the culture of terror because these experiences are foreign and, therefore, intriguing and entertaining. Our interviews with the sample of non-inner city consumers support our findings:

P.R. (Caucasian Male, Ludlow, MA)

Cause it is something that people don’t have…it’s their closest way to experiencing it, especially middle class community. I mean, if you really listen to the songs, that’s the closest you’re gonna get. I mean, I grew up in suburbia so, I mean, I can’t really relate to growing up in the city and seeing drug deals all the time and gun shots and stuff like that.

H.R. (Caucasian Female, Plainville, MA)

“It’s just, it presents a world of fantasy sort of thing.”

M.E. (Asian Female, Amherst, MA)

“It exposes them (my friends) to scenes or places that they’ve never been.”

D.B. (Caucasian Male, Westborough, MA)

“Cause they (my friends) wanna hear about their life experiences. Yeah, it’s that because they wanna hear about their life experiences. It’s kinda, yeah, it’s that because they didn’t (have them).”

A.X. (Caucasian Male, Larchmont, NY)

I think the most intriguing part of it is that it is so different from my life that it just creates; it’s something that you wanna visualize. It’s like watching a movie. You wanna, you watch them to see different perspectives of something you’re not even used to.
1.6 Study 2 Discussion: How Consumers Relate to Street Credible Endorsers

While both interviewed groups show evidence of attachment to the endorsers and their histories, the inner-city consumer sees the endorser more as an aspirational reference group while the non-inner city consumer is drawn to the street credible endorser’s narrative as a form of entertainment.

1.6.1 Inner-city Consumers

From the vantage point of the inner-city respondents, the street credible endorser is attractive. Here affinity toward the street credible endorser based on a shared similar history in the form of the inner-city consumers share ethnicity, socioeconomic status, geographical origins, and a unique life experience with the street credible endorser that leads to the endorser being seen as likeable or attractive. This attraction is consistent with the existing body of literature on the determinants of attraction. Kelman’s Social Influence Theory (1961) posits that identification with a celebrity increases the celebrity’s influence because individuals derive satisfaction from their belief that they are like the celebrity in some aspects. The likelihood that a person will be attracted to an endorser or enact a prescribed behavior depends on that person’s identification with the model (Bandura 1977; McCracken 1989; McGuire 1985). Other findings state that the antecedent of a similar history results in the endorser being seen as likeable (Deshpande and Stayman 1994) and trustworthy (Ohanian 1991). In this case, the inner-city consumer’s identification with the street credible celebrity is derived from their shared experience within the street culture, a similar race, and a similar geographical origin.
This attraction to the street credible celebrity endorser by the inner-city consumer can also be attributed to a form of expertise that is not often discussed in the prior literature. The ability of a person to achieve success in both the underground and the mainstream economies is considered to be an accomplishment that demonstrates expertise in the form of knowledge or special skills (Ohanian 1991), cultural capital (Bourgois 2003), or dual consciousness (Du Bois 1903). This ability represents a form of expertise that is absent from the traditional discussions of credibility (Ohanian 1990). Thus, we propose the following:

P1: Inner-city consumers’ affinity for the street credible endorsers is based on these endorsers having similar authentic personal history to that of the consumer.

Here, authenticity leads to trustworthiness and attractiveness. The acquisition of power which increases street credibility is thought of as expertise as is the ability to widen the gap between the endorser’s origin and his current level of power. We further propose that the measures that define attractiveness and expertise are distinctly different from those used in the traditional endorsement literature. Here attractiveness is based on shared history rather than physical beauty. The attractiveness based on shared history leads to affinity for the endorsers’ inclusion in the consumers’ aspirational reference group (see Figure 1.1).
1.6.2 Non-inner City Non-Minority Consumers

Unlike the inner-city consumer, the non-inner city consumer sample reported overwhelmingly that they do not relate to the street credible endorser’s history in terms of shared ethnicity, socioeconomic status, geographic origins, and unique life experience. Moreover, the non-inner city consumers report that their affinity for these endorsers is driven by the entertainment value of the endorsers and the endorsers’ history, which is described by the antecedents of street credibility. In other words, as Gilroy, Grossberg, and McRobbie (2000) posit, these consumers are drawn to the street credible endorsers because their world provides an interesting form of exoticism and fantasy.

Exoticism, defined as “the tendency to adopt what is exotic, wild or not native” (Gilroy et al. 2000), is common within the world of entertainment. Gilroy et al. (2000) posits that the popularity in Europe of the Buffalo Bill Wild West Show, which featured a “Real American Indian,” in the 1870s, the allure that jazz held in the United States in the 1920s and ‘30’s, and the interest that suburban white males had in gangster rap in the 1990s are all examples of exoticism. Similarly, the consumption of rappers’ narratives about their inner-city origins provides the consumer with a view into a world that appears exciting, foreign, and fascinating. Here, consuming the life stories of the street credible endorser provides the non-minority non-inner city consumer with fantasies, feelings, and fun experiences (Holbrook and Hirschman 1982).

The sense of enjoyment that these consumers derive from dangerous or harmful situations is considered to be the result of the sublime effect (Phillips and McQuarrie 2010). Here, the consumer can enjoy the idea of pain or danger because it isn’t actually
present. Thus, the antecedents of “street credibility,” though foreign, are both “exciting and delightful” (Phillips and McQuarrie 2010). Therefore, we propose the following:

**P2:** The non-inner city non-minority consumers’ attraction to street credible endorsers is based on exotic fantasy experiences. These experiences are rooted in the consumers’ fascination with the endorser’s authentic personal history and other antecedents of street credibility and are moderated by the exotic or dissimilarity between the endorser and the consumer which results in the sublime effect (see Figure 1.2).

### 1.7 Study 3: Race, Social Class and Product Fit

The purpose of this study is to gain further understanding of the relationships between constructs including race and socio-economic group, with affinity toward the street credible endorser. In addition, we seek to gain insights into which types of brands and products are the best fit for a street credible celebrity endorsement. Within this study, we dichotomize race into minority, comprised of African-Americans, Hispanic-Americans and Native-Americans, and majority, comprised of Caucasian-Americans and Asian-Americans. Asian-Americans were classified with Caucasian Americans as part of the majority because Asian-Americans more closely resemble Caucasian Americans than they do other minority groups in terms of political beliefs (Wu 2002), education, income (U.S. Census 2006). In fact Asian-Americans’ median income is now higher than all other minority groups and that of the majority. This has led to Asian Americans often being labeled the “model minority” or “non-disadvantaged minorities” and not being
considered as a historically underrepresented minority group in terms of racially based admittance or scholarship (Wu 2002).

The prior studies resulted in an empirically based definition of the construct of street credibility. This study further provided insights on how street credibility is gained and lost and how different consumer groups relate to street credible endorsers. However, these studies stopped short at identifying how non-inner city minorities define street credibility, who they feel are exemplars and how they relate to them. In addition, the second study did not provide insights into the types of products and brands that consumers consider to be an appropriate fit for street credible celebrity endorsement. Further, while ethnography allows different research tools to be applied to obtain the contextually relevant meanings held by different populations (Crockett, 2012), we felt that a single interview guide could further aid in between-group comparisons in terms of meanings, exemplars and associations. Therefore, a third study was conducted that applied the same research tool to address the following research questions: How salient is street credibility? Which current celebrity endorsers have street credibility? Is the construct’s meaning consistent with our earlier findings? How strongly related is street credibility to other constructs? What products and brands do consumers consider to be an appropriate fit for street credible endorsement? What meanings lay behind these associations? What effect do race, socio-economic background, and other life experiences play in response to each of the aforementioned questions?
1.7.1 Methodology

The history of photo elicitation is rooted in anthropology and sociology; this method has been fruitful in providing an understanding of the role of consumer ethnicity in the interpretation of advertisements (Harper and Faccioli, 2000; Kretsedemas, 1993) and the importance of clothing for teenagers in terms of cultural anxiety (Hethorn and Kaiser, 1999). The presence of photos causes the brain to process more information than it does for exchanges that are based solely on words. More specifically, allowing respondents to look at and organize photos into meaningful categories “invokes deeper elements of human consciousness” and “enlarges the possibilities of conversational research” (Harper, 2002). These effects result in richer “definitions of the self to society, culture, and history” (Harper, 2002). As such, we find it to be an appropriate technique for mining data from diverse groups.

1.7.2 Procedure

Interview sessions were held with a new group of respondents. The first half of each interview consisted of questions centered on photo elicitation exercises. The second half of the interview focused on the personal life histories of the respondents. A focus was placed on life stories because such narratives have proven fruitful in providing insights into the role of consumption in self-construction (Baumgartner, 2002). Personal life histories reflect deep values and personal information. Because retelling their personal history may prime the respondents’ memories and affect their responses during the photo elicitation interviews, the photo elicitation sessions were positioned before the discussion of life stories.
The interviewees were recruited from a large northeastern university and from a high school to college success program that operates in a major northeastern inner-city. To control for the confounding factor of race, a number of minorities from the non-inner city were included, which created three distinct sets of respondent cells. Because this is not a strict experimental design and because it is difficult to recruit non-minority interviewees who grew up in the inner-city, the number of interviewees of each type was not strictly balanced. To remove the confounding factors of local phenomena, inner-city respondents were not restricted to one city. Rather, the inner-city respondents hailed from Harlem, Boston and Philadelphia.

A uniform interview guide was used for each interview. To ensure consistency in the interviews, the principal investigator interviewed all respondents. A total of 30 respondents aged 19 – 23 (mean age 21), were interviewed; 11 respondents were from the inner-city (45% female, 91% minority) and 19 were from the non-inner city (53% female, 58% minority) (see Table 1.3). The respondents were each compensated $10 per hour for their time. The average interview lasted for 1 hour and 43 minutes for a total of 51.5 hours of interviews.

The interviews were captured with an audio recording device and the respondents’ photo collages were captured with a digital camera (see Figure 1.3). Next, the interviews were transcribed, producing over 600 pages of transcribed dialogue. After transcription, each interview was studied by the primary investigator, and a preliminary code guide was created. A set of ten interviews was coded in NVivo 10 by the primary investigator using the preliminary code guide. The code guide was altered as needed throughout this process, resulting in a seven-page code book. The code book was then
used to train two research assistants. Next, all 30 interviews were coded in NVivo 10 by the primary investigator and the two research assistants using the code book.

1.7.3 Results and Analysis

We first analyze and discuss our findings regarding the definition of street credibility and its antecedents and compare these to the findings from our earlier studies. After this step, we focus on the consistency of the street credible exemplars across the three respondent sets as well as between this and our previous studies. Next, we discuss how street credibility relates with the construct of cool. We then focus on how different consumers relate to street credible celebrities, what products or brands these celebrities can endorse, and how these consumers experience street credible endorsements.

1.7.3.1 Construct Definition and Construct Salience

The findings regarding the definition of street credibility and the exemplars for such were consistent with our earlier studies. In agreement with the findings from Study 2, the construct of street credibility was most salient to and easily defined by inner-city males and females. This conclusion is evidenced by these participants’ ability to provide detailed definitions of the construct and exemplars prior to the use of photo elicitation. In addition, the non-inner city male and female minorities and the non-minority males, while able to define the construct, often had difficulty or showed uncertainty when articulating its meaning. This difficulty is made evident by their definitions, which were punctuated with doubtful phrases such as, “I am not sure,” “I don’t know,” or “this is hard.” The respondents in this study defined street credibility in the same terms that we
had seen in our previous interviews. Moreover, the respondents’ definitions of street credibility include the same antecedents recorded in Study 2.

**1.7.3.2 Antecedent 1: Street Life**

Consistent with our earlier findings, the respondents report that the construct of street credibility is established in the poor and dangerous neighborhoods found within the inner-city. As demonstrated in the following examples, these findings were consistent across each set of respondents.

**T.K. (Male, Minority, Inner-city)**

“Street people would be someone that grew up on the streets, somebody else with street cred… I would say like the hood, like just the slums, low-income, poor, dangerous, streets.”

**J.L. (Male, Minority, Non-inner City)**

The streets, just. . . to me the streets is you walk around you see poverty, you see like. . . yeah. Just pov--like in a way you just see poverty. I don't want to offend anyone; I don't want to say it in an offensive way...(in) the streets there's people in poverty.

**M.A. (Female, Non-Minority, Non-inner City)**

Because that’s, you can’t, that’s (Compton) hard to survive in I feel like….street cred is like what you do on the street when people are like, like if you’ve come, you get street cred if you’ve come from like a bad place…it’s like you have street cred if you come from a bad neighborhood, if you’ve come from the projects or like Jay-Z has street cred, been there, done that, sold drugs, has street cred, he was a gangster. Like that’s street cred. Like me, Cape Cod, Massachusetts, doesn’t have street cred.

The reports from the respondents in each cell also buttressed the findings in the earlier samples regarding street life. Here, street life experiences were described as producing street credible individuals who are tough and street smart. In addition, we find further evidence that street life is tied to street codes and involvement in the underground
Further, the respondents implied that street credibility is lost when one is proven to be deficient in any of these areas. Again, these findings mirror those of our earlier findings. The following quotes exemplify these findings.

**E.A. (Female, Minority, Inner-city)**

Well, to me, where I’m from, street cred would probably be like your reputation, so like if someone is tough, they have street cred. Like if you beat someone up, you get more street cred. If you back down, you get less, stuff like that…. I would say mafia, but I don’t know any specific, except for maybe like Whitey Bulger. Who else, street cred? Boxers, that’s a good one. You need to be tough in your fights… I remember there was this one (neighborhood) boy, they called him ________. I don’t remember his real name, but pretty much everyone respected him. He would always be in a fight. Why, I don’t know. I’m just assuming people hear people talking about him, so he would fight them, things like that. I feel like he had street cred because everyone was scared to even get near him or talk about him or stuff like that.

**K.N. (Male, Minority, Non-inner City)**

Street Cred is judged on kinda important things like, for example, like if someone robs a car or something like, "Oh you robbed a car, that's so cool" and this and that. And then they get respect for that but I feel like that's not something to be proud of, like that's why street cred is so difficult because a lot of the things that you get street cred for aren't like things you should get credit for cuz they're not like, I don't know, I won't say good but they're not.

**A.W. (Male, Non-Minority, Non-inner City)**

I think it refers to the knowledge that you know of the streets, I guess. I don’t know really, like street cred is... I really don’t know, to be honest. How well you know the streets, or staying true to where you came from maybe, I don’t know... The only thing is, I mean like street smarts, I get that, it’s just having knowledge of the real world rather than just textbooks and academia.

### 1.7.3.3 Antecedent 2: Power

As in the previous study, street credible individuals were described as holding power within the streets in the form or physical, sexual, and financial power, as defined in our earlier studies. These findings were consistent across the three respondent cells.
B.A. (Female, Minority, Inner-city)

“I do believe he (2Chainz) may have some money and he may treat women like as we say in his video, he hooks up with them and pushes them to the side, you know all that.”

J.L. (Male, Minority, Non-inner City)

“Definitely just beating somebody up and have a lot of people see that, see that you're like the big guy. That's Street Cred.”

J.O. (Male, Non-Minority, Inner-city)

“These are the people who want to be gangsters like really nice jewelry, rims on their car,”

1.7.3.4 Antecedent 3: The Width of the Gap Between Street Origins and Current Possessions and Power

The gap, as previously defined, is a measure of how far one has advanced from one’s starting place. In this sense, the wider the gap between one’s origins and one’s current position of power, the greater the amount of street credibility given. The importance of the gap within the street credibility construct was evident throughout this set of interviews.

J.E. (Female, Minority, Inner-city)

“I feel like she’s (Oprah) the definition of the whole started from the bottom, now look at me. She’s come a very long way.”

J.R. (Female, Minority, Non-inner City)

“That you're part of us and you kind of became--"us" being poor people from the streets--and you've been able to overcome poverty, all the hurdles and you're able to be something so much bigger and greater.”
A.W. (Male, Non-Minority, Non-inner City)

“Jay-Z and 50 Cent, they, in their songs, their earlier music was about how they had to sell drugs to get by, and that sort of stuff. So that’s why I feel like they have the street cred, like, hey, I made it off these damn streets.”

Consistent with our earlier findings, street credibility deals with the respect given to those who have survived what Bourgeois (2003) coined as a culture of terror such as the street culture found within the poor inner-city neighborhoods. Consistent with our findings from the ethnographic works on street culture and the findings from our own qualitative work reported earlier, street credible individuals gain street smarts and tough personas and have a history of working in the underground economy. In addition, street credibility increases as one increases the gap between the original economic state and the current state as delineated in both Study 1 and Study 2. Such findings are further reflected in the respondents’ categorization of endorsers as either street credible, weak, posers, trendy, nerdy, or cool; the “street credible” categorization produced a consistent list of respondents with backgrounds rooted in authentic histories of street life, the acquisition of power in the streets, and increasing the gap.

1.7.3.5 Construct Exemplars

By and large, the same celebrities—Jay-Z, Eminem, and 50 Cent—were categorized the most often as street credible by the respondents regardless of the respondents’ gender, ethnicity, and place of origin (see Table 1.4). This result is illustrated graphically through the word cloud, created using NVivo 10 (see Figure 1.4). At times, Oprah Winfrey and Eve were named as female exemplars of street credibility. However, these listing were less consistent and each of these female celebrities was
categorized as cool or trendy with equal or greater frequency. In addition, while the
aforementioned male exemplars were often used to define street credibility prior to the
photo elicitation studies, no female exemplars were mentioned prior to such priming.
Thus, as in our earlier studies, we find evidence that supports street credibility as a
masculine construct or, at the very least, that male exemplars are more salient.

Athletes were named as having street credibility, but with far less frequency than
Jay-z, Eminem, and 50 Cent. In general, the inclusion of these athletes was based on their
toughness. As noted earlier, being tough is a result of having an authentic life history in
the street. However toughness may be acquired and shown in other contexts such as
physical toughness displayed in sports. Hence non-street credible but tough celebrities
seldom were deemed as street credible due to their toughness. Such inclusions were
disproportionately made by female non-minority, non-inner city respondents. In general,
only female non-minority, non-inner city respondents varied greatly in terms of exemplar
categorization, construct salience, and construct definition.

In accord with our findings in our earlier studies, non-minority, non-inner city
females, as a group, appeared to be the most unfamiliar with the construct of street
credibility. Prior to the use of photo elicitation, their definitions were punctuated with
statements of uncertainty and, as before, some respondents within this group described
street credibility as credibility or respect detached from street origins. In these sessions,
those respondents defined street credibility partly as general credibility or respect. During
the photo elicitation, these respondent’s depiction of street credibility became a
combination of the respect and general credibility based definitions they gave prior to the
introduction of the photo elicitation material and street credibility relating to street life as defined in our earlier study. This association is demonstrated in the following excerpts:

E.A. (Female, Non-Minority, Non-inner City)

Initial definition of street credibility:
“I suppose how people view them as a person, not a celebrity…I suppose, I don't know...how people view them...I guess it is your reputation, I don't know.”

Selection of street credibility exemplars during photo elicitation:
“Street cred, I did as kinda (as) a respect thing. In their business everyone respects them (Jay-Z, Dale Earnhardt Jr., Eve, and Tom Brady).”

K.E. (Female, Non-Minority, Non-inner City)

Initial definition of street credibility:
“I kinda think of it as how tough you are, how much people respect you.”

Selection of street credibility exemplars during photo elicitation:
“Well these guys (50 Cent and Eminem) always talk about how they had a rough childhood, getting shot at, (and) earning street cred. With Tom Brady it is in a different way, like how he is a really well know athlete and respected quarterback.”

As in Study 2, the female, non-minority, non-inner city group appear to have a slightly different understanding of the construct. For this group, respect in a more general sense is a large part of their definition. While some members of this segment define street credibility in the same manner as the other respondents, a few see the term as being more related to respect or traditional credibility. This difference is further exemplified by their categorization of 50 cent during the photo elicitation segment. A number of the female non-minority non-inner city respondents placed 50 Cent into the “weak” or “poser” category. These respondents explained that this selection was based on a recent incident where the celebrity made fun of a mentally handicapped person. Thus, in their eyes, 50 Cent lost street credibility, when deemed as respect, for his actions. Although the
respondents from other sub groups mentioned this incident, it did not stop them from categorizing 50 Cent as street credible because these respondents defined street credible more in terms of one’s street origins, the level of power gained in the streets and the width of the gap he has overcome. In agreement, a few respondents also categorized 50 Cent as outside of street credibility because they felt he had forgotten where he came from or had left the streets behind, a clear violation of street credibility as earlier defined.

It must be noted that not all female non-minority non-inner city respondents shared this general respect-based understanding of the construct. However, for four of the seven female non-minority non-inner city respondents, the construct is less salient and thus their definition is less complete. Here, their interpretation of street credibility and its application to exemplars was attached to “credibility,” as they searched for context clues within the term “street credibility” to help them define it. This response is due in part to these respondents being further removed from an understanding of being a minority male in poverty or “the streets” than other respondents. In addition, in accordance with Choi and Rifon (2007), these individuals’ intuitive understanding may be diminished due to a lack of similarity between them and the street credible exemplar in terms of both gender and race.

Overall, we found that respondent groups identified the same respondents as street credible with similar frequency. Each group indicated that Jay-Z, Eminem, and 50 Cent had street credibility, and these celebrities were depicted as being street credible based on definitions of the construct related to street life, power in the streets, and the gap between their origins and their current level of success.
**1.7.3.6 Street Credibility and Cool**

Our findings indicated that street credibility is different than cool. Still, when categorizing celebrities as street credible, cool, posers, weak, nerdy or trendy, the few times that the endorsers who fit the aforementioned definition of street credibility were not categorized as street credible, they were most often placed into the cool category. However, a further analysis of the interviews indicates that while a celebrity may have ownership of both constructs, the two are different. The respondents’ statements indicate that at the very least, it may be cool or even “hyper cool” to have street credibility but that the two constructs are not mutually inclusive. That is to say, unlike cool, street credibility is reserved for those who have authentic street origins, survived a culture of terror and gained power inside and outside of the streets. This distinction is depicted in the following interview excerpts.

**A.E. (Female, Minority, Inner-city)**

They’re just so cool. They have street cred. 50 Cent’s whole story is just ridiculous, with his getting shot nine times. Yeah, that’s his street cred. And then Eminem, he’s Eminem. He’s like, I don’t know. He’s crazy. He’s been through some stuff. …But, she’s one of the best female rappers, so, she’s Eve. She’s good. I don’t think she’s cool-cool. I wouldn’t put her under cool. I think she’s cooler than cool. I guess street cred is appropriate.

**A.W. (Male, Non-Minority, Non-inner City)**

You know, he (Eminem) probably could have went with street cred too but I feel like he’s a cooler guy. I mean these (50 Cent and Jay-Z) are cool too, but I feel like they fit the bill for street cred, like they just really came up off the streets and they’re still pretty true to it, I guess, like they still go around to old places. They keep it real, I guess. They haven’t really changed or sold out.

**E.A. (Female, Non-Minority, Non-inner City)**

“I don’t know (how street cred and cool differ), I just put, like with street cred, I put like kind of gangster affiliation to them.”
1.7.3.7 Street Credible Endorsers and Product Fit

All of the respondent groups pointed out that the street celebrities could endorse products or brands in a wide variety of areas. More specifically, the respondents suggested that the street credible celebrity best represented the products and brands that were associated with the celebrity's street origins, current lifestyle, or area of expertise. Current lifestyle items, including fashion and alcohol, had to be premium or “high end,” reflecting the current level of success as depicted by the street credible antecedent of "the gap”.

**E.A. (Female, Minority, Inner-city)**

“For the guy, maybe like fitted hats. Five Hour Energy…I can’t picture them in any perfume or cologne… (they could do) any type of clothing; shoes.”

**S.N. (Male, Minority, Non-inner City)**

“I think meeting the high end products, like meeting the high end clothing products Jay-Z could do.”

**S.V. (Male, Non-Minority, Non-inner City)**

I think Eminem might be more like street fashion products and for the energy beverages, like Monster and Red Bull…You have maybe like a more somewhat notorious personality that street cred help you to make market, like I said, like street style products, like sweatshirts and hoodies and certain brands of pants and shirts…Like I said before maybe like energy drinks and stuff like that. In fact, maybe alcoholic beverages also because I know Pit Bull did a Bud Light commercial, and I guess that's where I would put more like street cred towards like those kinds of products.

**K.A. (Female, Non-Minority, Non-inner City)**

They could because they (50 Cent, Eminem, Eve, and Jay-Z) are pretty high status celebrities so they could do that. I see them more doing like liquor, like vodka and stuff like that because their music is more club-based…I think it would have to be high-end vodka. I don't think they would endorse cheap vodka. They're like, I'm fancy now, I get the high-end stuff. I don't think they'd put their name on anything inexpensive.
The respondents also felt that the street credible celebrity would be a suitable spokesperson for charity causes, nonprofit organizations and to promote firms as a responsible corporate citizen. The appropriateness of this role is due to these celebrities’ association with the poverty and injustice that so many nonprofits seek to undo and firms attempt to address. Moreover, this role would reflect the celebrity’s street origins and represents their ability to endorse products at this end of "the gap."

Between the groups of respondents, the minority respondents felt that these endorsers could endorse anything, while the non-minorities readily restricted them to items related to parties or street culture, such as alcohol or urban wear, and premium items. Overall, the specific mention of items fell most often at one end of the gap or the other. In short, our findings suggest that for the non-inner city consumer, the street credible endorser would be a good fit for products and brands at the lower end of the gap (such as a low end of transportation like a New York City bus pass) or at the higher end of the gap (such as a premium car like an Audi) but not for a brand in the middle of the gap (such as a value brand car like a Hyundai). In terms of the audience for street credible endorsers, the respondents felt that these endorsers appealed to consumers with similar and different backgrounds. This is reflected in the following respondents’ reports.

Q.N. (Male, Minority, Inner-city)

Street cred could pretty much endorse anything they want. I was just thinking maybe something along the lines of giving back, giving back to like a country, like Africa or something. Feed the Children or something like that. I think they would all fit, because they’ve got it and they still, they know what it is to give back to people that need it... Mostly I think people would endorse something business related. I think maybe they would endorse a corporation or something, maybe try to better a corporation, mostly that’s what I think the street cred people would do.
R.N. (Male, Minority, Non-inner City)

“...it'd be better to see (50 Cent in) more commercials with the energy drink, especially if they're emphasizing what the company does and how they help people.”

M.A. (Female, Non-Minority, Non-inner City)

“I mean, I guess (Eminem, Jay-Z, and Oprah could do) something to help underprivileged communities, like not an item, does it have to be an item? Yes, like something to help underprivileged communities or for the good of the whole.”

A.I. (Female, Non-Minority, Non-inner City)

Clothing lines…Music. I’d like to mix it with education though… Think about their success and how beneficial it would be for these (inner-city) adolescents to just, imagining Eminem just walking into their school talking to them, you know, about their top five favorite sneakers, what they did to get to where they’re at, their journey. That would be ridiculous.

Overall, respondents felt that these endorsers held appeal with a wide range of consumer groups. This position was most consistent among minority, non-inner city consumers. This appears to be due to their connections to the endorsers as minorities and their own mainstream existence. That is to say, that for these consumes, an association with both street credible endorser and the main stream culture allow them to most easily conceptualize a merger of the two. The following examples of minority non-inner city respondents view of the universal appeal of street credible endorsers is representative of this group.

J.R. (Female, Minority, Non-inner City)

I just said they're a powerful group because they could reach to a wide population. They could really do anything, it could be jewelry, it could be fashion, it could be like a baseball glove, you know. It could be whatever; they're just a powerful group because they reach to such a wide variety of people.
E.H. (Female, Minority, Non-inner City)

“All the people with Street Credibility, Jay-Z, Pink, 50 Cent, and Eminem could advertise pretty much anything. Meaning that level of Street Cred transcends any age group.”

1.7.3.8 Overview: How Consumer Groups Relate to Street Credible Celebrities and Their Endorsements

Throughout the interviews, the respondents’ level of relationship to the street credible endorser was predicated on their shared past experiences. The inner-city respondents relate to street credible endorsers based on shared life experiences, the minority non-inner city respondents relate to them based on share experiences as minorities, and the non-minority non-inner city respondents relate to them based on their ability to provide fantasy. We will next discuss each of these phenomena in greater detail.

1.7.3.9 How Inner-city Respondents Relate to Street Credible Endorsers

Respondents from the inner-city reported that they identified with the celebrity based on their shared experiences. Such shared experiences are highlighted in the respondent’s life stories that depict overcoming poverty, violence, dealing with crime and their own or a loved one's incarceration, and other obstacles that are more prevalent in the inner-city. This similarity in experiences is best depicted within an interview with T.K. who had recently been released from Riker’s Island on gun possession charges.

T.K. (Male, Minority, Inner-city)

(In my neighborhood there is) violence. Shootings. It used to be crazy back then. It used to be crazier. Having a gun was only one year (sentence). You get like three to five now, so it was a little bit more, I wouldn’t even say a little bit more (crazy). People still tote guns. I think it was a little bit more though, with the guns. I actually caught a gun charge, in 2007. I got probation, NYO, so they won’t see it on my record. I’m about to finish probation next month…Then it will be done.
Five years probation... We went to the... my guy had like some problems with somebody. We went over there to fight. I brought it, just in case. I didn't bring it actually. My friend had it, and he was just about to fight. He was just about to fight. Actually what happened was my friend went over there, we went over there. There was a couple of us. My friend had fought somebody, and one of the dudes that was over there had let a gun off in the air, so my other friend, he was like some real crazy dude. He’s the one had the gun on him. He’s like, why you let the gun off? You shot in the air too. Why you shot in the air? Now I want to fight, so he took his coat off and stuff like that. He wanted to fight the dude, but they didn't want to fight. The dude was walking away. I had grabbed the gun out of his coat and put it in my pocket, and then the cops came... Since the guy let the gun off in the air, there was cops coming already, so by the time they did all that, him trying to fight those guys, we was on their block, so they got out of there. We left, we were going to our block and the gun was in my pocket. They stopped everybody, big crowd of black dudes. They stopped everybody, searched. I tossed it, but they found it. They took four of us in, and one of my friends, he was out on bail, so I confessed up to it. Like you know, it was mine, whatever the case may be. It took me from there... I was actually in jail for like two-and-a-half months, just fighting my case... Yeah, just for fighting the case. My mother didn't have enough money for bail. She don’t even know people like that. My family isn’t rich, so they don’t have money like that. I wanted to stand up until my case was not closed, but they had to let me go for whatever reason they let me go. I’m still not sure why, but I had to keep fighting my case. The judge said you finish high school and I’ll give you probation and NYO, so... (in Rikers’ Island) general population. Youths, though, adolescents, which is more wild. Back home adolescents were more wild OGs and stuff, the old-timers there, the older heads. It was kind of wild in there, but to me, I wouldn’t really take the experience back, because actually when I was around that time, growing up, you could actually see yourself in jail. It’s crazy. You know the stuff that you’re doing is not right. You can actually see yourself in jail, so me getting there was kind of like a homecoming. This is it, right here. I don’t want to come back, that’s it.

In agreement with street code and being street smart, T.K. accepted the gun because as the member of the group with the least amount of infractions on his record, he would serve the least amount of time. Parallel to our findings in Studies 1 and 2 and in the lived stories of the celebrities categorized as street credible in Studies 2 and 3, adherence to street codes, being street smart, and exposure to crime and violence are the lived stories of those still in the culture of terror. Here, we also find crime and jail are normalized and that involvement in the underground economy is considered to be a
legitimate means of employment, as the means to an in. A shared lived experience is
exemplified in R.D.’s life story, which includes gaining financial power and traversing
the gap through employment in the underground economy as well as gaining street
credibility by being street smart and tough.

**J.E. (Female, Minority, Inner-city)**

I guess (I relate to) any one of them that grew up in the inner-city. Most likely the
ones that are black, hands down. Automatically I relate to them first. It’s almost
like I don’t, a lot of times I just don’t feel like I could relate to the white artist or
the white actresses, because our skin color is just completely different. But then
there’s Eminem. He’s a white rapper and we all know his story. He struggled
worse than I did growing up, to be honest. So why is it I feel like I can’t relate to
him? I feel like I can, too.

**R.E. (Male, Minority, Inner-city)**

I might even be a little too brave or bold for my own good, but for the most part,
I'd say I have a good street sense… It's kind of a personal story but to get to the
point across, one of my friends-- A situation comes up with me and this group of
guys maybe 6 or 7… the reason it happened, they were trying to play me for a
sucker and I was not having it, I was not backing down at all. Honestly, if I were
to go through it again, I’d probably do the same thing. At the end of the day I
know these guys, they look back at themselves—I could look these guys in the
eye today and be like, “Okay whatever.” And from what I understand they have
somewhat of respect for me for standing up for myself and have no respect for
this guy (the friend who ran) at all... He was always this guy trying to be a tough
guy, trying to, “Oh I got your back no matter what.” You know have a couple
beers, “You know, I'd take a bullet for you.” All this B.S., so it teaches you that,
one of the things my grandma always told me, if you don't have any friends, get
associates, put yourself first and foremost. Another life lesson learned in college I
guess… I was actually in the dorms... Some kids out of, yeah, local city... We have
couple interactions, you know they're trying to bargain with price (for the
marijuana I’m selling) and I'm like “Nah”… Yeah, they trying to bargain with
price, I'm like “Nah”. There were three transactions; the first time I was like
“alright $50.” "Nah, let me give you $45, let me give you $40." “Alright, I'll take
less” and I gave them less. The next day they meet their agreement, $50. And then
the next day they're like, “Alright $40.” By this time I have a new product and I'm
like that's fine no problem, give them what they need and then they try to play me
like, “Oh yeah, go get your little scale thing, let’s see what’s good with this.” And
I'm like alright. I come back; I knew exactly what it was. Everyone knows I have
this new stuff for cheap and so they given me the stuff in the bag to open it and it
comes up short and I'm like, "Ya'll aren't about to play me right now for this."
And so, alright so this goes down and of course the the guy starting shouting, "Lets go dude! There's more of us than you!" I'm like “Where are you kids from?” Worcester. I'm like “You guys aren't tough, you think I'm gonna be scared of you over this little bit of whatever. I'm not scared of you dude.” And they're all bigger than me. I don't really care-- none of this I'm taking into consideration. But everytime people tell me this story back they like, “Dawg, these dudes are bigger than you, you shoulda died.” And I'm like, “I had my boy there.” I had like 4 people that coulda been on my side, and they all ditched and I just wasn't going to take that short. I wasn't feeling how things went down so I (was) standing up for myself and eventually got jumped, basically. Only one of my boys who was the one that knew them and invited me up like helped break things up. And other than that, it was just a huge lesson learned. Since then, I quit smoking, I'm done with all that but just seeing my friend, seeing my boy. Like we were best friends for a long period of time. Just going through that with a friend, like now if I have someone around me and they're not benefiting me, I feel like they're trying to milk my resources or use me, I'll cut them off just like that. So a lot of times, I hear from people that are successful that say you should surround yourself with people that are smarter than you, will improve you what not, not people that will drag you down. I think I have gotten better at things like that since this incident. So it was a huge incident, definitely something I learned a lot from.

Consistent with our earlier findings, once R.E.’s financial situation changed, he quit working in the underground economy because continuing this type of employment would jeopardize what he had gained and thus is stupid – not street smart. Moreover, his decision to fight rather than run was both a product of street smarts, knowing the result of giving in, and toughness, which later afforded him street credibility with those who attempted to rob him. Throughout our interviews, these types of viewpoints and shared lived experiences were predominantly provided by the respondents from the inner-city. These experiences provide a platform for relating strongly to the street credible celebrities who have lived similar lives. In some cases, the shared experiences are within the same city, neighborhood, or street. In addition to the unique experiences of street life, these respondents also share an experience that is unique to minorities. Once again, we find that the minority respondents empathize with Eminem who, as a white male in the
inner-city, is viewed as a minority among the minorities. All together, these shared experiences allow the inner-city respondents to identify with the street credible celebrity.

As in our previous study, we find that in this scenario, the street credible celebrity serves as a role model. Therefore, the inner-city respondent, as a consumer, is inspired by the commercial product endorsement. The following quotations reflect these findings:

A.I. (Female, Minority, Inner-city)

Jennifer Lopez, I’ve liked her all my life. She just captured my attention so well when I was seven years old, when she was playing Selena in 1997. It was just like “Wow.” And then growing up watching this woman, the progression, how could you not fall in love? This woman was a fly girl, a dancer, a dancer? You know what I mean? Those are your days. I’m a little kid, watching. So from that to all these movies. First of all, Selena, you start with that. You’ve got a Puerto Rican (like me) playing a Mexican. How much controversy was that? All that fuel was there. The first (Puerto Rican) person that ever had the number one CD and number one else. The things she’s done just really impresses me. I’ve just fallen in love with the progression. I’m just fixated. I guess her looks have something to do with it too… And I met her as well. That was ridiculous… My aunt works at Macy’s corporate in New York. She was in the store promoting her fragrance, got in line, bought the fragrance, got to meet my lady. It was good. Best two minutes of my life

I’d say it (which group I relate to) would be a cross between street cred and cool. I feel like again, with my brand being out there, I have to people wanting to tweet about it, wanting to post a status about it, so that person next door on this street is going to find out about me. Like I’ve got to be in the streets. I gotta be, so I’d do street cred….Jay-Z is like the only artist I’ve seen survive through all the changes in the music industry. And then I see the endorsements that Jay-Z has and the commercials and the way they market him from HP, and now I work for Microsoft representing HP and now I get to do my own commercial and I’m looking at Jay-Z’s commercial for inspiration. That’s that dude right there. Jay-Z is just taking over the world. He’s really influencing a nation. It’s impressive…Yeah, he (Jay-Z) has the Duracell. He’s always going, you need to energize. I’m always on the move. It’s beautiful. Did you see the commercial? Oh, my. He doesn’t even talk in the commercial. That man got paid millions, and all you see is his hand going like that to the, you ought to see the commercial. You’ve got to see it. It’s so, I love marketing. I love marketing. I just love how they can portray so much in this 40 second interval. You have the celebrity. Their following is going to get on with it too, and then this brand; whoever they have following and they’re just both meeting at the top. I just, I love it, definitely love it…
Jennifer Lopez with her own fragrances, her own clothing line. She has L’Oreal, she has Venus. Like what doesn’t this woman have? Gucci under her belt. She did the car commercial, but she yanked out once she found out they were affiliated with terrorists or whatever the hell the situation was…Yeah, Fiat. It’s cool just to see how her brand works. She’s impressive. I love that woman so much... No. I don’t wear makeup, so I’m not buying L’Oreal. I do shave my legs, but I don’t know what brand. Is it Venus? Yeah, it is Venus, but I didn’t buy it because of her. But I bought her fragrance because of her…Yeah. Hell, yeah.

**Q.N. (Male, Minority, Inner-city)**

I would say out of all of those, probably, the one I respect the most I’d like to say is the 50 Cent, the Formula 50. That was a good collaboration with him and the vitamin water company, because who thinks, you know, just to come up with their own little name for a drink, and not just the amount of money that he got paid, just for the name, that’s crazy; 350 million, that’s a lot of money. Who else I’d like to say? I’d have to say Jay-Z, only because I’m from Brooklyn, I’m a Brooklynaire, so I just respect how he’s really showing up for his home town where he really came from. Not a lot of real celebrities really do that. When they leave, they gone. They don’t really care about the neighborhood, but he really stuck to his word and just brung Brooklyn back alive again. Now Brooklyn is like a mini-Manhattan now. That’s it.

**1.7.3.10 How Non-inner city Minority Respondents Relate to Street Credible Endorsers**

While minority inner-city respondents identify street credibility as being based on shared lived experiences within street culture and being a minority, the minority, non-inner city respondents relate to the street credible endorser based on a respect for what they have achieved as well as for their shared experiences as minorities. Here, shared experience comes in the form of oppression. These respondents find the street credible endorser’s stories to be inspiring and important.
J.R. (Female, Minority, Non-inner City)

I like to dance to their music mostly. Yeah, I haven't listened to her [Eve's] lyrics very carefully but I'd say the music has good beats and that... but Jay-Z and Eminem are almost always gonna be in the Street Cred category, I like what they say, they have meaningful things that they say, some is a little controversial, but they talk about... they just describe feelings that I have felt in my life or times, so things that I could relate to. For the Street Cred, they could endorse anything that they want but it has to be something that... cuz these figures have a very powerful effect on a different type of population. I feel like they're powerful figures for that type of population cuz they're really cool and it speaks to someone like me, who's not from the streets and it speaks to someone from the streets.

T.N. (Male, Minority, Non-inner City)

I feel like I relate to Jay-Z and Usher because they’re black-- same with Oprah and Eve. I relate to Eminem because I feel like, with Eminem, he's always tried against the struggle or something internally. I feel like everyone regardless of whatever profession you're in, you always can relate to something that’s held you back, and it doesn't have to be drugs, it doesn't have to be anything like that. But you always have something stop you in a way.

I like Oprah because she's very successful and because she has a lot of emotional intelligence. She's very good at connecting with people, so I feel like I can connect with people and understand how people are coming from: what they feel, how they feel and make that connect with them. I feel like Oprah can do that very well and to a lot of people, clearly.

Jay-Z came from nothing and clearly doing his own thing, and breaking rules and social norms and things like that. So that's why I like him. And Eve, I just like Eve, I don't know why. I just like Eve. There's something about Eve. As an actress she's good, she sings a little bit so... I don't know, but I just like her as a person.

In all, the minority non-inner city respondents place the street credible endorser within their aspirational reference group. Like the inner-city respondents, for these consumers, the street credible endorsements were both important and memorable. This group of consumers perceived the endorsed product as being fun and of high quality. In addition, in agreement with McCracken (1989), the respondents indicated that ownership of products endorsed by street credible endorsements provides the consumer with some level of street credibility or, at the least, a badge the represents knowledge of what street
credibility is. In addition, street credible endorsers provide non-inner city minorities transportation fantasy just as it does for non-inner city non-minorities. Here the street credible endorsers, while similar in terms of race, also present a world that, for these consumers, is exotic and sublime.

T. A. (Female, Minority, Non-inner City)

“I think people who aren’t from the hood are attracted to the hood just because it’s, like for me, it does such a good job of painting one picture of it. They are attracted because the media is mostly the only reflection of it they will see.”

1.7.3.11 How Non-Minority, Non-inner City Respondents Relate to Street Credibility

Non-minority, non-inner city respondents share few life experiences with the street credible endorser. In their life stories, the obstacles reported by these respondents consisted of dealing with parents divorcing or being between jobs, people in high school being mean, and in some cases, reports of no obstacles at all. It is not that these respondents’ obstacles were not difficult for them but rather that, unlike the previous groups, these respondents did not share the specific life experiences within the streets or as minorities. Even those respondents that grew up poor indicated that they did not live in poor or dangerous neighborhoods. Thus, the endorsers’ meaning for them is not based on some form of identification, as it is with the previous groups. Rather, we find that the non-minority, non-inner city respondent attraction, as found in Study 2, is
based on the street credible endorser’s ability to provide escape and fantasy for these consumers.

K.A. (Female, Non-Minority, Non-inner City)

Now that I'm of age and I can go to a bar and a club, I haven't been to a ton of them, I can imagine them better. I don't imagine myself in them but when I'm hearing a song I play my own little music video in my head… If I hear Eminem Lose Yourself I just see him with his hood up and doing his little bouncy thing and I just see . . . you know how there's videos of different concert clips and you merge them all together, I just picture those types of deals and those situations. I actually, I used to think, “Oh you know what would be cool in this music video is if they put a whole bunch of people in random situations just singing along to the song…”

(Interviewer: Can you relate to that?) Not really. It's creative, it's not even that creative cuz it's just playing out what they're saying... In certain songs, not in every song. I can't say there's a reason why I would or wouldn't put myself in it. Just how much time I had, I guess. If I had a lot of time I'd think, “Yeah, what if I was in that situation.” But if I'm in the car listening to that song and then I'm out, I don't put that much time into thinking about it.

A.W. (Male, Non-Minority, Non-inner City)

Because you get a feel for what they had to go through. That’s why I like music a lot, because people are really singing about their life. You’re just, you’re almost getting kind of like time-warped into what they went through. And I think that’s powerful…You’re just kind of, I don’t know if time-warped is the right word to say, but it’s just like you’re transported into what they were feeling at that time. So you’re feeling the emotions that they may have been going through, having to sell those drugs to just feed themselves. So it’s like, wow, that’s something that I can’t even imagine, but it must have been so hard to do. So it’s just like you’re really feeling like the emotions that they went through…You almost try to like imagine yourself doing what they’re doing, listening, going okay. You can almost try to put yourself there just to try to walk in their shoes, per say. (Interviewer: So is that part of the enjoyment factor?) I think so, yes, because you’re also hearing about a different life that you probably don’t experience too often. I don’t live in a rough area, never have. I don’t think I ever will. So it’s like I will never be able to know what that’s like. But through their music, it’s like I can kind of see what it is they went through, what they had to go through. So I just think in that aspect it’s pretty cool that they get to share it…You know, I didn’t grow up very wealthy so it’s like I feel like in a way I was pretty poor growing up, so it did kind of suck, so I know that already sucks. But to go even below what I had, I feel like that would be, I don’t think anyone really would want that. I just feel like for someone to put
it in their songs, to say, “Hey, this is what people go through,” you don’t want that, you want to kind of end it. I don’t feel like, no, I don’t think I would want that. I don’t think anyone wants that. But I think through their music it’s cool that they’re putting it out there to really say “This shit is going on, we need to kind of end this.”

As in our earlier studies, for non-inner city, non-minority consumers, the attraction to these celebrities is based on entertainment and escapism. Here, the exotic and sublime provide an escape into a different and exciting world. In terms of what street credible product endorsements mean to non-inner city respondents, we find that these meanings are not as salient as they are with the other respondents. That is to say, that while non-minority, non-inner city respondents are attracted to street credible endorsers, they were able to directly report how, or if, this attraction is manifested in commercial endorsements. However, our findings indicate that for this segment, the meaning transferred from the street credible endorser to the product is tied to the fantasy produced by the endorser. Hence, while the respondents in other segments felt that street credible celebrities could endorse anything, the non-minority, non-inner city respondents overwhelming felt that street credible endorsers could only endorse products that were tied to street culture. This response indicates that the product affiliation for a street credible endorser was considered to be best when associated with the fantasy. Several respondents in this segment noted that street credible celebrities would be effective at endorsing energy drinks. While intuitively, this association may be linked to 50 Cent’s current energy drink endorsement, it may be equally due to a relationship between fantasy and energy that sparks this category coupling. That is, participation in fantasy may lead to the momentary removal from ones’ own stressful life and a feeling of invigoration upon return (Wohlfeil and Whelan 2012). Hence, the fantasy inspired by the
street credible endorser may be a source of energy, which consumers then associate with particular product categories that are seen as good matches for these endorsers. However, as the non-minority non-inner city respondents’ interviews proved less fruitful in detailing the relationship between the respondents and street credible endorsements, further research is needed to flesh out the meaning transferred within such exchanges.

1.7.3.12 Race, Social Class and Product Fit

Our findings in terms of construct definitions, antecedents and exemplars are consistent across our different samples. Inner-city respondents had a deeper and more salient attachment to the construct of street credibility. Inner-city respondents' definitions of street credibility were predicated on overcoming the obstacles associated with the plight of the streets. The requirement for authentic street origins and a real change in power and possessions that produces street credibility distinguishes it from the construct of cool, which anyone is able to acquire, imitate or purchase (Belk, 2006). That difference explains why, though it may be cool to have street credibility, having street credibility does neither make one cool, nor does being cool give one street credibility.

We find it particularly interesting that while inner-city consumers’ affinity for these celebrities is based on shared personal history, and non-minorities that are not from the inner-city hold affinity for the celebrities based on their ability to produce fantasies, non-inner city minorities’ affinity is based on both shared histories and the celebrity’s ability to evoke fantasy. This finding is consistent with the literature on attraction to figures based on similarities (see Bandura 1977, McGuire 1985 and Choi and Rifon 2007) on empathy, (Davis, 1980), and on consumers’ feelings of enjoyment generated by fantasy (Wohlfeil and Whelan 2012).
Notably, Williams and Qualls (1989) find that middle class minorities strongly relate to minority endorsers. This is due in part to their being more likely to identify themselves a member of an ethnic group and to rate their ethnicity as more important than their nationality than their non-minority counterparts. Therefore we propose:

**P3: The non-inner city minority consumers’ affinity for street credible endorsers is based on both inclusion of the celebrity in the consumers’ aspirational reference group and the endorser’s ability to provide the consumer with transportation fantasy experiences.** (see Figure 1.5).

To summarize, respondents believed that street-credible endorsers would be most effective when they were associated with products directly related to their area of expertise. This is consistent with the match-up hypothesis (Kamins, 1990; Kamins and Gupta, 1994; Till and Busler, 1998; Till and Busler, 2000). Thus, they are also able to endorse charity or street related products, services and organizations as well as high end products, due to their association with both ends of “the gap.” In addition, these endorsers can reach consumers across different racial and social demographic lines due to the consumers’ ability to relate to them on one of three levels; shared street life experiences, shared experiences as minorities, and relationships built on fantasy. In short the affinity for or relationship with the celebrity is based on different meanings that the celebrity holds for the consumer. This is in agreement with McCracken’s (1989), premise that the effectiveness of the endorser is determined by the meanings the endorser brings to the endorsed product, and these meanings are influenced by cultural aspects such as class and
race. Here we find these meanings surface as encouragement, excitement, and symbols of identity within product purchases.

1.8 Conclusion and Future Research

In conclusion, we define the construct of street credibility and examine the attraction of both urban and non-urban consumers to street credible endorsers. In short, street credibility is respect given to those who thrive within a culture of terror such as the street culture found within some inner-cities. Individuals who are able to succeed both within the culture of terror and the main-stream culture are endowed with more street credibility. Furthermore, we provided an explanation of the consumer attraction to street credible individuals. For inner-city minority consumers, the attraction is based on shared personal history. For the non-inner city, non-minority consumer, the attraction is based on fantasy. For the non-inner city minority consumer, the attraction is based on both personal histories and fantasy. These findings are seemingly inconsistent with previous theories of celebrity endorsement, that street credibility affords celebrities within both the urban and the mainstream populations. This emerging construct provides a simple blueprint for identifying street credible endorsers but stops short at discussing the social or moral implications that promoting such celebrity may entail. There are several additional areas of research within this emerging construct that should be explored. Most notable are 1) formal construct scale development; 2) testing the effects of street credible endorsers as they relate to urban and mainstream consumers; and 3) the transfer of street credibility from celebrities to brand categories. In addition, the following questions can be addressed: 4) will the street credible celebrity come to be seen as merely credible, and what variables moderate this process? 5) When is a street credible endorser more
attractive than an endorser who is merely cool? 6) Is street credibility a western or a global construct? 7) How does the endorser’s race moderate street credibility? Finally, our current respondents are college students. Future research should be conducted with a broader population.
**Table 1.1: How Street Credibility is Acquired and Lost**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Antecedent to Street Credibility</strong></th>
<th><strong>How Street Credibility is Lost (exemplars)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STREET LIFE</strong></td>
<td>Authentic Personal Origins and History</td>
<td>Falsifying Personal History (Vanilla Ice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street Smarts</td>
<td>“Stupidity” (Michael Vick)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street Toughness: Crime, Anger, Violence</td>
<td>“Snitching” or “Punking Out” (Hail Rail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACQUISITION OF POWER</strong></td>
<td>Physical Power</td>
<td>Being Physically Dominated or Intimidated (Ja Rule)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Power</td>
<td>Loss of Wealth (Michael Vick)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual Power</td>
<td>Homosexuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GAP</strong></td>
<td>Width of the Gap Between Street Origins and Current Possessions and Power</td>
<td>Decreasing the Gap (Michael Vick)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.2: Exemplars of Street Credibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Celebrity</th>
<th>Inner-city Consumers Identify as</th>
<th>Non-inner city Consumers Identify as</th>
<th>Street Life</th>
<th>Success</th>
<th>Large Gap Between Street and Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jay Z</td>
<td>Street Credible</td>
<td>Street Credible</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Cent</td>
<td>Street Credible</td>
<td>Street Credible</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eminem</td>
<td>Street Credible</td>
<td>Street Credible</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biggie</td>
<td>Street Credible</td>
<td>Street Credible</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Member</td>
<td>Street Credible</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TuPac</td>
<td>Street Credible</td>
<td>Street Credible</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Wayne</td>
<td>Street Credible</td>
<td>Street Credible</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamron</td>
<td>Street Credible</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waka Flocka Flame</td>
<td>Street Credible</td>
<td>Street Credible</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Jones</td>
<td>Street Credible</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obama</td>
<td>Street Credible</td>
<td>Street Credible</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P Diddy</td>
<td>Cool</td>
<td>Cool</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usher</td>
<td>Cool</td>
<td>Cool</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drake</td>
<td>Cool</td>
<td>Cool</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonas Brothers</td>
<td>Cool</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miley Cyrus</td>
<td>Cool</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Swift</td>
<td>Cool</td>
<td>Cool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.3: Study 3, Respondents by Gender and Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Inner</th>
<th>Non-Inner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inner-city</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.4: Study 3, Celebrity Endorsers Categorized as Street Credible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Celebrity Endorser</th>
<th>Number of Times Celebrities Were Categorized as Street Credible</th>
<th>Percentage of Times Celebrities Were Categorized as Street Credible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Z</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Cent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eminem</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oprah</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Brady</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwayne Wade</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Earnhardt Jr</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Beckham</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiger Woods</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Swift</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miley Cyrus</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Zeta-Jones</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Bieber</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1.1: Minority Inner-city Consumers’ Affinity for Street Credible Endorsers

Figure 1.2: Non-Minority, Non-inner City Consumers’ Affinity for Street Credible Endorsers
Figure 1.3: Photo Elicitation Category Collages Exercise

Figure 1.4: Word Cloud of Street Credible Endorsers

Based on the 20 most frequently used words in naming street credible exemplars, Study 3: Photo Elicitation
Figure 1.5: Non-inner City Minority Consumers’ Affinity for Street Credible Endorsers
2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 The Emergence of the Street Credible Endorser

Swimmer Michael Phelps became a national hero after winning eight gold medals in the 1998 Olympics. He rapidly acquired endorsement deals with major companies, such as Kellogg’s. However, when a photo of Phelps using recreational drugs surfaced, Phelps’ credibility was tarnished and Kellogg’s terminated its endorsement contract (Goldman and Bennett 2010). While Phelps retained some endorsements, it took him several years to rebuild his image and endorsement portfolio. This example of how a traditional celebrity can fall from grace is consistent with existing theories of celebrity endorsement—negative information or scandal decreases his or her persuasive power. The traditional understanding of celebrity endorsement, based on theories of persuasive communication and reference groups, explains Phelps’ story. However, it fails to explain the enduring or even increasing popularity of certain endorsers in the face of serious negative information. For example, the rapper Snoop Dogg served time in prison for felony narcotics possession prior to becoming a celebrity (Sheff 2006). Nevertheless, once a celebrity, his popularity actually increased while he faced a murder charge and endured several gun and lethal weapons charges as well as charges for assault, sexual assault, and drug possession (Sheff 2006). Traditional models of credibility would lead us to expect that both consumers and major marketers would shun Snoop Dogg. Yet, a
broad population of consumers still admires him, and he has endorsement deals with major marketers, such as Pepsi, EA Sports, Overstock.com and Adidas.

Since the 1980s, street credible celebrity endorsers have grown in importance. Some sources suggest that street credible celebrity endorsers will soon replace sports figures as the most important segment of product endorsers (McCarthy 2005a; McCarthy 2005b). In short, the growing attraction to street credible endorsers over several decades indicates that the popularity of this type of endorser is more than a mere fad. Snoop Dogg is one of a growing group of street credible endorsers. Street credible endorsers show little damage from association with negative information that would destroy a traditional endorser’s credibility. This paper delineates a new paradigm to explain consumers’ affinity to street credible endorsers.

2.1.2 The Ethos of Life on the Street

Traditional endorser status differs from that of the street credible endorser. The traditional endorser builds his or her status upon his or her accomplishments as a celebrity (Friedman, Termini, and Washington 1976; Patra and Datta 2010b). However, an endorser’s street credibility is based on his or her ability to garner respect within the tough inner cities. As outlined in our earlier research, street credibility is the respect and status given to individuals from poor and dangerous origins who, through experiences unique to their environments, have acquired street smarts. Moreover, these individuals have suffered through unique street life experiences that include crime and violence, and a pursuit of power. Here power is displayed in the form of physical dominance, favor from the opposite sex, and material possessions. Those individuals who are talented
enough to gain the highest levels of such power by their own means are endowed with the largest amount of street credibility.

The first component of street credibility is respect based on the ability to thrive within the culture of terror found within the inner-city. This ability is measured by the acquisition of money, power, and sexual favor among members of the opposite sex (Anderson 1990; Bourgois 2003; LeBlanc 2003; Venkatesh 2000; Venkatesh 2006; Venkatesh 2008). Within a culture of terror, such measures are most often accomplished through acts of crime (Bourgois 2003), resulting in a gained respect within the inner-city (Anderson 1990; Bourgois 2003; LeBlanc 2003; Venkatesh 2006; Venkatesh 2008).

The second component of street credibility is the acquisition of street smarts and being tough. Both are a means to protect oneself, others, and one’s belongings within a culture of terror. Gaining street smarts, or becoming street wise, occurs through experiences within street culture that makes one more proactive and less likely to be victimized (Anderson 1990; Bourgois 2003). A less passive form of protection is being tough (LeBlanc 2003). Being tough requires the will to engage in acts of violence when one’s belongings, person, reputation or character is threatened (Bourgois 2003; LeBlanc 2003; Venkatesh 2008).

The final component of street credibility is the ability to achieve what Bourgois (2003) terms as “cross over dreams”. This ability is the means to achieve success within the mainstream economy (Bourgois 2003). Street credible individuals are those who are able to thrive within the inner-city’s culture of terror. The most street credible individuals are able to move beyond socioeconomic barriers and lack of cultural capital to achieve
celebrity status through their accomplishments as entertainers (Bourgois 200; Venkatesh 2008).

2.1.3 Envisioning a New Perspective

There is a clear difference between the effects of negative information on traditional and street credible endorsers. Traditionally, celebrities are known for their accomplishments in sports and entertainment (Friedman, Termini, and Washington 1976). They use their public recognition to benefit a product or brand (McCracken 1989). Firms seek such celebrity endorsements because celebrities have a persuasive effect on consumers’ interpretation of the product, brand, or advertisement that leads to attitude change, purchase behavioral intent, and, ultimately, purchase behavior (Petty, Cacioppo, and Schumann 1983; Ohanian 1990; Ajzen 1991).

When the traditional endorser’s popularity fades, the firm normally severs the endorser product relationship. More notably, if the endorser is associated with negative information, his or her credibility diminishes, the consumer’s aspirations to be like the celebrity fade, and firms typically end the endorsement deal. Examples of this are reported in Table 2.1.

While the prior literature proposes models that explain the consumers attraction to traditional endorsers like Phelps, and the effect that negative information has on this attraction, little attention has been given to consumers' attraction to street credible celebrities, such as like Snoop Dogg, who are “bankable endorsers despite their negative actions” (Amos, Holmes and Strutton 2008). In contrast, street credible endorsers survive or even thrive on public knowledge of the celebrity’s evolvement in an illegal, immoral,
or highly unethical act. As a result firms seek out these artists in spite of their personas built on their history as drug dealers or association with other criminal or unethical acts. For example, Focus.com (2012) includes two street credible rap artists in their list of the 12 highest paid celebrity spokespeople. As the use and acceptance of street credible endorsers have increased over the years, the introduction of new conceptual models that explain this phenomena need to be introduced into the field.

The purpose of this conceptual paper is to provide an alternative perspective of consumers’ attraction to celebrities. This perspective differs from the traditional endorser credibility models and offers a feeling, fantasy and experiential consumption model to explain consumers’ attraction to non-traditional endorsers, such as those with street credibility. This perspective does not attempt to replace existing theories but instead provides an alternative view that, when combined with the traditional vantage point, offers a revised and more complete understanding of source persuasion.

Moreover, this paper examines differences in reactions to traditional and street credible endorsers and suggests that such indicate the need for a new paradigm to explain reactions to celebrity endorsers. In doing so, this paper will first discuss the marketing implications of celebrity endorsements. We will then provide an overview of two streams of the traditional literature on celebrity endorsement. In particular, we will first discuss the persuasive communications literature, from Hovland and his colleagues (i.e., Hovland and Weiss 1951; Hovland, Janis, and Kelley 1953) through Ohanian (1990). We will then discuss the literature on reference groups. Next, we present McCracken’s (1989) challenge to the existing endorsement literature. McCracken (1989) explains anomalies about which the traditional understanding of celebrity endorsement cannot explain.
observed phenomena. He further calls for an understanding of endorsement based on meaning provided by endorsers. We enlarge upon this by showing how reactions to street credible endorsers present further anomalies unexplained by the traditional theories. These anomalies need more explanation than McCracken (1989) provides. To address this, we broaden the field of endorser research to include works related to brand personality (Fournier 2005), relationships with brands (Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel 2004), and exoticism, fantasy, and experiential consumption (Holbrook and Hirschman 1982; Gilroy, Grossberg, and McRobbie 2000; Wohlfeil and Whelan 2012). We next present a feelings and fantasy, and experiential consumption model to describe the new paradigm further and demonstrate how it addresses the previously unexplained anomalies. Finally, we present this paper’s contributions and avenues for future research.

2.2 Overview of the Celebrity Endorsement Literature

2.2.1 Endorsers and Endorsements

Before discussing the research on consumer affinity towards celebrities, we will review characteristics of celebrities and the effects of celebrity endorsement. Friedman et al. (1976) propose that a celebrity is a figure widely known to the public for specific accomplishments. That is, prestigious people make celebrity endorsements rather than the average consumer (Friedman and Friedman 1979). The celebrity’s prestige increases or decreases based on his or her successful accomplishments. Thus, celebrity status may be long lasting or short-lived (Agrawal and Kamakura 1995). Traditionally, outstanding performance within the professional sports or entertainment realm generates such success (Choi and Rifon 2007; Frizzell 2011). Further, success in the public domain leads to the
celebrity being highly recognizable to mainstream consumers, having a fan base, and receiving media coverage (Patra and Datta 2010a).

McCracken (1989) argues that a celebrity endorsement requires a famous athlete or entertainer to use his or her public recognition to benefit a product or brand by appearing with it in an advertisement, thus endorsing the product or brand. These endorsements normally take one of four forms: explicit, implicit, imperative, and co-present. The explicit mode reflects a celebrity’s open endorsement of a product ("I endorse this product."). The implicit mode reflects a celebrity’s endorsement of a product through product use ("I use this product."). In the imperative mode, the celebrity recommends that consumers use the product ("You should use this product."). Finally, in the co-present mode, the celebrity only appears with the product. All of these modes are used to transfer meaning from the celebrity to the product (McCracken 1989).

2.2.2 Effects of Endorsement

Firms use celebrity endorsements because of their multiple positive effects within marketing communications. In particular, celebrity endorsement increases revenue and signals market performance. It has been estimated that Michael Jordan’s endorsements generated the contracting brands an approximate $10 billion in revenue over the course of his professional athletic career (Erdogan 1999). The announcement of signing a celebrity endorser is seen as a positive signal within the market and, thus, provides significant positive effects on abnormal stock returns (Agrawal and Kamakura 1995; Ding, Molchanov, and Stork 2011).
Researchers within the field of advertising and marketing have completed extensive studies on how the use of endorsements moderates various dimensions of consumer responsiveness to advertising. Dichter (1966) found that nearly 10% of purchases generated from word-of-mouth recommendations are the result of celebrity recommendations. This may be due in part to findings which stated that celebrity endorsements increased consumers’ recall (Friedman and Friedman 1979), favorability ratings (Atkin and Block 1983), and believability (Kamins 1990), and the endorsements signal product quality (Dean 1999) and indicate which products are intended for which consumer groups (Tantiseneepong, Gorton, and White 2012).

Celebrity endorsement aids in establishing brands. One mechanism for this is increased brand recall (Petty et al. 1983). Also, endorsement helps consumers to distinguish brands (Petty et al. 1983; Kamins 1990). Endorsement breaks through clutter (Choi and Rifon 2007) and increases both brand purchase intentions and attitude towards the brand (Lafferty and Goldsmith 1999; Carlson, Donavan, and Cumiskey 2009). Additional studies have shown celebrity endorsers are effective persuaders within the areas of non-profit marketing (Samman, McAuliffe, and MacLachlan 2009), public policy, and public health (Larson, Woloshin, Schwartz, and Welch 2005) as well as in the political policy arena (Jackson and Darrow 2005; Veer, Becirovic, and Brett A.S. Martin 2010; Frizzell 2011). The next section of this paper will present the dominant theoretical models in the traditional study of celebrity endorsement. These are appropriated from the social-psychological work on persuasive communication and reference groups.
2.2.3 Traditional Theories of Celebrity Endorsement

Within the lines of research on endorsement characteristics, three dominant models, the source credibility model, the source attractiveness model, and the match up hypothesis, have emerged. We next review each of these lines of research.

2.2.3.1 The Source Credibility Model

A large portion of research on endorsements draws on the persuasive communications literature in social psychology. From Hovland and Weiss (1951) to Amos, Holmes, and Strutton (2008), credibility has been identified as the major determinant of endorser persuasiveness. This approach has tried to delineate the characteristics of credibility. The Source Credibility Model (Hovland and Weiss 1951) suggests that persuasiveness depends on the trustworthiness or expertise of the source. Later work (McGinnies and Ward 1974) states that perceived trustworthiness is more influential than perceived expertise and that an endorser’s expertise and persuasiveness are strongly correlated (Aaker and Myers 1987).

2.2.3.2 Credibility and Attractiveness

McGuire’s Source Attractiveness Model (1985) posits that source attractiveness is dependent on familiarity, likability, and similarity as well as physical attractiveness. Other researchers have found similar results. For example, it has been found that an endorser’s level of physical attractiveness increases consumers’ affective ratings of products (Baker and Churchill 1977) and impact on sales (Joseph 1982). Debevec and Kernan (1984) suggest that attractive female models are more effective in persuading
male consumers to buy products they endorse. Additionally, when trust, likeability, and expertise are held at a constant, physical attractiveness also moderates an endorser’s credibility (Patzer 1983).

2.2.3.3 Likeability, Similarity, and Attractiveness

Likeability may also be captured within the measure of trust, as likeability is considered the dominant antecedent of trust (Friedman and Friedman 1979). McGuire (1985) states that likeability is affinity held for a source based on a source’s appearance and similarity to the audience. Here similarity is defined as a supposed resemblance between the source and the receiver of the message (McGuire 1985; McCracken 1989). Several scholars have suggested that an attraction to a celebrity endorser is, in part, due to the consumer’s ability to identify with the endorser due to the endorser’s holding attributes that the consumer considers as being personally similar to him or herself. Kelman’s Social Influence Theory (1961) states that identification with a celebrity increases a celebrity’s influence as individuals derive satisfaction from their belief that they are like the celebrity in some aspect. Bandura’s (1977) Social Cognitive Theory states that a person’s likelihood of enacting a behavior depends on that person’s identification with the model. Moreover, Williams and Qualls (1989), Deshpande and Stayman (1994) and Choi and Rifon (2007) contend that consumers have been shown to be persuaded more by endorsers who share their ethnicity and therefore, are seen as trustworthy and attractive.
2.2.3.4 Credibility as a Composite Measure

Credibility as a single measure has less effect on persuasion than a composite credibility score comprising trustworthiness, attractiveness, and expertise (Simons, Berkowitz, and Moyer 1970; Baker and Churchill 1977; Patzer 1983; Ohanian 1990; Ohanian 1991). Amos et al. (2008) suggest that the construct of credibility has additional source effects that are yet to be determined.

Building on the source credibility model and the source attractiveness model, Ohanian (1990) developed a model of credibility based on trustworthiness, expertise, and physical beauty (see Figure 2.1). Ohanian also developed a scale to measure endorser credibility as defined by this model. Within Ohanian’s (1990) model and scale, for endorser credibility, trust is defined as the consumers’ acceptance of and confidence in the endorser. Trustworthiness is measured as a composite of scores for the terms “dependable, reliable, honest, sincere, and trustworthy” (Ohanian 1990).

According to Ohanian (1990), expertise is the measure of the endorser’s education or work in the appropriate field. Here, perceived expertise has a positive impact on attitude change and behavioral intent (Ohanian 1990). To this end, “expert, experienced, knowledgeable, qualified, and skilled” are common terms used to measure the dimension of expertise (Ohanian 1990). Ohanian (1990) uses the terms “attractive, classy, handsome/beautiful, and elegant” to measure physical beauty as an aspect of attractiveness.

The multidimensional aspect of credibility as a determinant of celebrity effectiveness was verified by Amos et al. (2008). These researchers explored the relationship between celebrity endorser effects and advertising effectiveness by
conducting a meta-analysis of 32 journal articles spanning over 30 years of endorsement literature. They found that among the nine moderating variables in question, trustworthiness had the most positive influence on attitudes toward the ad, attitudes toward the brand, and purchase intentions. The second and third most influential source effects were followed by expertise and attractiveness respectively.

2.2.3.5 The Match-up Hypothesis

The Match-up Hypothesis (Kamins 1990; Kamins and Gupta 1994; Till and Busler 1998; Till and Busler 2000) reports that endorsements increase in persuasiveness when there is a strong relationship between the product category and the endorser’s expertise or attractiveness. This hypothesis builds on the work of Friedman and Friedman (1979) who declare that certain types of endorsers are significantly more persuasive at endorsing certain types of products. For example, a professional basketball player’s expertise in basketball would make him a more effective endorser for a basketball-related product than the average person. The same could be said about an attractive celebrity’s endorsement of a personal hygiene or beauty product. This is, in part, due to consumers questioning the believability of the endorser when the fit between the celebrity and the product isn’t clear (Erdogan 1999). Hsu and McDonald (2002) find that a celebrity’s and product’s fit positively affects consumers’ attitudes towards the product, ad recall, product recognition, purchase intention, willingness to pay higher prices, and view of the celebrity as credible. That is to say, the endorsement is more believable.
In agreement, the elaboration likelihood model (Petty and Cacioppo 1986) suggests that strong arguments, including an expert source, are persuasive when elaboration is high. That is to say, that when the expertise of the celebrity is matched-up with the endorsed product, the endorsement becomes a strong central argument. Amos et al. (2008) also find that the source product fit is indeed important and suggest that future studies should include interactions between celebrity product fit and other source effects. In the next section, we will discuss the second traditional theoretical basis of celebrity endorsement effects—reference groups.

2.2.3.6 Reference Groups

While the credibility literature focuses on what meanings make an endorser persuasive, the reference group literature focuses on how such endorsers are used by consumers to provide meaning to themselves as well as others within the world in which they operate.

Hyman (1942) originally described “reference groups” as groups to which individuals compare themselves. Later work suggests that reference groups have two key functions, as a source of self-appraisal (comparative) and a source of identifying personal norms, values, and attitudes (Kelley 1947). Further research separated reference groups into “in-groups,” consisting of individuals who are given affinity due to their inter-category similarities and “out-groups,” which are constituted of those who are disassociated from the “in-group” and are often feared or disliked and avoided (Allport 1954; Brewer 2007; Tajfel 1982).
Individuals use in-groups and out-groups to identify and define themselves within the context of others and their surroundings. By doing so, one builds a construct of oneself. The need to define oneself in relation to groups leads to a desire to fit within an identified in-group. This need further leads to conforming to the norms of the in-group. Indeed, research findings suggest that in-group members are one of the most important determinants of an individual’s evaluations, aspirations, and behavior (Burnkrant and Cousineau 1975; Park and Lessig 1977). In agreement, the Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen 1991) describes these subjective norms as one of the major determinants of behavioral intention.

Celebrities are likely to be members of aspirational reference groups. An aspirational reference group is constituted of people an individual wishes to be like in some way and who the individual holds in the highest of esteem (Choi and Rifon 2007; Ohanian 1990). People may aspire to have the characteristics of aspirational reference group members with whom they expect no interaction (Park and Lessig 1977).

Because celebrities may still be included in consumers’ in-groups (Kamins 1990; Carlson et al. 2009), their behavior provides standards of achievement to which consumers aspire (Childers and Rao 1992). Purchasing products endorsed by celebrities helps consumers create a self-concept and personal image (Ball and Tasaki 1992; Kleine, Kleine, and Kernan 1993).

Because purchasing products endorsed by aspirational reference group members helps consumers express who they are, a reference group’s influence is greater on product and brand choice decisions when there is a chance for public observation of product consumption. Moreover, luxuries are more subject to reference group influence than
necessities are (Childers and Rao 1992). Thus, identification with reference groups is closely related to the perception that “We are what we own” (Belk 1988). Moreover, purchasing products endorsed by celebrities helps consumers to “construct the self” and to communicate who the self is to other people (Escalas and Bettman 2003). Consequently, consumers with self-verification goals are more influenced by in-group members and take on behaviors that are consistent with their self-constructs (Escalas and Bettman 2003). In short, this line of research suggests that consumers conform to and mimic the perceived purchase behaviors of celebrity endorsers who are members of their aspirational reference groups.

2.3 Anomalies in the Old Paradigms for Understanding Celebrity Endorsement

As we have seen, methods and theories for understanding celebrity endorsers have roots over 50 years old. The introduction of street credible endorsers has led to reactions that are inconsistent with the theoretical predictions of the traditional theories. These anomalies lead to concerns regarding the adequacy or scope of the traditional theories. Fortunately, in the past 30 years, new paradigms have evolved for studying and understanding consumption. While the focus of these theories has been on consumption, they are very fruitful for understanding communications phenomena, such as celebrity endorsement. These new paradigms resolve many of the anomalies of consumers’ enduring affinity towards street credible endorsers in the presence of negative information.

In this section, we will summarize the old paradigms that have been presented earlier in this paper and describe anomalies that cannot be explained by these paradigms.
Some of these anomalies were reported by McCracken (1989) and Amos et al, (2008). Others result from observations of consumer reactions to street credible endorsers.

2.3.1 Main Features of the Old Paradigm

The first aspect of the traditional view focuses on persuasive communication and concludes that effective endorsers are deemed trustworthy, expert, and attractive. These positive qualities can be quantified—a YMCA director might serve as a persuasive endorser, but a Nobel Prize winning scientist is more persuasive because of his or her higher level of expertise (Bochner and Insko 1966). The more positive qualities an endorser has, the better he or she will be at being persuasive. The second aspect of the traditional view of endorser credibility places endorsers within consumers’ aspirational reference groups. Consumers aspire to be like these individuals. Membership in aspirational reference groups is connected with a cluster of related attitudes (Newcomb and Charters 1950).

In these traditional approaches, negative information about a celebrity endorser decreases the persuasive power and credibility of the endorser. Within the existing paradigm, association with negative information includes involvement in illegal, unethical, or immoral acts. When these acts become public knowledge, they are considered celebrity scandals that can affect the endorsed brand (Ohanian 1991; Fournier 1998; Till and Busler 1998; Erdogan 1999; Erdogan and Drollinger 2008). Negative information is also the most influential moderator of a celebrity’s effectiveness in advertising, even more so than trustworthiness, expertise, or attractiveness (Amos et al. 2008). Jain, Sudha, and Daswani (2009) find that being “non-controversial” is perceived
to be an important factor for celebrity endorsers. As a result, firms tend to end
endorsement relationships under these conditions. However, as we have seen, the street
credible endorser, whose celebrity persona is based on negative acts, contradicts these
traditional models.

2.3.2 McCracken’s (1989) Description of Anomalies in the Old Paradigm

McCracken (1989) argues that the universally accepted theories of endorser
credibility fail to reflect the full characteristics of the celebrity endorsement process.
According to these models, the persuasiveness of the celebrity endorser reflects measures
of credibility. However, these models have not served as practical or theoretical guides to
celebrity endorsement. For example, in the late 1980’s Bill Cosby was an effective
These anomalies exist because the traditional theories do not explain how the endorser's
image actually interacts with different products or with the creative direction of the
advertisement.

McCracken (1989) points out that because the traditional models do not consider
the “compelling and useful meanings” of celebrities, they do not allow us to discriminate
between celebrities. For example, Ohanian’s (1990) credibility scale may indicate that
David Beckham and 50 Cent are equally trustworthy and attractive and hold equal levels
of expertise but does not indicate their differences in symbolic meanings or uses. These
symbolic differences may explain the failure of highly credible endorsers as well as the
success of those with lower credibility scores. Such anomalies suggest that celebrities’
persuasiveness is built on more than just the traditional construct of credibility. Rather,
celebrity endorsers hold additional meanings that consumers find compelling and useful. These necessitate new research models.

2.3.3 Anomalies Resulting From the Popularity of Street Credible Endorsers

In general, the popularity of street credible endorsers with histories of street life and acts of crime and violence is inconsistent with the old paradigm. Because their celebrity is built on past and present involvement in scandalous acts, their popularity is anomalous from the perspective of the traditional view. According to the literature described above, the negative information about these celebrities should render them ineffective as endorsers.

However, street credible endorsers with criminal reputations have been securing effective product endorsements across multiple product categories. Consumers’ affinity towards these celebrities contradicts the traditional literature on celebrity’s association with negative information.

A second anomaly occurs when street credible endorsers are involved in scandals. This example is highlighted in the contrast between Michael Phelps and Snoop Dogg that appeared in the introduction to this paper. Michael Phelps lost major endorsements for appearing in a photo with drug paraphernalia. In contrast, street credible endorsers retain or gain popularity from being involved in certain scandals. For instance, Snoop Dogg did not lose his appeal despite ongoing criminal activities and convictions at the height of his career. Indeed, Amos (2008) calls for more research on such celebrities, stating that “research is surely needed on celebrities who portray the ‘bad boy’ or ‘bad girl’ image and their effectiveness as celebrity endorsers. These sorts of anti-celebrities may transfer
a certain image of danger, risk, or toughness that may appeal to some consumers or alienate others. The prospect of either outcome should be more thoroughly examined.”

The application of the reference group perspective cannot fully explain away these anomalies. While it is intuitive that a rebellious teenager may place someone who is street credible within his or her aspirational reference group, it is harder to apply the same logic to other consumers who show affinity towards these celebrities. More specifically, Bialik (2005) reports that according to MRI data, Caucasian adult consumers between the ages of 18 and 35 purchase 70–75% of music produced by street credible recording artists. It is harder to imagine that the majority of these adults are aspiring to rebel. Because the traditional theories of celebrity endorsement cannot explain these anomalies, we must look in a different direction to understand consumers’ affinity towards street credible celebrities. In the next section, we will describe a new paradigm for understanding celebrity endorsement that resolves these anomalies and incorporates many of the new perspectives in consumer research.

2.4 The New Paradigm

To develop a better understanding of celebrity endorsement effects, we ground our view on McCracken’s (1989) rationale that new models need to be constructed explaining how the meanings celebrities hold for consumers play out in the endorsement process. We extend McCracken’s (1989) view by arguing that celebrity effectiveness is based on the useful meanings derived from relationships, feeling and fantasy, and experiential consumption.
McCracken (1989) states that consumers do not hold the celebrity in high esteem because the celebrity has accomplished what the consumer aspires to accomplish but rather the celebrity holds certain social and cultural meanings that are relevant to the consumer. As depicted in Figure 2.2, cultural meaning, such as persona and lifestyle, move from the celebrity endorser to endorsed product, and, finally, to the life of the consumer through product purchase and consumption (McCracken 1989). Hence, endorsements are successful when the properties of the endorser are transferred to the endorsed product and to the consumer through product purchase and use. While he was not considering street credible endorsers, McCracken (1989) called for a new paradigm based on the meaning of celebrity endorsement.

This paper presents such a new paradigm, which addresses the anomalies in reactions and the failure of the traditional approaches to explain the street credible endorser. To construct this new view, work by other scholars inside and outside of the marketing discipline provides a foundation that is broader than McCracken’s (1989) seminal article suggests. In doing so we also answer Holbrook and Hirschman’s (1982) call for an exploration of paradigms in which consumption is based on experiences that result in feelings, fantasy, and fun. Holbrook and Hirschman (1982) posit that researchers should incorporate an experiential view of consumer behavior, which focuses on not only the symbolic but also the hedonic and esthetic nature of consumption. Our view of relationships, feelings and fantasy, and experiential consumption builds on this work.
2.4.1 Elements of the New Paradigm: Relationships, Feelings and Fantasies, and Experiential Consumption

Within this new paradigm, the celebrity’s meaningful uses (McCracken 1989) are explained through relationships, feelings, fantasies, and experiential consumption. Here, consumers form relationships with celebrities, which allow them, through fantasy and transformation, to escape from the stress or complications of their everyday lives through adventures with the celebrity (Wohlfeil and Whelan 2012). These escapes lead to the celebrity providing the consumer with feelings of pleasure, which strengthen the relationship (Wohlfeil and Whelan 2012). Such feelings and fantasies are re-energized through experiential purchases of products (Holbrook and Hirschman 1982) that are associated with the celebrity (Wohlfeil and Whelan 2012) (see Figure 2.3). Next, we will discuss each of these points in detail.

2.4.1.1 Relationships, Feelings and Fantasy, and Experiential Consumption

Relationships may take many forms and provide several possible relational, social-cultural, or psychological benefits for their participants (Fournier 2005). Relationship themes may take on many forms and purposes, such as providing oneself with rewards or enhancing one’s own feelings (Fournier 2005). In addition, relationships may allow the consumer to resolve tension and conflict in everyday life by providing the consumer with a means of escape through fantasy. This escape includes consumption of feelings, fantasy, and fun when stress is temporarily replaced with hedonic indulgence (Holbrook and Hirschman 1982).
Hirschman (1983) indicates that individuals regularly participate in activities that allow them to project themselves into a fantasy role. This projection may be a self-reward or an effort to escape by providing the self with distractions from the stress or unpleasantness of one’s own reality (Hirschman and Holbrook 1982). According to the narrative transportation theory (Gerrig 1993, Green and Brock 2000), in these instances, consumers’ tensions are placated by transference into visualizations of himself or herself as living in a distant world through third party or self-generated narratives (Wohlfeil and Whelan 2012). This activation of consumers’ escapism towards celebrity-based fantasy over actual lived experiences is evident in consumer compulsion, captivation, and fascination with the celebrity (Kerrigan, Brownlie, Hewer, and Daza-LeTouze 2011).

This activation may take the form of engagements with books, movies, music, or TV shows (Hirschman and Holbrook 1982) and spark or provide a platform for further daydreaming and fantasy (Wohlfeil and Whelan 2012).

Fantasies transport consumers into the story through a focused visualization or other action that is both cognitive and emotional. Thus, the consumer is temporarily “inaccessible” and then returns from the journey somewhat altered by the trip (Wohlfeil and Whelan 2012). These fantasies lead the consumer to feel as if he or she knows or even loves the celebrity as one would a friend, family member, or significant other (Wohlfeil and Whelan 2012). For example, Wohlfeil and Whelan (2012) provide evidence that such relationships may provide relief for someone who feels isolated or lonely. Here, the consumer’s visualizing himself or herself in a relationship with a celebrity dissipates the feelings of isolation and loneliness. In these cases, relationships are often “para-social”, private and secretive in nature (Wohlfeil and Whelan 2012).
Consequently, consumer affinity towards the celebrity relationship partner is not
dependent on the partner’s inclusion in reference groups or the construction of one’s self-
construct. Rather, consumer affinity builds on the celebrity’s ability to help the consumer
escape the stress and conflict of his or her current surroundings (Wohlfeil and Whelan
2012).

As Hirschman (1983) points out, consumers purchase goods that aid them in
supplementing reality with a desired unreality or fantasy. The purchase of items
associated with the celebrity relationship partner increases the salience of these
relationships, re-energizes the feelings and fantasy, and results in experiential
consumption (Luo et al. 2010). Such an experiential re-engagement (imagery, daydreams,
and emotions) that occurs during the consumption of the endorsed product is just as
important as the satisfaction with the product itself (Holbrook and Hirschman 1982).
Consequently, while symbolic consumption suggests that purchases aid in the
construction of the self and the projection to others of that self, experiential consumption
is based on the construction of feelings and fantasy that may be associated with private
needs and desires (Wohlfeil and Whelan 2012). It is the desire to fulfill the personal
needs that drives the consumption of information or items associated with the celebrity
(Wohlfeil and Whelan 2012).

2.4.1.2 Moderators of Feelings, Fantasy, and Fun

Feelings derived from fantasy are moderated by congruence between celebrity
brand personality and negative information, exoticism, and the sublime. The brand
relationship literature suggests that while some transgressions are forgivable, the brand
personality of the transgressor moderates forgiveness. The two most prominent brand personality types are sincere and exciting (Aaker et al. 2004). Sincere brands foster relationships built around concepts of warmth, nurturance, family orientation, and traditionalism. In addition, they communicate trustworthiness and dependability (Aaker et al. 2004). Exciting brand relationships, on the other hand, are comprised of concepts of being energetic, daring, spirited, cool, imaginative, unique, current, trendy, and independent (Aaker et al. 2004). These brands communicate excitement, cultural vitality, and differentiation from the incumbent (Aaker et al. 2004). Relationships with sincere brands suffer when negative information about the brand partner is introduced (Aaker et al. 2004). This change is due to the negative information interrupting the congruence of the fantasies produced by the sincere persona. In contrast, when negative information is introduced into the relationship with the exciting brand, the information is congruent with the brand personality and feelings of disappointment or stress are avoided (Aaker et al. 2004). Applying these findings to celebrities as human brands, we conclude that exciting celebrity relationship partners can endure certain types of scandals that the sincere celebrity relationship partners cannot. Furthermore, negative information congruent with the personality of the exciting celebrity will enhance the excitement and provide a new stimulus for fantasy as opposed to destroying it.

Enjoyment found in narratives of fantasy is moderated by both exoticism and the sublime. Hirschman (1983) states that to seek both novelty and a sensation derived from danger is a characteristic related to those who engage in self-projected fantasy. Seeking novelty and such sensations derived from danger may be further explained in terms of exoticism and the sublime respectively. Exoticism, the affinity to adopt what is novel,
wild, exotic, or not native, is common within the world of entertainment. Indeed, certain new phenomena provide an interesting form of exoticism and fantasy (Gilroy et al. 2000). Here, a concept from distant and dangerous places both increases and holds consumers’ fascination and interest. For example, exoticism explains suburban white males’ interest in gangster rap in the 1990’s (Gilroy et al. 2000). In addition to exoticism, the element of a danger, which is real, increases the sense of enjoyment in fantasy. Excitement derived from “real life” dangerous situations is the result of the sublime (Phillips and McQuarrie 2010). Here, the consumer can enjoy the idea of real-life pain or danger because it is not actually present. This removal of actual danger reduces fear associated with the danger. This reduction, coupled with the sense of reality, is enthralling for the consumer (Phillips and McQuarrie 2010). Therefore, relationships provide feelings of fantasy that aid consumers in escaping from their everyday lives. Here, negative information, exoticism, and the sublime moderate these fantasies. We will next discuss how these relationship, feelings, and fantasies lead to the purchase of endorsed products.

2.4.2 Resolving the Anomalies in the Old Paradigm

While the traditional models cannot easily explain consumer affinity to the street credible endorser, this phenomenon is easily understood when viewed through the relationship, feelings, fantasy, and experiential consumption framework. Here, relationships are beneficial to consumers as they provide an escape from stress or conflict (Fournier 1998). Through this view, the consumer’s relationship with street credible endorsers is not built on credibility or reference group membership but rather on the endorser’s ability to help the consumer escape into fantasy. For example, a street credible
endorser’s rap narrative is visualized in the consumer’s mind and he or she, as the artist or with the artist, is living in a different world, if only for a short time. It is the escape that the consumer finds useful and therefore makes the street credible endorser a viable relationship partner. That is to say, consumers are not drawn to the source characteristics of credibility or that of street credibility but rather the deeper meanings these characteristics attempt to measure and how these meanings are useful to the consumer in some way (McCracken 1989).

While the association with negative information decreases celebrity effectiveness in the traditional models, it may be an asset within our framework. We argue that street credible endorsers have exciting personalities and produce exciting fantasies. Returning to the vantage point that the celebrity is a human brand and that exciting brand relationships are unaffected or enhanced in light of negative information, association with some forms of negative information will increase the congruence between the street credible endorser and exciting fantasies.

The street credible endorser provides non-inner city consumers with narratives that are both exotic and sublime. The endorser’s tales of street lore are both distant and dangerous and, therefore, more intriguing. As Sheff (2005) explains, the street credible celebrity’s engagement in certain acts of crime or violence increases consumers’ perception that their narratives are both real and dangerous. Hence, these transgressions increase both the exotic and sublime characteristics of the endorsers and their world. This adds to the fantasy and makes the celebrity and the fantasies they evoke more exciting. In agreement with Aaker et al. (2004), relationships with exciting personalities may endure or even be strengthened by the partner’s acts of transgressions. Therefore, this
new paradigm better explains how acts that are traditionally considered as “bad” can actually be “good”.

2.4.3 Dual Paradigms

In agreement with Kuhn (1957), we argue that two paradigms explaining a phenomenon may co-exist. In one sense, “dual paradigms” refers to the competition between the paradigms for scientific approval. In another sense, different paradigms may have different efficacy for explanations in different domains. For instance, Newtonian mechanics work well in most situations on earth, but relativity is needed to explain interstellar or subatomic phenomena.

Two different domains of explanation are also the case with the street credible endorser. For the majority of consumers, who are from the non-inner city, street credible endorsers offer an escape into a world of fantasy. However, this is not the case for the inner-city consumers. For the inner-city consumer, affinity for the street credible endorser is rooted in the older paradigm of credibility and aspirational reference group. Here, the street credible endorser is seen as both an expert and as attractive. This is due to shared similar personal history as well as the endorser’s ability to succeed within the context of street culture and beyond. Accordingly, for the inner-city consumer, the street credible endorser has credibility, is seen as a member of the aspirational reference group, and triggers symbolic consumption of the endorsed products.

2.5 Contribution and Future Research

This paper contributes to the greater body of work by introducing an alternative view of how consumers relate to celebrity endorsers. In doing so, this paper attempts to
both build on the useful meanings that celebrities may have (McCracken 1989) and shed light on why consumers may be attracted to endorsers regardless of his or her association to negative information. Our view of celebrity endorsements suggests that celebrity usefulness is found in entertainment that leads to escapism through fantasy. Thus, the most valuable celebrity endorser may be the one that is best at evoking consumer fantasy. While this paper uses the street credible endorser as an example of an anomaly in the old paradigm, the applications of our alternative view help to explain consumers’ attraction to other non-traditional endorsers. For instance, Charlie Sheen, a non-street credible celebrity, was able to gain endorsements amidst a divorce, sex, and drug scandal. We categorize Sheen as a “train wreck” type of endorser. When consumers focus on Sheen’s own depravity the consumer is allowed an avenue of temporary escape from his or her own problems. It is possible that there are other categories of non-traditional endorsers whose attraction to consumers is better explained by the relationship feeling fantasy and experiential consumption model. Future research in this area is suggested. Moreover, future research on the viability of the model is also warranted.

We propose that there are three areas of research that should be investigated. First, the application of brand measures and the brand relationship model to celebrities should be further investigated. Do consumers forgive celebrities with certain brand personality types more readily than those with other brand personality types? Second, celebrities’ ability to evoke fantasy and the role that negative information plays in celebrity fantasy generation need to be explored. Questions that may be investigated include do different celebrity types lead to different types of fantasy generation and what role does similarity to the endorser play in these relationships? Finally, the concept of
experiential consumption as driven by celebrity relationships need to be further investigated. Is there a level of congruence between endorsements of fantasy based products and endorsers who evoke fantasy based relationships? For example, street credible celebrities currently endorse video games, a medium that allows for consumers’ active participation in fantasy. Are these endorsements effective and if so is this due to the congruence between celebrity and product fantasy? Would a traditional endorser have a stronger or weaker effect on consumer attitude, purchase intent, recall? Investigation in all three areas should include both qualitative and quantitative studies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Celebrity</th>
<th>Scandal</th>
<th>Lost Endorsement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kobe Bryant</td>
<td>Sexual assault charges</td>
<td>Sprite, Nutella, and McDonald's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiger Woods</td>
<td>Multiple extra marital affairs</td>
<td>AT&amp;T, Accenture and Gatorade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Moss</td>
<td>Alleged cocaine use</td>
<td>H&amp;M, Chanel, and Burberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry Bonds</td>
<td>Steroid use allegations</td>
<td>MasterCard, KFC, and Charles Schwab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Rooney</td>
<td>Extra marital affair/prostitute solicitation</td>
<td>Coca-Cola and Tiger Beer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Vick</td>
<td>Dog fighting</td>
<td>Nike and Rawlings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Brown</td>
<td>Felony Assault Charges (on a woman)</td>
<td>Wrigley’s Gum, American Dairy Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose Canseco</td>
<td>Arrested for Illegal Possession of a Handgun</td>
<td>California Egg Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary-Kate and Ashley Olsen</td>
<td>Rehab for Eating Disorders (Mary –Kate had the disorder)</td>
<td>Dairy Association of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Stone</td>
<td>Blaming the Sichuan Earthquake on China's &quot;bad karma&quot;</td>
<td>Christian Dior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison Chen (Hong Kong Actor)</td>
<td>Erotic Videos with Fans</td>
<td>Samsung, Pepsi, and Levi’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madonna</td>
<td>Released Video that Offended Catholics</td>
<td>Pepsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Phelps</td>
<td>Alleged marijuana use</td>
<td>Kellogg’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsey Lohan</td>
<td>Alleged drug use/rehab</td>
<td>Jill Stuart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Roethlisberger</td>
<td>Sexual assault allegations</td>
<td>PLB Sports, Big Ben’s Beef Jerkey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2.1: Ohanian’s (1990) Model for Endorser Credibility

Figure 2.2: McCracken’s (1989) Meaning Transfer Model

Figure 2.3: Relationships, Feelings, Fantasy, and Experiential Consumption
CHAPTER 3:
MEASUREMENT AND ANALYSIS OF THE CONSUMER - STREET CREDIBLE ENDORSERS FANTASY BASED RELATIONSHIPS

3.1 Street Credible Endorsers

Celebrity endorsements play an important part in the today's marketing landscape. These endorsements help firms increase brand recall (Friedman and Friedman 1979; Petty et al. 1983), break through clutter (Choi and Rifon 2007) and differentiate brands (Petty et al. 1983; Kamins 1990). As a result of such effectiveness, it has been estimated that up to 20% of all televised commercials now include celebrity endorsers (Agrawal and Kamakura 1995; Creswell 2008; Elberse and Verleun 2012). More recently, a new and important type of endorser, the street credible endorser has emerged. These endorsers are predicted to replace sports stars as the most important type of celebrity spokesperson (Patrick 2005). Two street credible celebrities are currently listed among the twelve richest celebrity spokespersons (Focus.com 2012). However, very little research has been focused on understanding consumers’ affinity toward these endorsers.

Our own qualitative research states that street credible endorsers are celebrities with poor and dangerous origins who have lived through experiences unique to such environments. These experiences include exposure to crime and violence, and a pursuit of power. As a result, the celebrities have acquired street smarts and a tough persona and have gained power in the form of physical dominance, favor from the opposite sex, and material possessions by their own means. Moreover, by achieving celebrity status, these individuals widen the gap between their origins and their current level of power and possession. In doing so, they increase their level of street credibility.
While consumer affinity for traditional celebrity endorsers decreases when these endorsers are associated with negative information (Amos et al. 2008), our earlier research indicates that consumer affinity for street credible endorsers is maintained or even increased when he or she is associated with certain scandals. This occurrence creates an anomaly within existing marketing research. Our own qualitative research addresses this anomaly by suggesting that such enduring affinity is based on the street credible celebrity’s ability, through their tales of street life, to provide consumers a means of escape through fantasy. This escapism allows the consumer a break from their own daily stress and makes the celebrity a useful relationship partner. This is captured in our model of Relationships, Feelings, Fantasy, and Experiential Consumption. Building on McCracken’s Meaning Transfer Model and consumer and fantasy research by Hirschman and Holbrook (1982), Hirschman (1983) and Wohlfeil and Whelan (2012), this model posits that celebrity evoked fantasies are associated with the celebrity endorser product and that the fantasy is reenergized to some degree when the product is consumed. Here, the street credible celebrity’s involvement in certain scandals adds to the fantasy. To date, this model, and some of its basic assumptions, has not been empirically tested.

3.2 Literature Review and Research Questions

One basic assumption of the Relationships, Feelings, Fantasy, and Experiential Consumption Model is that consumers may hold a relationship with celebrities in a similar fashion to those they hold with brands. This is based on the premise that 1) celebrities are human brands and 2) that the consumer-human brand relationship’s strength and endurance are moderated by the brand personality type.
Prior research has classified well-known celebrities in marketing communications as human brands (Thomson 2006). Further, Kerrigan, Brownlie, Hewer, and Daza-LeTouze (2011) suggest that celebrities, acting as brands, are engines of celebrity culture which can be consumed like a branded product. Because no previous research has compared the brand personality of traditional and street credible endorsers, our first research question is as follows:

R1) Are the brand personalities of traditional and street credible endorsers different?

Our Relationships, Feeling, Fantasy, and Experiential Consumption Model posits that celebrity endorsers evoke fantasy. It has been determined that consumers make themselves feel better through fantasy (Hirschman and Holbrook, 1982; Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982; Wohlfeil and Whelan, 2012). In addition, studies indicate that fantasies may take on many forms, including empathy and transportation (Davis’s 1980; Green and Brock’s 2000; Wohlfeil and Whelan 2012). Further, Wohlfeil and Whelan (2012) propose that consumer relationships with celebrities may be based on the celebrities’ ability to activate or spark these types of fantasies.

To date, research on celebrity based fantasies is scant. Therefore, in this paper, we question whether celebrities assist in the creation of fantasy. In addition, we investigate if there is congruence between fantasy and celebrity type.

R2) Do traditional and street credible endorsers evoke different types of fantasies?
3.3 The Case for Scale Development

The exploration of street credibility and its effects on fantasy necessitates the development of reliable and valid scales. To this end, we seek to develop separate scales for the measurement of 1) the characteristics of street credibility and 2) the level and type of fantasy that celebrities evoke in consumers. We follow the works of Aaker (1987), Ohanian (1991), and Brakus (2009) in our construction of a street credibility scale that measures the antecedents of street credibility. Next, we draw from the literature on consumer fantasy and transportation (Davis 1980; Hirschman and Holbrook 1982; Holbrook 1982; Escalas and Stern 2003; Escalas 2004; Escalas 2007; Wohlfeil and Whelan 2012) to construct a scale that measures both identity and transportation fantasy.

3.4 Street Credibility Scale Development

3.4.1 Study 1: Item Generation

To build a scale that accurately measures street credibility, we first reviewed the ethnographic works on street life and street culture by Anderson (1990), LeBlanc (2003) and Bourgois (2003). An examination from the descriptions of the life experiences captured in these studies resulted in the generation of 86 words, adjectives, and descriptive phrases that refer to street credible individuals or acts that exemplified street credibility or a lack thereof. We next reviewed our original qualitative research consisting of over 70 hours of in-depth interviews with minority and non-minority college students on the subject of street credibility and street credible celebrities. This analysis resulted in an additional set of 197 words, adjectives and descriptive phrases for
a total of 283 items that measured how street credibility is gained and increased, including 49 items (reverse coded) that measured a lack or loss of street credibility.

Two expert judges next categorized the items into 13 characteristics that represented the three antecedents of street credibility (origin, power, the gap) as defined in our earlier qualitative work. The antecedent of an authentic personal history was represented by eight characteristics: life stories from the streets (11 items), involvement in crime (26-items), respect in the streets (9 items), living in poverty (28 items), adherence to street ideology and street codes (17 items), exposure to violence (12 items), acquisition of streets smarts (19 items), and toughness (51 items). The antecedent of power in the streets was represented by four characteristics that represented signs of financial power (12 items), sexual power (31 items), physical power (37 items), and a general measure of power (3 items). Finally, the antecedent of the gap, the distance between one’s origins and one’s current position, was represented by one characteristic, “the gap” (27 items).

3.4.2 Study 2: Initial Item Reduction and Scale Analysis

Two judges independently reviewed the list of 283 items and removed those that they felt were redundant, ambiguous, or double barreled. The judges’ lists were compared, and any discrepancies regarding an item’s inclusion were decided through discussion. This process resulted in a list of 198 items (36 reverse coded) that represented the 13 characteristics: authentic life stories from the streets (6-items), involvement in crime (17 items), respect in the streets (9 items), living in poverty (23 items), adherence to street codes and ideology (12 items), exposure to violence (12 items), acquisition of
streets smarts (17 items), toughness (23 items), financial power (11 items), sexual power (20 items), physical power (27 items), power (3 items), and the gap (18 items).

To test each of the 198 items’ ability to measure its respective characteristic, a non-student sample of 263 respondents (44% female, 5% Asian or Pacific Islander 8%, African American, 13% Hispanic, average age 34) from Amazon Mechanical Turk were randomly assigned one of five surveys. To reduce respondent fatigue, each survey contained a subset of 39 to 41 items from the list of 198 items. The subjects were given a definition for each characteristic and were asked to rate (1= strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree) how strongly they felt each that item was descriptive of someone who fit the definition of the characteristic in question. Each respondent was paid $0.25 for their participation.

Eleven respondents were removed for failing to follow instructions, leaving 252 surveys. Overall, the majority of the items represented the characteristics, with 88% of all items reporting a mean rating of 5 (agree) or higher on a seven point scale. To generate a list of the items that best represented each characteristic, we retained the items with a mean score that was 1) above 5.4 and 2) was among the seven highest scores for its characteristic. This elimination process resulted in a list of 83 items (26 reverse coded): 6-items (5 reversed) for authentic life stories from the streets, 6-items for involvement in crime, 7 items for respect in the streets, 7 items (5 reversed) for living in poverty, 6-items (3 reversed) for adherence to street codes and ideology, 7 items for exposure to violence, 6-items (3 reversed) for the acquisition of streets smarts, 7 items (6 reverse) for toughness, 7 items for financial power, 7 items (1 reversed) for sexual power,
7 items (1 reversed) for physical power, 3 items for power, and 7 items (2 reversed) for the width of the gap between street origins and current possessions and power (the gap).

3.4.3. Stimuli Selection

The purpose of this study was to identify street credible celebrities to use as stimuli in the exploratory phase of scale development. To control for the confounding variables of race and gender, it was determined that suitable stimuli should include a minority male exemplar, a non-minority male exemplar, a minority female exemplar, and a non-minority female exemplar. To generate this list, we first reviewed our two previously conducted qualitative studies on street credibility. The respondents in the first qualitative study most often named Jay Z, 50 Cent, and Eminem as street credible exemplars. Within this study, Eve was the single female celebrity receiving favorable mentions, and she was only mentioned once. The celebrities most often identified as street credible in the second qualitative study were Jay Z, 50 Cent, and Eminem. The celebrities Eve and Oprah were also categorized as street credible, though with much less frequency than the aforementioned male celebrities.

The examples of street credible celebrity provided by the first qualitative study were primarily male. The female exemplars from the second qualitative study were selected from a prescribed list of celebrities and thus may only be the best exemplars within the list of provided choices rather than the best exemplars of the construct. Therefore, it was determined that an additional study should be developed to confirm our earlier findings on male exemplars and to provide suitable female exemplars.
To construct a third set of exemplars, a non-student sample was recruited via Amazon Mechanical Turk to increase the generalizability of the overall set of exemplars. A total of 83 respondents were given a definition of street credibility and asked to report the first male celebrity for a given category, past or present, that they could think of who would be a good example of the definition given. The respondents were also asked to do the same for a bad example. Good and bad examples were also reported for female celebrities. Each respondent was given each of three categories in random order. The categories were singer or rappers, TV or movie stars, and celebrity sports figures or athletes. Because street credibility may be gender specific and to ensure that the respondents did not feel pressure to provide an answer when none applied, they were instructed to list “none” in any space if they “could not think of a name after 30 seconds.” Two respondents were removed for failing to follow instructions, leaving 81 (44% female, 7% Asian or Pacific Islander 7% African American, 14% Hispanic, average age 34) completed cases. Respondents were paid $0.25 each for their participation.

Because some celebrities were listed by the respondents as both a good and bad example, each celebrity was given a Salient Street Credibility Score (SSCS) corresponding to the number of times they were recognized as a good exemplar minus the number of times they were recognized as a bad exemplar. The exemplars whose scores fell more than two standard deviations from the mean were considered to have extremely high or low levels of salient street credibility.

The celebrities chosen for the scale development study were all singers and rappers. This category was chosen because it 1) produced exemplars with the highest and lowest salient street credibility scores for both males and females, and 2) generated the
lowest number of responses of “none,” indicating higher levels of salience for both good and bad exemplars for the given category. Table 3.1 lists all the celebrities named as well as their SSCS.

The male exemplars with the highest levels of salient street credibility were Eminem (SSCS = +18), 50 Cent (SSCS = +15), and Jay Z (SSCS = +10). Lil Kim held the highest score for all women (SSCS = +10). No non-minority woman met the given criteria for salient street credibility. Therefore, 50 Cent, Eminem, and Lil Kim were selected as the stimuli for the exploratory phase of scale development.

3.4.4. Study 3: Further Item Reduction

3.4.4.1 Procedure

Consistent with Aaker (1987), a non-student sample was utilized to increase the generalizability and external validity of the scale. Using Amazon Mechanical Turk, 823 respondents were paid $0.25 each to take a survey about a celebrity. Only respondents who currently reside in the United States were allowed to participate in the survey. The respondents were randomly given one of three surveys. The surveys were identical with the exception of the change in the celebrity’s name (50 Cent, Eminem, or Lil Kim) and the corresponding pronouns (he/she, his/her). The surveys first asked the respondents about their level of familiarity with the given celebrity (1 = very familiar, 7 = very unfamiliar) and then asked respondents to evaluate the given celebrity using the aforementioned 84 items. To reduce order listing bias, the items were presented randomly.
After all of the data were collected, some respondents were removed for the following reasons: they only partially filled out the survey (65); they self-reported as being “unfamiliar” (68) or “very unfamiliar” (26) with the celebrity; or they failed to follow instructions (41). This process resulted in 683 participants (50.9% female, 8.2% African American, 6.7% Hispanic or Latino, 7.3% Asian or Pacific Islander, 1.3% Native American, 1.8% other; 70.5% middle class, 25.7% lower class) who produced acceptable surveys for the three celebrities (50 Cent n=254, Eminem n = 247, and Lil Kim n = 182).

3.4.4.2 Exploratory Factor Analysis

The next study was conducted to further reduce the number of scale items. As a first step, we eliminated the items that did not correlate with others (Fields 2003). This resulted in the elimination of two items that held less than medium (≥0.3) correlation coefficients with over 96% of all other items. The 81 remaining items were factor analyzed using a Principal Component Analysis with Orthogonal (varimax) rotation. The factor analysis revealed a 12 factor solution (see Table 3.2) with eigenvalues greater than 1 (variance explained = 61.54%). The point of inflection, as indicated by the scree plot, indicate the formation of a stable plateau after five factors (see Figure 3.1). Because the scree plot could be easily interpreted as falling on the sixth or seventh factor, both six- and seven-factor solutions were explored. In both cases, only five factors showed high loadings (loadings of three or more items at .6 of above), confirming the original interpretation of the scree plot (Field 2003). Next, a second EFA was conducted on the data set in the same manner with the exception that the analysis of the 81 items was limited to five factors (see Table 3.3). To refine the list, items with a loading below 0.6 or
that had a cross loading greater than .4 were removed, and a third EFA (with varimax rotation) was run on the data.

The new five-factor analysis resulted in a 40 item solution (see Table 3.4). No items in this solution had large cross loading (above .4) on a second factor. The five factor model accounted for 60.35% of the variance. Factor 1 and Factor 2 accounted for almost equal amounts of the variance within the model at 16.13% and 15.53%, respectively. The same is true for Factors 3 (11.49%) and 4 (10.27%), which explain nearly equal variance within the model. Finally, Factor 5 accounted for 6.94% of the total variance in the data.

The item “street smart” was not included in the 40 item EFA. Special attention was given to the exclusion of this term because it was used extensively in both our qualitative work and in the ethnographic studies on street culture to describe individuals with street credibility. In addition, as an item, “street smarts” received the highest mean score (6.61 on a 7-point scale) of the 283 items for its ability to describe street credibility in Study 2. However, in the initial orthogonal EFA, the term cross loaded heavily (above .4) on the factors later determined to be “street origins” and “tough”. Because of the item’s theoretical contribution to the scale, an 81 item oblique EFA with a promax rotation was explored. Here, the item still loaded heavily on the street origins and tough factors. Thus, while theoretically it makes sense that street smarts would be associated with both these factors, it was determined that the item be dropped due to its high loading on two factors in both the orthogonal and the oblique solutions and because it appears that the essence of street smarts is captured by the other measures within the scale.
Next, the items within each factor were examined to properly identify each subscale. Factor 1, “Tough”, consisted of 12 items (12 reverse scored) from the characteristics toughness, authentic life stories from the streets, street smarts and street ideology. Street smarts imply the tactic knowledge of the rules for navigating within a culture of terror such as the streets of some inner cities. Part of this knowledge is when and how to be tough. A tough persona is acquired at an early age, form authentic life experiences within a culture of terror and culminates with the adoption of and adherence to street ideology (Anderson 1990). Eventually acting tough evolves into being tough when physical force is used (Anderson 1990; LeBlanc 2003). All items within this factor imply characteristics or actions that are reported to be the antithesis of being tough or a lack of toughness (Anderson 1990; LeBlanc 2003; Bourgois 2003). The items with the highest factor loading indicate a lack of toughness (is weak, is a push over, can be easily pushed around).

Factor 2, “Street Origins”, contained 11 items (2 reversed scored) that represented the characteristics living in poverty, exposure to violence, and the gap. The grouping of these characteristics stands to reason, as ethnographic studies indicate that poverty and violence are widespread in a culture of terror such as the street culture where street credibility is first gained (Anderson 1990; LeBlanc 2003; Bourgois 2003). In addition, our own qualitative research indicates that “the gap” measures the distance between one’s origins and one’s current position. Thus, the loading of “the gap” item on this factor is due to the characteristic’s grounding in one’s origins within the culture of terror. Items with the highest loadings on this factor include “was extremely poor at one time,” “is from a poor family,” and “were extremely poor but now are wealthy.”
Factor 3, “Power in the Streets”, included seven items from the financial, physical, and overall power characteristics. The items that loaded highest in this factor include “was able to acquire financial power while living in the streets,” “is admired by his or her peers for the amount of money he/she could make in the streets,” and “was able to acquire power in the streets.” Factor 4, “Sexual Persona”, contained six items that are from the sexual power characteristic. These items addressed the beliefs and actions that lead to a public reputation in terms of sexual behavior and holding the personification of one who plays the field in terms of dating. The items with the highest factor loadings were “believes that a great number of sexual conquests translate into being respected,” brags about sexual conquest,” and “boast about sexual exploits.” The emergence of factors 3 and 4 is consistent with our original model of street credibility as well as the prevailing literature on life within street cultures. Here, the ability to gain favor from the opposite sex, acquire wealth and display physical dominance are depicted as forms of power and currency wielded by street credible individuals (Anderson 1990, LeBlanc 2003 and Bourgois 2003).

Factor 5, “Criminal History”, included four items from the authentic criminal history characteristic. The emergence of this factor is consistent with the literature’s view of crime as legitimate employment within the culture of terror and a signal to others of one’s overall street credibility (Anderson 1990 and Bourgois 2003). The three items with the highest loadings in this factor were “has been to jail,” “has been to prison,” and “has a criminal past.”
3.4.5 Study 4: Assessing the Stability of the Street Credibility Solution

3.4.5.1 Procedure

To determine the ability of the solution to measure street credibility with different celebrities and to determine if it could be used across different consumer groups, separate Principal Component Analyses (PCA) with varimax rotations were run. First, a PCA was produced for each of the different celebrities and compared to the initial five-factor solution. This process was then repeated for different demographic groupings of gender, class, age and race. Following the work of Osgood (1957), Ohanian (1990), and Aaker (1987), the stability in the scale was assessed by 1) the same traits loading on the same factors in a similar manner as in the initial solution and 2) the similarity of the percent variance explained by each factor.

3.4.5.2 Exploratory Factor Analysis

A separate five-factor Principal Components Analysis on the 40 retained items was conducted for each celebrity used in the study. All items loaded similarly across the initial factor solution and that of the three celebrities, with the exception of four items within the 50 Cent solution and one item within the Lil Kim solution that cross loaded at a level greater than .4 (see Table 3.5). In each celebrity solution, the amount of variance explained by each factor was relatively similar to the initial solution. The near equal variance explained by Factors 1 and 2 as well as Factors 3 and 4 suggests that these factors may change in order when measuring particular celebrities or within particular subgroups. The loading order of Factors 1 and 2 switched place within the Eminem solution. Overall, the similarities across the original and the three celebrity solutions
suggest stability in the original solution. The same criteria were used to assess the solution stability across different respondent groups segmented by gender, class, age, and race. In terms of gender, all items loaded in a similar manner. (see Table 3.6).

The number of upper class respondents (n = 26) did not support a separate EFA for this demographic. Therefore, the analysis was conducted on only the middle (n=481) and lower class (n=186) respondent data. A comparison of the initial solution with that of the respondents from the middle class and lower class revealed similar solutions, a sign of stability across classes (see Table 3.7).

To compare age groups, a median split was used to produce near equal sample sizes for older (31 years and older) and younger (30 years old and younger) respondents (see Table 3.8). Again, the factor loadings for each item were similar, but the order of the factor loading in the older age solution rotated between the first and second factor.

To maintain consistency with our earlier qualitative work, race was grouped under two categories, minority respondents, consisting of African American, Hispanic, and Native American respondents, and majority respondents, consisting of Caucasian and Asian respondents. Within the minority respondent solution, power in the streets becomes the second factor as three items from tough cross-load more heavily with street origins than they do in the original or the majority only solution (see Table 3.9). The variance explained by the tough factor increased by 2.55 percentage points from that of the original solution. This shift in the explained variance among this group is expected as our earlier qualitative work suggested that minorities have a deeper understanding of street credibility than their majority counterparts.
Overall, the scale proved to be stable. The same five-factor solution emerged with over 90% of all items across the six different solutions loading similarly to the initial solution. Moreover, the percentage of variance explained in each demographic solution was similar to that of the initial solution. The average of the difference in variance explained between a factor in the original solution and any factor of the separate solutions was .67.

3.4.6 Study 5: Final Item Reduction

3.4.6.1 Cronbach’s Alpha and Item Reduction

To create a usable scale, Cronbach’s Alpha was calculated for each factor (see Table 3.10). Next, items were removed from each factor based on the five following considerations:

1. The frequency with which the item loaded on more than one factor across the different group solutions.
2. The overall effect of item reduction on the factor’s Cronbach’s Alpha.
3. The item’s inter-item correlation to all other items.
4. The level of redundancy for the item presented with other items within its factor.

The result was a five subscale, 15-item scale consisting of three reverse scored items for tough (is weak, is a push over, is naïve), street origins (was extremely poor but now is wealthy, comes from a place that is dangerous and violent, is from a poor family), street power (was able to acquire financial power while living in the streets, once ruled the streets of an inner city, became successful at dealing with business in the streets), sexual persona (brags about sexual conquest, boasts about sexual exploits, built a reputation based on sexual conquest), and criminal history (has been to prison, has a criminal past, has been involved in a violent crime). The Cronbach’s alphas for the new
subscales (tough, .77; street origins, .78; street power, .76; sexual persona, .82; and criminal history, .81) were significant (> .70) (Spector 1992). The overall Cronbach’s alpha for the 15-item scale was .82 (see Table 3.11).

3.4.6.2 Exploratory Factor Analysis

An EFA was conducted on the 15-item scale (varimax rotation). The solution accounted for 71% of the variance in the data. All items loaded as predicted with no items cross loading heavily on any other factor (See Table 3.12).

3.4.6.3 Confirmatory Factor Analysis

To test the validity of our findings, we performed a CFA using MPlus 6. A U.S. based non-student sample (n = 810) completed the exact same 81 item online survey for the CFA as that used in the EFA study. The data were screened in the same manner used in the EFA study with respondents being removed for timing (1), not following instructions (140), and for self-reporting as being unfamiliar (98) or very unfamiliar (41) with the endorser. This process resulted in 670 acceptable respondent surveys (49.1% female, 11.8% African American, 5.4% Hispanic, 8.4% Asian or Pacific Islander, 0.7% Native American; 4.5% upper class, 24.2% lower class; average age 32) for the three celebrities (50 Cent n = 215, Eminem n = 255, and Lil Kim n = 200). The CFA was conducted on the items from the 40 item solution. The theoretical model is presented in Figure 3.2. The goodness of fit indexes, comparative fit index (CFI) = 0.937, Tucker-Lewis fit index (TLI) = .918, and the root mean square index (RMSEA) = 0.08 all indicate a good fit between the CFA model and the observed data from our EFA. The Chi
Square ($\chi^2 = 323.07 \text{ df} = 80, \ p < .05$) was not taken into consideration for fit in this or any following studies because its use has been questioned for large data sets (Bagozzi and Heatherton 1994, Schreiber et al. 2006, Brakus 2009). All factors correlated with each other with the exception of Sexual Persona, which had insignificant correlations with Street Origins and Tough. A second model was run without the Sexual Persona factor (see Figure 3.3). This model resulted in a slightly better fit: comparative fit index (CFI) = 0.956, Tucker-Lewis fit index (TLI) = .940 and the root mean square index (RMSEA) = 0.087. However, the initial five factor model (15-item solution) was retained due to the theoretical significance that Sexual Persona held within our own qualitative work and throughout the literature on street life and street culture.

3.4.7 Study 6: Test-Retest Reliability

To provide further validation for the scale, the test-retest reliability of the scale was explored. The 683 respondents used in (study 3) were invited by email to retake the study. The respondents were first contacted by a mass email and again by individualized emails one week later. 201 respondents accepted the invitation to retake the survey. A total of 40 respondents were eliminated due to failure to follow instructions leaving 161 (52.2% female, 9.5% African American, 5.5% Hispanic or Latino, 8.0% Asian or Pacific Islander, 1.5% Native American, 2.0% other, 71.1% middle class, 24.4% lower class) acceptable respondent surveys for the study. The average time between respondents taking the two surveys was eight weeks. To avoid systematic bias, the exact same survey was used both times.
The data were analyzed by comparing each of the fifteen items’ correlation at time 1 and time 2 and by comparing the CFA models at time 1 and time 2. The average Pearson correlation for the 15-item scale was .78 confirming its reliability (Fields 2003) over a near two-month period. Next, a Confirmatory Factor Analysis was performed on the retest data. The five factor CFA model for time 2 was very similar to model produced for time 1. All of the items loaded on the predicted factor (see Figure 3.4). In most cases, the loading for time 2 were slightly higher. The overall model fit was good; comparative fit index (CFI) = 0.932, Tucker-Lewis fit index (TLI) = .911, and the root mean square index (RMSEA) = 0.086. A four-factor CFA (without sexual persona) was also conducted. Again, all the items loaded on the predicted factors (see Figure 3.5) and as with the five-factor model, most item loadings were slightly higher in time 2 than they were in time 1. The overall model fit was good; comparative fit index (CFI) = 0.956, Tucker-Lewis fit index (TLI) = .939, and the root mean square index (RMSEA) = 0.078.

This scale allows for the measure of street credibility among celebrities. To understand the role street credible celebrities play in consumer fantasy, we next conduct research to build scale measures for fantasy type.

### 3.5 Fantasy Scale Development

Narrative Transportation Theory was originally used by Gerrig (1993) to describe the phenomenon of becoming absorbed, through fantasy, in a story. The consumer’s interest in the characters may lead to shared feelings with them as an outside observer (sympathize), as one with shared experience (empathize), or as one personally experiencing their feelings (identify) (Gerrig 1993). Wohlfeil and Whelan (2012)
further applied the theory to explain the foundation upon which consumers build relationships with celebrities. Here, fantasies allow consumers to journey to distant places and interact with both real and fictional characters as if they are friends or lovers (Wohlfeil and Whelan 2012). Fantasies also allow the celebrity to imagine that they are the celebrity (Wohlfeil and Whelan 2012). In this since the term “transportation” takes on a broader meaning than involvement through empathy, sympathy and identity. Here, transportation includes the celebrity partners’ ability to transport the consumer to a new, far and distant place (Wohlfeil and Whelan 2012).

To understand the fantasy-based relationships that consumers have with celebrity endorsers, we seek to measures two types of fantasy: identification and transportation. Here, we use the term identification fantasy to focus on identification in a broad sense, encompassing fantasies and daydreams that are based on shared feelings or that are triggered by empathy, sympathy or identification. Our definition of transportation fantasy, in agreement with Wohlfeil and Whelan (2012) is based more on escapism and transportation to new and far-off places. Here, empathy is absent from this fantasy type.

The current scales used to measure transportation or fantasy primarily focus on the consumer's propensity to engage in fantasy (Davis 1980) or the ability of a stimulus to draw the consumer into the narrative and disconnect them from present reality (Green and Brock 2000; Escalas 2004). In essence, these scales capture the meaning of fantasy by evidence of its outcome, such as the existence of fantasy, the excitement produced by fantasy, and the ability to draw one into fantasy. However, these scales stop short of measuring the types of fantasy that produces the aforementioned outcomes. Therefore, a
scale of fantasy type was needed to better understand the effectiveness of street credible endorsers.

3.5.1 Study 7: Item Generation, Selection, and Scale Development

3.5.1.1 Item Generation

To create scale items for identification and transportation fantasy, we first modified items from the existing scales on fantasy. Four items were modified from the empathy and fantasy subscale of Davis’s (1980) Interpersonal Reactivity Index. Another three items were slightly altered from Green and Brock’s (2000) transportation into narrative worlds scale. Five items were adapted from Escalas and Stern’s (2003) Ad Response to Sympathy and Empathy Scales. Finally, fifteen additional items were created from the Wohlfeil and Whelan (2012) studies on fantasy transportation to produce a final list of twenty-seven items (12 identification, 15 transportation).

3.5.1.2 Stimuli Selection

Eight celebrities were initially selected as stimuli for the experiment. To reduce the confounding potential of celebrity genres and sex, only male celebrities with roots within the music industry were selected. Stimuli were chosen from the Focus.com (2011) list of top celebrity endorsers and our own qualitative work. The celebrities used in the study were: Drake, Usher, 50 Cent, Kanye West, Waka Flocka Flame, Snoop Dogg, Will Smith, and Jay Z.
3.5.1.3 Procedure

To build a generalizable and externally valid scale, a non-student sample generated through Amazon Mechanical Turk was used. A total of 562 respondents were paid $0.25 each to take a survey about a celebrity. As with the previous studies, only current U.S. residents were allowed to participate. The respondents were randomly given one of eight surveys, each featuring a unique celebrity as the stimuli. The surveys were identical except for the change in the celebrity’s name. The respondents were asked to evaluate the celebrity, his music, and videos based on the 27 items as well as additional filler questions. To reduce order listing bias, the items were presented randomly. Next, 58 the respondents were removed for not following instructions, and 81 were removed for having a low level of familiarity with the given celebrity. This resulted in 413 respondent surveys (52.1% female, 9.9% African American, 8.5% Hispanic or Latino, 7.3% Asian or Pacific Islander, 9.0% Native American, 0.5% other; 71.7% middle class, 24.5% lower class). The data were next divided into two sets, one each for exploratory (n=206) and confirmatory (n=207) analysis.

3.5.1.4 Exploratory Factor Analysis

The 27 items were factor analyzed using a Principal Component Analysis with orthogonal (varimax) rotation. The scree plot’s point of inflection (see Figure 3.6) indicates the formation of a stable plateau after three factors. In agreement, the fourth factor held few (less than three) significant loadings (loading at .6 or above) (Fields 2003). Next, an EFA (varimax rotation) limited to three factors was run (see Table 3.14). The first two factors were easy to interpret as transportation and identity. In agreement
with Wohlfeil and Whelan (2012), the transportation items suggested that respondents were able to visit new and different worlds while the identity items reflected the Davis (1980), Green and Brock (2000) and Escalas and Stern’s (2003) interpretations of empathy. A third factor was identified as a measurement of the ability to hook or draw one into fantasy. However, this factor was dropped because it held less than three items with high loadings. Next, the items within the first two factors with a factor loading below .6 or that cross loaded above .4 on more than one factor were eliminated, and a two-factor analysis was run. This step resulted in a 19 item solution (see Table 3.15). Ten items (5 identification, 5 transportation) with factor loading above .7 and cross loading below .4 were chosen as the acceptable scale items.

To create a parsimonious scale, two judges reviewed the 10 item scale. Two items were removed from each subscale based on ambiguity or redundancy, resulting in three items for identity (I am reminded of similar events in my life, shows the kind of things that I have personally gone through, I can very easily put myself in the place of the main character) and three items for transportation (presents a dangerous and exciting world, provides me with a passport to a place I would not normally be allowed to visit, I feel as if I am getting a glimpse into another world that is different from my own). An EFA using Principal Component Analysis with orthogonal (varimax) rotation was run on the six item solution. The analysis explained 71.99% of the variance in the data and all items loaded on two factors, identity and transportation, with low cross loadings (see Table 3.16). The scale reliability was further assessed using Cronbach’s Alpha. Each subscale reported high alphas (identity = .840, transportation = .741) as did the total fantasy scale.
(.776) (see Table 3.17).

3.5.1.5 Confirmatory Factor Analysis

To confirm the stability of the scale, the data from the 207 remaining surveys was analyzed using a Confirmatory Factor Analysis performed with MPlus 6. All of the items loaded on the predicted factors (see Figure 3.7). The overall model's fit was good: comparative fit index (CFI) = 0.956 and Tucker-Lewis fit index (TLI) = .917. The root mean square index RMSEA of .110 suggested a poor fit. However, the heuristic of an RMSEA of .80 or less as an acceptable fit is based on sample sizes less than or close to 200 (Chen, Curran, Bollen, Kirby and Paxton 2008) and should not be used at all when small degrees of freedom are present (Kenny 2012), as is the case here (df= 8). Therefore, RMSEA is not used to determine fit here.

3.5.2 Study 8: Further Tests of Reliability and Validity

3.5.2.1 Stimuli Selection

To ensure that the scale was able to measure fantasy beyond the music industry, a new survey that included stimuli from several entertainment genres was administered. Six short (1:45 – 2:20 minute) video clips were selected as the stimuli for the survey. A set of two videos, one for identification fantasy and one for transportation fantasy were selected to represent the movies, television shows, and music video genre. The videos were each pretested for their ability to generate identity or transportation fantasies. The identification fantasy stimuli selected were Prom (movie), Digging out of Debt (TV), and Grenade (music video). Prom and Grenade were selected because 98 % of adults have
experienced love (Wisler 2012) and 75% of high school students attend prom (Weaver 2013). The PBS televised documentary *Digging out of Debt*, a TV documentary focused on managing credit card debt, was selected because 75% of American’s have credit card debt and nearly half have more credit card debt than savings (Stark 2013). The fantasy stimuli selected included video clips from *Star Trek Into Darkness* (movie), *Game of Thrones* (TV), and *I Go Hard in the Paint* (music video). *Game of Thrones* and *Star Trek into Darkness* were chosen because each represents fantasy settings (an imaginary magical medieval kingdom and future space travel respectively). *I Go Hard in the Paint* was chosen because it depicts life within a culture of terror, street culture, which is foreign to most Americans. Both of the *I Go Hard in the Paint* and *Grenade* videos were set in the inner city, but *Grenade* addressed love and heartache, phenomena that consumers are more familiar with.

### 3.5.2.2 Procedure

A total of 493 US based respondents were administered the survey. Each respondent was paid $0.25 for their participation. The respondents were randomly given a survey with one of the six stimuli. The respondents were asked to watch the short video. When possible, all advertisements were edited out; otherwise, the respondents were asked to ignore any advertisements. Videos that were originally longer than 2.5 minutes were edited to meet the time restrictions with the exception of *Digging out of Debt*, where the respondents were instructed when to stop watching at a certain scene, 2.5 minutes into the video. Next, the respondents were asked to fill out the survey question, which included the fantasy scale items as well as demographic questions. Five respondents were removed
for not following instructions, leaving a total of 485 respondents (41.7% female, 10.5% African American, 7.3% Hispanic or Latino, 9.3% Asian or Pacific Islander, 1.4% Native American, 1.2% other; 61.4% middle class, 29.1% lower class, average age 33.9) divided into the six cells: Prom (n=79), Digging out of Debt (n=86), Grenade (n=78), Game of Thrones (n=77), Stark Trek Into Darkness (n=86), and I Go Hard in the Paint (n=79).

3.5.2.3 Exploratory Factor Analysis

To determine the scale’s reliability across different entertainment genres, an Exploratory Factor Analysis (Principal Component Analysis with varimax rotation and eigenvalues greater than 1) was conducted on roughly half of the data set (N =242). The analysis produced two factors that explained 78.43% of the variance. None of the items cross loaded heavily on both factors and the factors were easily identified as identity and transportation (see Table 3.18).

3.5.2.3 Confirmatory Factor Analysis

To determine the validity of the scale, a Confirmatory Factor Analysis was conducted on the second half of the data set (N= 243) using MPlus 6. All of the items loaded as predicted (see Figure 3.8). The overall model's fit was good: comparative fit index (CFI) = 0.967 and Tucker-Lewis fit index (TLI) = .938. As stated earlier, the root mean square index (RMSEA) is reported here (.111) but not used as a strict indicator of fit for sample sizes below or near 200. Notably, Kenny (2012) states that the RMSEA should not be calculated at all.
3.6 Street Credibility Scale Validation and Main Studies

The first purpose of the subsequent studies is to verify that street credibility is a unique construct—different than traditional credibility, similarity to the endorser, and from "cool." The second purpose is to investigate the mediating role that consumer’s similarity to the endorsers plays in the street credible endorser’s effect on transportation fantasy and traditional endorser’s effect on identification fantasy.

3.6.1 Stimuli Selection and Procedure

For the discriminant validity study and the main studies, six celebrities—three street credible and three non-street credible—were selected based on celebrities mentioned in our own qualitative work and our list of salient celebrity endorsers. To reduce the confounding potential of age and race, the street credible celebrities were paired with non-street credible celebrities of the same race and age whenever possible. Because all of the testing up to this point had been restricted to celebrities from the music industry, it was determined that a non-music celebrity pair should also be used. This process resulted in two matched age-race pairs, the Game with Will I am, and Eminem with Vanilla Ice, and one matched age pair Michael Vick and Peyton Manning. It should be noted that in our initial qualitative work, Michael Vick was considered to be a street credible celebrity who had lost street credibility due to participation in criminal acts that, in effect, caused him to lose his power and reverse the gap that he had traversed. However, as Vick has returned to the NFL and has again widened the gap, our more recent qualitative studies, the surveys in salient street credibility exemplars, and the pretest indicate that Vick had regained street credibility.
A set of 1,148 non-student U.S. based respondents were randomly assigned to one of the six celebrities and asked to fill out the survey on the celebrities. The survey was identical to that previously used except that the phrase “when I listen to or watch videos” was replaced with “when I read or hear about the life story” for the athletes. After review, 369 respondents were removed for not following instructions (110), and for self-reporting as very unfamiliar (134), and unfamiliar (125) with the celebrities creating a data set of 739 respondents (47.9 % female, 10.7 % African American, 6.6% Hispanic American, 8.8% Asian American, 0.5% Native American, 1.8% other; mean age 32.03) split among the six celebrity surveys (The Game n=114, Will I Am n=142, Eminem n=154, Robin Thicke n=122, Michael Vick n=108, Payton Manning n=99). The data from this respondent set are used in the next three of the next four studies.

In the next four studies, we 1) conduct an initial analysis of our data and reevaluate our stimuli for the subsequent studies, 2) use Exploratory Factor Analysis to evaluate the discriminant validity of the street credibility scale, 3) employ MANOVA to investigate the differences between the street credible and the traditional endorsers on the scales corresponding to coolness, brand personality, and fantasy type in the first of two main studies, and 4) apply the methods outlined by Zhao, Lynch, and Chen (2010) to test whether similarity to the celebrity endorser mediates the effects of street credibility or traditional credibility on different types of fantasy generation in our second main study.

3.6.2 Study 9: Street Credibility Scale Discriminant Validity

An Exploratory Factor Analysis was run to investigate the discriminant validity of the street credibility scale. The scale was analyzed using the existing endorser credibility
scale (Ohanian 1990), the similarity to the spokesperson scale (Whittler 1989), and a single item measure for the construct of “cool.” The Ohanian (1990) scale was included because it measures the traditional view of endorser credibility, trustworthiness, attractiveness, and expertise. Moreover, this scale encompasses the meanings and measures of the previously developed scales of endorser credibility and persuasiveness and has stood as the standard for measuring endorser credibility in both scholarship and in practice for the last twenty-three years.

While the attractiveness factor of the Ohanian scale includes measures of physical beauty and likability, direct measures of similarity to the endorser are absent within the scale. To this end, we included a scale of similarity to the spokesperson (Whittler 1989). This scale was deemed to be important because it measures the consumers’ similarity to the endorser beyond race or physical appearance and includes measures for similarity in beliefs, dress and lifestyle.

Finally, our qualitative work revealed that street credibility is often related to the construct of cool; a scale to measure cool has yet to be developed. This may be because cool is elusive and difficult, if not impossible, to define (Kerner and Pressman 2007) and what is cool is personal and changes from observer to observer based on their perception of both objects and occurrences (Belk 2006). We measured cool with a single item which we believe is appropriate here based on 1) the lack of scale development in the field, 2) the personal and diverse interpretation of what is cool, and 3) findings within scholarship that indicate the validity of single item scales (Bergkvist and Rossiter 2007). Other measures for celebrity endorsers such as attitude towards the spokesperson (likeability) (Whittler and DiMeo 2001), were not incorporated in this study as they measure the
respondent’s attitude toward the endorser (like, dislike) rather than identifying the latent attributes or meaning that the endorser holds or represents.

Any negatively termed items were reverse scored and ten items were created from the composite scores of each scale’s subscales (trustworthy, attractive, expertise, street origins, tough, power in the streets, sexual persona, criminal history, and similarity) and a single item measure for cool. Next, the items were analyzed using an Exploratory Factor Analysis (Principal Component Analysis with varimax rotation), resulting in a three factor solution (see Table 3.19). Here, the trustworthiness, attractiveness, expertise, similarity and cool subscales held the highest loadings on the first factor; no other items displayed high cross loading here. We interpret this first factor as traditional credibility. Four of the five Street Credibility subscales, Street Origins, Crime, Sexual Persona, and Power in the Streets, loaded onto the second factor. No other items loaded highly on this factor. We interpret this factor as Street Credibility. Tough, the final Street Credibility subscale, loaded on the third factor. With the exception of “Expert” no other items held high loading on this factor. While Expert held higher loadings on the first factor, it is not surprising that this item would also load on a factor with Tough as “naive” a reversed scored item that measures street smarts within the tough subscale, is similar to the items used to measure expertise. Still Tough is the only item with high loading (above .6) on the factor and we interpret the factor as “Toughness.” We surmise that this factor loads separately than the others because these reverse scored items (opposite meanings)—weak (strong), is a push over (is tough) is naive (is clever)—are attributes that, per our qualitative work, are not exclusive to street credible characters. Most importantly, the
tough composite subscale does not load on the same factor as the cool, similarity or the credibility subscales.

3.7 Celebrity Brand Personalities

3.7.1 Study 10: Celebrity Brand Personality

3.7.1.1 Procedure

As stated earlier, celebrities are considered to be human brands (Thompson 2006). To this end, we seek to confirm if Aaker’s (1987) brand personality scale appropriately measures celebrity personalities. Using the same survey, stimuli, respondents, and method of data reduction outlined in Study 7, we asked a non-student population (N=413) to rate celebrities using the brand personality scale. We did not include the full brand personality scale; rather, we follow the work of Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel (2004) in studying brand personality relationships and only introduced respondents to the subscales for exciting and sincere. The exclusion of the other brand personality types (rugged, competent, and sophisticated) is acceptable because the exciting and sincere brand personalities are the most important in intimate partners and explain the majority of variance in the brand personality ratings (Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel 2004). Prior to running a confirmatory analysis to determine model fit, we find it necessary to run an exploratory analysis for comparison.

3.7.1.2 Exploratory Factor Analysis

An exploratory factor analysis on the eight items was conducted using a Principal Component Analysis with orthogonal (varimax) rotation with eigenvalues greater than 1.
This analysis revealed a two-factor solution that explained 62.43% of the variance in the data. The factors were easy to interpret as sincere and exciting. All of Aaker’s (1987) sincere items loaded heavily (above .6) on the sincere factor; the exciting items also loaded heavily on the exciting factor (see Table 3.20).

### 3.7.1.3 Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Data from the 207 remaining surveys were analyzed using a Confirmatory Factor Analysis performed with MPlus 6. All of the items loaded as predicted (see Figure 3.9). The overall model's fit was good: comparative fit index (CFI) = .941 and Tucker-Lewis fit index (TLI) = .913. The root mean square index RMSEA of .091 suggested good fit despite the small sample size (Chen, Curran, Bollen, Kirby and Paxton 2008).

### 3.8 Hypotheses Development and Main Studies:

#### 3.8.1 Street Credible Celebrities’ Cool, Exciting and Sincere Personalities

Our original qualitative work suggests that street credibility and cool are different. While both constructs have origins in the inner city, cool is something that is neat or different and is interpreted differently by each individual. In addition, cool is something that can be acquired through product purchases. Street credibility, however, is something that can only be earned by surviving and thriving within a culture of terror. In contrast, our original qualitative research suggests that consumers feel that having street credibility is cool or even “cooler than cool”. While the results of these studies have indicated that cool and street credibility are not mutually inclusive, they also suggest that street credibility makes celebrities “hyper cool”. Therefore, we hypothesize that
H₁: Street credible celebrities are cooler than celebrities with traditional credibility.

Earlier research has indicated that the narratives produced by street credible celebrities are exotic and sublime. Due to the exotic and sublime nature of street credible endorsers’ personal stories and narratives, we expect that consumers will depict street credible endorsers as having very exciting brand personalities. Thus, we propose that street credible celebrities, as human brands, hold exciting brand personalities. Based on the assertions that sincere and exciting brand personalities can explain the majority of brands’ personalities (Aaker, 1987) and that celebrities hold brand personalities (see Study 10), we expect consumers to classify some traditional endorsers as having exciting and some as having sincere brand personalities. However, because traditional endorsers lack exotic and sublime personal histories, it stands to reason that they will be considered to be less exciting than street credible endorsers. In addition, because street credible endorsers often have personas built on crime and violence, it stands to reason that they will be considered to be less sincere than traditional endorsers. Further, we predict that while traditional endorsers will be considered as having either sincere or exciting brand personalities, street credible endorsers will have exciting brand personalities. Moreover, we expect that the street credible endorsers will receive a significantly higher score on the “exciting” dimension of brand personality than even those traditional endorsers who are considered to be exciting.

Thus, we hypothesize the following:

H₂a: Street credible endorsers have more exciting brand personalities than traditional endorsers.
H$_2$b: Traditional endorsers have more sincere brand personalities than street credible endorsers.

3.8.2 Street Credible Celebrities and Fantasy Types

The findings from our earlier qualitative work suggest that respondents’ interest in street credible endorsers stems from their unique life experiences. These experiences are foreign, and thus intriguing, to most consumers. Further, unlike traditional endorsers, the life narrative of the street credible endorser depicts events and places that are foreign to most consumers; therefore, the fantasies that these narratives produce are more likely to be transportation rather than identification fantasies. We predict that street credible endorsers will also receive significantly higher scores in terms of their ability to evoke transportation fantasies but not identification fantasies. Thus we hypothesize the following:

H$_3$a: Street credible endorsers will be less similar to consumers than traditionally credible endorsers.

H$_3$b: Street credible endorsers will provide a greater effect on transportation fantasy than the traditionally credible endorsers.

H$_3$c: Traditionally credible endorsers will have a greater effect on identification fantasy than the street credible endorser.

In line with our qualitative work, we feel that consumers find celebrities that are less similar to exotic and more capable of generating transportation fantasies. Our earlier qualitative work posits that the street credible endorser is both dissimilar to consumers, as a whole, and that consumer affinity for these celebrities is based on their ability to evoke
transportation fantasies. Conversely, if consumers are more similar to traditionally credible celebrities, they will be more able to empathize and sympathize with these endorsers. Consumers’ similarity to these endorsers will make these endorsers more able to generate identification fantasies. Hence, while our primary aim is to explore the meanings and usefulness that consumers have for street credible endorsers through transportation fantasy, it is evident that some form of usefulness may be applied to traditional endorsers through identification fantasy. Thus, we propose the following:

H4a: Consumers’ similarity to the celebrity endorser partially mediates the relationship between the celebrity’s level of street credibility and the celebrities' ability to generate transportation fantasy.

H4b: Consumers’ similarity to the celebrity endorser partially mediates the relationship between the celebrity’s level of traditional credibility and the celebrities' ability to generate identification fantasy.

3.8.3 Study 11: Similarity, Street Credibility and Fantasy

3.8.3.1 Procedure

The purpose of this study is to test Hypotheses H1 – H3c. Using the 739 completed surveys on the celebrities (The Game n=114, Will I Am n=142, Eminem n=154, Robin Thicke n=122, Michael Vick n=108, Peyton Manning n=99), a MANOVA was conducted.
3.8.3.2 Analysis

An initial MANOVA indicated a significant interaction between celebrity set (music pair 1, music pair 2, and sports pair 1) and credibility type (street credible vs. traditional credibility) on the dependent variables (street credibility, traditional credibility, cool, exciting brand personality, sincere brand personality, similarity to the endorser, transportation fantasy and identification fantasy) (Wilks’s $\lambda = .847, F (16, 1,454) = 7.834, p <.001$). The results indicated a significant interaction between the celebrity genre and celebrity credibility type. Hence the main effects alone were difficult to interpret. Therefore we sought to interpret the simple effects. In doing so, we first pooled the groups of celebrities into two conditions, creating a 2 (celebrity genre: music, sports) x 2 (celebrity credibility type: street credible, traditional credibility) experimental design.

A new MANOVA indicated an overall significant interaction between credibility genre and celebrity credibility type (Wilks’s $\lambda = .844, F (7, 729) = 13.625, p <.001$), indicating that celebrity genre moderate the measures of celebrity street credibility, credibility, coolness, exciting brand personality, sincere brand personality, similarity to the consumer, ability to evoke transportation fantasies, and the ability to evoke identification fantasies. The main effects and simple effects for each interaction and for credibility type were next interpreted.

Manipulation checks were conducted in regards to celebrity street credibility, traditional credibility. In terms of street credibility, the main effects suggest that those celebrities predetermined as having street credibility measured higher in terms of street credibility than those predetermined as having traditional celebrity (main effect; $F (1,$
In terms of celebrity genre, being in the music (sports) genre leads to higher (lower) levels of street credibility (main effect; $F(1, 735) = 90.664, p < .001$) (see Figure 3.10). There was a significant interaction between celebrity genre and celebrity credibility type, $F(1, 735) = 4.425, p < .05$. The simple effects indicated that within the music genre, street credible celebrities ($M = 4.89$) measured significantly higher in terms of street credibility than celebrities with traditional credibility ($M = 3.52$), $F(1, 735) = 523.41, p < .001$. Among athletes, street credible endorser measured significantly higher on street credibility ($M = 4.47$) than traditionally credible celebrities ($M = 2.85$), $F(1, 735) = 267.99, p < .001$. This is depicted in Figure 3.11.

For credibility measures, our findings indicate that the celebrities predetermined to have street credibility are less credible than the traditionally credible celebrity (main effect; $F(1, 735) = 175.257, p < .001$). There was no main effect for celebrity genre ($F(1, 735) = 0.649, p = .421$) (see Figure 3.12). There was a significant interaction between celebrity genre and celebrity credibility type, $F(1, 735) = 63.699, p < .001$. The simple effects indicated that within the music genre, street credible celebrities measure lower in terms of credibility ($M = 4.06$) than traditionally credible celebrities ($M = 4.50$), $F(1, 735) = 24.71, p < .001$. Within sports, street credible celebrities measure lower in terms of traditional credibility ($M = 3.46$) than traditionally credible celebrities ($M = 5.24$), $F(1, 735) = 155.74, p < .001$, as shown in Figure 3.13.

Overall, street credible celebrities are less cool than their credible counterparts (main effect; $F(1, 735) = 94.011, p < .001$). This does not support the hypothesis ($H_1$) that street credible endorsers are cooler than traditional endorsers. Overall, sports celebrities are less cool than the music celebrities (main effect; $F(1, 735) = 25.601, p < .001$) as
shown in Figure 3.14). In regards to measures of coolness, there was a significant interaction between celebrity genre and celebrity credibility type, $F(1, 735) = 66.713, p < .001$. The simple effects indicated that there is no effect within the music genre, (street credible celebrities $M = 4.66$, traditional credible celebrities $M = 4.85$), $F(1, 735) = 2.02, p > .05$. However, street credible endorsers are significantly less cool ($M = 3.00$) than traditionally credible endorsers ($M = 5.34$) within the sports genre, $F(1, 735) = 114.88, p < .001$. This is represented in Figure 3.15. In regards to measures of coolness, celebrity genre has no effect within music but moderates the level of coolness within the sports genre.

Hypothesis $H_{2a}$ suggest that street credible celebrities will measure higher than traditionally credible celebrities in terms of exciting brand personality. However, the data indicates that street credible endorsers are less exciting than traditional endorsers (main effect; $F(1, 735) = 36.575, p < .001$) (see Figure 3.16). These findings fail to support the hypothesis ($H_{2a}$) that street credible celebrities are more exciting than traditional celebrities. Overall, sports celebrities hold less exciting brand personalities than the music celebrities (main effect; $F(1, 735) = 31.707, p < .001$). The interaction between celebrity genre and celebrity type was significant, $F(1, 735) = 37.887, p = .000$. In terms of the simple effects, we see that there is no effect within the music genre (street credible celebrity $M = 5.08$, traditional cred celebrity $M = 5.07$), $F(1, 735) = .02, p = .900$. Within sports, street credible ($M = 3.97$) hold less exciting brand personality than traditionally credible celebrities ($M = 5.11$), $F(1, 735) = 54.79, p < .001$. These results suggest that celebrity genre moderates measures of exciting brand personality. Here the
genre of sports decreases measures of excitement for street credible celebrities (see Figure 3.17).

In support of our hypothesis (H$_{2b}$) our findings indicate that traditionally credible celebrities are more sincere than the street credible celebrity (main effect; $F(1, 735) = 288.631, p < .001$). There was no main effect for celebrity genre ($F(1, 735) = .220, p = .639$) (see Figure 3.18). There was a significant interaction between celebrity genre and celebrity type in regards to measures of sincere brand personality, $F(1, 735) = 8.796, p < .05$. The simple effects indicated that within music, street credible celebrities hold a lower level of sincere brand personality (M = 3.74) than traditionally credible celebrities (M = 4.44), $F(1, 735) = 53.78, p < .001$. Within sports, street credible celebrities hold less sincere brand personalities (M = 2.95) than traditionally credible celebrities (5.31), $F(1, 735) = 287.81, p < .001$. As illustrated in Figure 3.19, the effect is steeper for sports.

In support of our hypothesis (H$_{3a}$), these findings indicate that street credible celebrities are less similar to consumers than the traditional credible celebrity (main effect; $F(1, 735) = 45.932, p < .001$). As shown in Figure 3.20, there was no main effect for celebrity genre ($F(1, 735) = 2.748, p = .098$). The interaction between celebrity genre and celebrity type was also significant for measures of similarity, $F(1, 735) = 9.189, p < .001$. In terms of the simple effects, we see that within music, street credible celebrities are less similar to consumer (M = 2.40) than traditionally credible celebrities (M = 2.80), $F(1, 735) = 12.58, p < .001$. Within sports, street credible celebrities (M = 2.26) are less similar to consumers than traditionally credible celebrities (M = 3.30), $F(1, 735) = 32.73, p < .001$. It is interesting to note that the effect is steeper for sports (see Figure 3.21).
In support of our hypothesis (H₃b), we find that street credible celebrities are more able to evoke transportation fantasies than the traditional credible celebrity (main effect; $F(1, 735) = 24.461, p < .001$). Overall, sports celebrities are less able to evoke transportation fantasies than the music celebrities (main effect; $F(1, 735) = 6.784, p < .05$) (see Figure 3.22). There is a significant interaction between celebrity genre and celebrity type, $F(1, 735) = 8.796, p < .05$. In terms of the simple effects, we see that within music, street credible celebrities are able ($M = 4.50$) to evoke transportation fantasy than traditionally credible celebrities ($M = 3.68$), $F(1, 735) = 56.09, p < .001$. Within sports, there is no effect (street credible celebrities $M = 3.93$, traditionally credible celebrities $M = 3.72$), $F(1, 735) = 1.25, p = .285$. This is illustrated in Figure 3.23.

Finally, in regards to the ability to evoke identification fantasy, our findings support our hypothesis (H₃c). The data indicates that traditionally credible celebrities are more able to evoke identification fantasies than the traditional credible celebrity (main effect; $F(1, 735) = 22.028, p < .001$). Overall, sports celebrities are less able to evoke identification fantasies than the music celebrities (main effect; $F(1, 735) = 32.492, p < .05$) (see Figure 3.24). As illustrated in Figure 3.25, there is a significant interaction between celebrity genre and celebrity type, $F(1, 735) = 9.189, p < .001$. In terms of the simple effects, we see that within music, there is no effect (street credible celebrity $M = 3.07$, traditionally credible celebrity $M = 3.02$), $F(1, 735) = .22, p = .643$. Within sports, street credible are less able to evoke identity fantasy ($M = 1.89$) than traditionally credible celebrities ($M = 2.97$), $F(1, 735) = 36.23, p < .001$.
3.8.3.3 Additional Findings

An analysis of the qualitative research on street credibility suggests that street credibility and cool are somewhat intertwined but are also separate. A post-hoc analysis of the initial MANOVA conducted for Study 11 provides more generalizable evidence of this relationship. The study indicated that endorsers could be cool and street credible (Eminem: street credible $M = 5.02$, cool $M = 4.31$), street credible but not cool (Michael Vick: street credible $M = 4.46$, Cool $M = 3.00$), and cool but not street credible (Peyton Manning: street credible $M = 2.85$, Cool $M = 5.24$).

3.8.4 Study 12: The Mediating Role of Similarity

3.8.4.1 Procedure

The purpose of this study is to test Hypothesis H4_a and H4_b. This study uses the 739 completed surveys used in the MANOVA. The one-step bootstrap test of the indirect effect for $a \times b$ (Zhao et al.) was used to investigate the mediating role that consumer’s similarity to the celebrity plays in the relationship between endorsers’ level of street credibility and transportation fantasy (H4a) and endorsers’ level of traditional credibility and identification fantasy (H4b). Regression analyses were conducted utilizing the Preacher-Hayes script for Windows SPSS 19, in which the independent variable, street credibility, was regressed on the dependent variable, transportation fantasy, and an interaction with the mediating variable, consumers’ similarity to the endorser, was investigated with a bootstrap sample set to 5,000. The same method was next used to investigate the mediating role that similarity plays in the relationship between traditional credibility and identification fantasy.
3.8.4.2 Analysis: How Similarity Mediates Street Credibility and Fantasy

An analysis of the data indicates that street credible endorser’s ability to evoke transportation fantasy is partially mediated by the level of similarity between the consumer and the endorser. The resulting indirect effect confidence intervals (LLCI = -.1106, ULCI = -.04720) did not include zero, indicating an indirect effect of $a \times b$ (see Figure 3.26) and mediation is established with a 95% confidence interval (Zhao et al. 2011). The mean indirect effect from the bootstrap analysis is negative ($(a \times b = -.0749)$). A unit increase in street credibility decreases consumers’ perceived similarity to the endorser by by.34 units (path a). While holding street credibility constant, an increase in one unit of similarity increases transportation fantasy by .2186 (path b). Holding similarity constant, an increase in one unit of street credibility increases transportation fantasy by .51 (the direct effect of path c). All paths are reported to be significant ($p < .001$). As path $a \times b \times c$ is negative, the mediation type is competitive (Zhao et al. 2011). This result indicates that although these findings support H4a, there is a high likelihood that there is an omitted mediator in the direct path (Zhao et al. 2011). This result stands to reason as our own qualitative work points not only to the importance of similarity or dissimilarity in the production of transportation fantasies but also the draw and influence of the exotic and the sublime. Hence, while the hypothesis of mediation is supported, the overall hypothesized theoretical framework that includes additional mediators such as the exotic and sublime need to be further explored. To further understand the relationship between street credibility, similarity and fantasy, the mediating effect of similarity on street credibility and identification fantasy was further explored.
An analysis indicates that street credible endorser’s ability to evoke identification fantasy is partially mediated by the level of similarity between the consumer and the endorser. The resulting indirect effect confidence intervals (LLCI = -.2444, ULCI = -.1366) did not include zero, indicating an indirect effect of $a \times b$ (see Figure 3.27) and mediation is established with a 95% confidence interval (Zhao et al. 2011). The mean indirect effect from the bootstrap analysis is negative ($a \times b = -1.387$). Increasing street credibility one unit decreases consumers’ perceived similarity to the endorser by by.34 units (path a). An increase in one unit of similarity, while holding street credibility constant, increases identification fantasy by 4.036 (path b). Holding similarity constant, an increase in one unit of street credibility increases identification fantasy by .1707 (the direct effect of path c). All paths are reported to be significant ($p < .001$). As path $a \times b \times c$ is negative, the mediation type is competitive (Zhao et al. 2011). This result indicates there is a high likelihood that there is an omitted mediator in the direct path (Zhao et al. 2011). Hence while similarity to the endorser mediates the street credible endorser’s ability to evoke identification fantasy, and most consumers are not similar to the street credible endorsers as similarity is measured here. However additional measures of similarity such as race or gender may also mediate the endorser’s ability to generate transportation fantasy. This stands to reason as our own qualitative work indicates that minority consumers from the non-inner city relate to street credible endorsers base on both (sublime and exotic driven) transportation and (similarity in experience as minorities driven) identification fantasies. Overall, these findings suggest that in order for the street credible endorser to evoke ID fantasy similarity to the endorser needs to be high and that role of additional mediators such as the similar race may need to be further explored.
3.8.4.3 Analysis: How Similarity Mediates Traditional Credibility and Fantasy

An analysis of the data indicates that traditionally credible endorser’s ability to evoke identification fantasy is partially mediated by the level of similarity between the consumer and the endorser. The resulting indirect effect confidence intervals (LLCI = .1402, ULCI = .2531) did not include zero, indicating an indirect effect of \((a \times b)\) (see Figure 3.28) and mediation is established with a 95% confidence interval (Zhao et al. 2011). The mean indirect effect from the bootstrap analysis is positive \((a \times b = .20)\). A unit increase in credibility increases consumers perception of similarity to the celebrity by 0.53 units (path a). While holding credibility constant, an increase in one unit of similarity increases identification fantasy by .37 (path b). Holding similarity constant, an increase in one unit of credibility increases transportation fantasy by .39 (the direct effect of path c is .39). All paths are reported to be significant \((p < .001)\). As path \(a \times b \times c\) is positive, the mediation type is complimentary (Zhao et al. 2011). This result indicates that although these findings support \(H_{4b}\), there is a high likelihood that there is an omitted mediator in the direct path (Zhao et al. 2011). This result stands to reason, as prior studies have indicated, the allure to credible celebrities is based on cultural meanings that consumer wish to acquire (Belk, 2006; Escalas and Bettman 2003; McCracken, 1989). Hence, while the hypothesis of mediation is supported, the overall hypothesized theoretical framework does not account for all significant mediators. Additional mediators need to be explored further.

To gain additional insight on the relationship between traditional credibility, similarity and fantasy, the mediating effect of similarity on traditional credibility and transportation fantasy was further explored. An analysis of the data indicates that a
traditionally credible endorser’s ability to evoke transportation fantasy is partially mediated by the level of similarity between the consumer and the endorser. The resulting indirect effect confidence intervals (LLCI = -0.390, ULCI = 0.3812) included zero, indicated no indirect effect (a x b) (see Figure 3.29). This suggests that similarity to the endorser does not mediate the relationship between an endorser’s level of traditional credibility and their ability to evoke transportation fantasy.

Overall, this study provides insight to the importance of similarity, a construct abandoned in contemporary models and scales, to the traditional endorser ability to generate fantasies. Both main studies suggest that street credible and traditional endorsers provide consumers with different types of fantasies. In agreement with McCracken (1989), these fantasies provide consumers meanings and benefits beyond the scope and measure of traditional models and scales for measuring endorser persuasion and usefulness.

3.9 Discussion

The 15-item street credibility scale captures five dimensions of street credibility; “street origins,” “tough,” “criminal history,” “sexual persona,” and “the gap.” These dimensions embody the three antecedents of street credibility, “street life,” “power,” and the “width of the gap between street origins and current possessions and power” as defined in our earlier qualitative research. This scale reported to measure a different construct than that of cool, credibility, and the consumer’s similarity to the endorser. This work agrees with our earlier qualitative research.

The 6-item fantasy type scale was constructed to determine which type of fantasy, identification or transportation, is being evoked. The final scale was determined to be
valid and reliable and was easy to administer. Both the street credibility and fantasy type scales will be useful in basic and applied research.

We find that endorsers who measure high on street credibility are more able to evoke transportation fantasy and are less similar to consumers. This suggests that the relationship between street credible endorsers and transportation fantasy is mediated by the consumer’s similarity to the endorser. This supports our suggestion that transportation fantasy is affected by dissimilarity in the form of the exotic and sublime.

Our research indicated that street credible endorsers are not significantly more exciting than traditional endorsers but significantly less sincere. Our earlier qualitative work indicated that street credible endorsers were indeed more exciting than their traditional counterparts. A review of our research suggests that the excitement associated with the street credible endorser is tied to the ideas of transportation, exoticism, and the sublime. The essence of these constructs may be absent from Aaker’s (1987) measures for an exciting brand personality. It is possible that the endurance of the consumer – street credible celebrity relationship in the face of celebrity transgressions is not related to the celebrity’s brand personality. We suggest that these relationships endure when there is congruence between the transgression and the factors that measure the endorser’s street credibility. This in turn should increase the endorser’s ability to evoke transformational fantasies. More research in this area needs to be developed.

Our findings suggest that sports celebrities with street credibility are less cool, less exciting, less sincere, and less able to evoke transportation fantasy than music street credible celebrities. This may be due to the nature of the relationship that the consumer holds with the street credible sports celebrity. In this relationship, the celebrity’s value
may not be from an ability to evoke transportation fantasies but rather in an ability, through sports, to foster other feelings such as excitement, community pride, and social acceptance (see Funk, Ridinger, and Moorman 2004). In this instance, acts of street credibility are not congruent to the sports role of the sports-street credible endorser. This may explain why Michael Vick, while street credible, was deemed less cool than any other celebrity. This may also be due to his previous fall from grace. Still, our findings are based on one set of sports celebrities from a small sample size. Thus more research needs to be developed in this direction.

Also, our researched did not delineate the main effects of celebrity type as they it were not relevant to our stated hypotheses. However, this data in addition to that relating to role race plays in mediating similarity to the endorser and fantasy types should be investigated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1: Celebrity Salient Street Credibility Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actors (TV and Movie)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ice T**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Denzel Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Danny Trejo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Ice Cube**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Curtis Jackson aka 50 cent**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Bruce Willis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Dwayne “The Rock” Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Tyrese Gibson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Vin Diesel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Donnie Wahlberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Earl Simmons aka DMX**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Eminem**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Hugh Jackman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Idris Elba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 James Earl Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 James Franco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Johnny Depp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 LL Cool J**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Ludacris**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Matthew McConaughey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Morgan Freeman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3.1: Celebrity Salient Street Credibility Scores (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors (TV and Movie)</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Music (Singer and Rappers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td><strong>Male Exemplars</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Robert De Niro</td>
<td>Nia Long</td>
<td>Michael Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Robert Downey Jr.</td>
<td>Oprah Winfrey</td>
<td>Michael Oher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Samuel L. Jackson</td>
<td>Sofia Vergara</td>
<td>Nick Diaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Scan Connery</td>
<td>Winona Ryder</td>
<td>Plaxico Burress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Snoop Dogg**</td>
<td>Angelina Jolie</td>
<td>Randy Moss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 T. I.**</td>
<td>Roseanne Barr</td>
<td>Rasheed Wallace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Tom Arnold</td>
<td>Alexis Bledel</td>
<td>Reggie Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Tyler Perry</td>
<td>The Kardashian Family</td>
<td>Sam Hurd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Will Smith**</td>
<td>Amy Adams</td>
<td>Usain Bolt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Ben Affleck</td>
<td>Angela Lansbury</td>
<td>Vince Wilfork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Channing Tatum</td>
<td>Angie Harmon</td>
<td>Kurt Warner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Jonathan Taylor Thomas</td>
<td>Anne Hathaway</td>
<td>Michael Phelps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Mark Wahlberg**</td>
<td>Bette Midler</td>
<td>Mike Tyson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Mario Lopez aka “A.C. Slater”</td>
<td>Claire Danes</td>
<td>Terrell Owens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Adam Sandler</td>
<td>Demi Lovato</td>
<td>Aaron Rodgers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Alex Trebek</td>
<td>Drew Barrymore</td>
<td>Alex Rodriguez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Arnold Schwarzenegger</td>
<td>Emma Stone</td>
<td>Andrew Luck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Billy Baldwin</td>
<td>Jennifer Aniston</td>
<td>David Beckham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Dave Couler</td>
<td>Jessica Biel</td>
<td>Ben Roethlisberger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 David Caruso</td>
<td>Jessica Simpson</td>
<td>Bruce Jenner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C.1.6 Table 3.1: Celebrity Salient Street Credibility Scores (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Male Exemplars</th>
<th>Female Exemplars</th>
<th>Music (Singer and Rappers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Leonardo DiCaprio</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Cate Blanchett</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Ewan McGregor</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Kate Winslet</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Robert Pattinson</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Katie Couric</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Jean-Claude Van Damme</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Kelly Ripa</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>John Cryer</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Keira Knightly</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>John Goodman</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Kim Kardashian</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Jude Law</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Kirsten Dunst</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Kevin Bacon</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Lena Dunham</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Laurence Fishburne</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Liv Tyler</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Macaulay Culkin</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Lucy Liu</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Mark Harmon</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Ashley Olsen</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Marlon Brando</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Melissa Joan Hart</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Matt Damon</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Scarlett Johansson</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Michael Cera</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Snooki</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Neil Patrick Harris</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Tina Fey</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Nicolas Cage</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Tyra Banks</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Paul Giamatti</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Zooey Deschanel</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Paul Ruebens aka Pee-wee Herman</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Glenn Close</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Richard Gere</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Gwyneth Paltrow</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C.1.6 Table 3.1: Celebrity Salient Street Credibility Scores (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors (TV and Movie)</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Music (Singer and Rappers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Male Exemplars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 Rob Dydrick</td>
<td>-1 Meg Ryan</td>
<td>-2 Tony Hawk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 Rob Schneider</td>
<td>-1 Miley Cyrus</td>
<td>-2 Tony Romo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 Robin Williams</td>
<td>-1 Nicole Kidman</td>
<td>-2 Wayne Gretzky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 Ryan Reynolds</td>
<td>-1 Kirsten Stewart</td>
<td>-4* David Beckham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 Seth Rogen</td>
<td>-1 Lindsay Lohan</td>
<td>-4* Derrik Jeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 Shia Labeouf</td>
<td>-1 Reese Witherspoon</td>
<td>-4* Luke Walton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 Simon Baker</td>
<td>-1 Sandra Bullock</td>
<td>-4* Tom Brady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Wayne Brady</td>
<td>-1 Julia Roberts</td>
<td>-6* Lance Armstrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 Will Ferrel</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 Zac Efron</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 Ben Stiller</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 Ryan Gosling</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 Tom Hanks</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74 Brad Pitt</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 Charlie Sheen</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 George Clooney</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Tom Cruise</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of Respondents That Could Not Think of a Good or Bad Exemplar to Fit the Celebrity by Genre**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors (TV and Movie)</th>
<th>Male Exemplars</th>
<th>Female Exemplars</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Male Exemplars</th>
<th>Female Exemplars</th>
<th>Music (Singer and Rappers)</th>
<th>Male Exemplars</th>
<th>Female Exemplars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** = Started career in music industry

• = True outliers, 2 standard deviations from the mean
Table 3.2: 81 Item EFA; 12 Factor Initial (Un-rotated) Component Matrix

*Components 13-80 removed for formatting purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
<th>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
<td>Cumulative %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.238</td>
<td>27.120</td>
<td>27.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.725</td>
<td>4.543</td>
<td>44.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.696</td>
<td>3.288</td>
<td>47.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.270</td>
<td>2.768</td>
<td>50.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.794</td>
<td>2.187</td>
<td>52.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.469</td>
<td>1.791</td>
<td>54.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.366</td>
<td>1.666</td>
<td>56.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.173</td>
<td>1.430</td>
<td>57.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.090</td>
<td>1.330</td>
<td>58.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.070</td>
<td>1.305</td>
<td>60.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.034</td>
<td>1.281</td>
<td>61.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Component 1</td>
<td>Component 2</td>
<td>Component 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has built a name for himself/herself in the street</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a poser</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tries to be something he/she is not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a criminal past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been involved in a violent crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has come from the bottom and made it to the top</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a true “rags to riches” story</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was extremely poor but now is wealthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once ruled the streets of an inner city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was able to acquire power in the streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At one time held physical, sexual, and financial power in the streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boast about sexual exploits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brags about sexual conquest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a string of men/women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built a reputation based on sexual conquest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a sell out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a snitch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was able to acquire money while living in the streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was able to acquire financial power while living in the streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is admired by his/her peers for the amount of money he could make in the streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Became successful at dealing with business within the streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is weak</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a wimp</td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be easily pushed around</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is stupid</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is naïve</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.3: 81 Item EFA; Five Factor Rotated Component Matrix (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was extremely poor at one time</td>
<td>0.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has lived in an impoverished area</td>
<td>0.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grew up in an area where he/she had to be ready to fight to survive</td>
<td>0.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comes from a place that is dangerous and violent</td>
<td>0.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is known for backing down</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a reputation within the inner city</td>
<td>0.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is respected in the inner city</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has cultivated a street identity</td>
<td>0.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lies about being from the streets</td>
<td>-0.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tells the truth about his/her life experiences in the streets</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At one point, saw crime as a way of life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has drifted in and out of prison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is respected in part because of his/her ability to come from such a bad situation</td>
<td>0.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is proud to be from the streets</td>
<td>0.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrates street culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is tough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is street smart</td>
<td>0.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows the rules of surviving in the streets</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was born with a silver spoon in his/her mouth</td>
<td>-0.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has had an easy life</td>
<td>-0.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is used to physical violence</td>
<td>0.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced violence at home</td>
<td>0.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was once feared by others in his/her neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses force to get what he/she wants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can beat people up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believes that a great number of sexual conquest translates into being respected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.3: 81 Item EFA; Five Factor Rotated Component Matrix (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always represents his/her neighborhood</td>
<td>0.436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers having a string of women as a measure of a man's success</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is from a poor family</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grew up in an area where being violent translated into being respected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been to prison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been to jail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was able to acquire cars while living in the streets</td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a push over</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is soft</td>
<td>0.669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a rat</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grew up in an upper class neighborhood</td>
<td>-0.679</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a failure</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is from a rich family</td>
<td>-0.658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grew up in a place where there was widespread violence</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has built a reputation based on violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grew up thinking that it was &quot;OK to be a virgin&quot;</td>
<td>-0.457</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can navigate successfully within the culture of the streets</td>
<td>0.536</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brags about life experiences in the streets that he/she has not actually had</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would say he/she would do something illegal but when the opportunity arose, would back out</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is respected for his/her ability to fight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could not survive in the inner city</td>
<td>-0.476</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was admired for his/her cars when he/she lived in the streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows how to determine if a situation is dangerous</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a nerd</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is surrounded by violent people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules with an iron fist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is dangerous if provoked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is respected by everyone in the ghetto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was able to acquire nice clothes while living in the streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While growing up, he/she could purchase anything he/she wanted at any time</td>
<td>-0.523</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total % Variance Explained</td>
<td>14.124</td>
<td>12.852</td>
<td>10.552</td>
<td>10.552</td>
<td>5.930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Component 1</td>
<td>Component 2</td>
<td>Component 3</td>
<td>Component 4</td>
<td>Component 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is weak</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>-0.214</td>
<td>-0.161</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a push over</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>-0.191</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be easily pushed around</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td>-0.216</td>
<td>-0.133</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>-0.106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a wimp</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>-0.222</td>
<td>-0.198</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>-0.132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is known for backing down</td>
<td>0.728</td>
<td>-0.218</td>
<td>-0.109</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is soft</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>-0.218</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>-0.108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a failure</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>-0.200</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is naive</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td>-0.106</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a snitch</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>-0.182</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>-0.077</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a rat</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>-0.201</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a poser</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>-0.279</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was extremely poor at one time</td>
<td>-0.150</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is from a poor family</td>
<td>-0.154</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was extremely poor but now is wealthy</td>
<td>-0.236</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comes from a place that is dangerous and violent</td>
<td>-0.187</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has lived in an impoverished area</td>
<td>-0.170</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grew up in a place where there was widespread violence</td>
<td>-0.213</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grew up in an upper class neighborhood</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td>-0.678</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>-0.167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is from a rich family</td>
<td>0.349</td>
<td>-0.678</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>-0.118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a true “rags to riches” story</td>
<td>-0.345</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>-0.088</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grew up in an area where he/she had to be ready to fight to survive</td>
<td>-0.243</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has come from the bottom and made it to the top</td>
<td>-0.364</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>-0.082</td>
<td>-0.140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was able to acquire financial power while living in the streets</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is admired by her peers for the amount of money he/she could make in the streets</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was able to acquire power in the streets</td>
<td>-0.185</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At one time held physical, sexual, and financial power in the streets</td>
<td>-0.133</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once ruled the streets of an inner city</td>
<td>-0.090</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.693</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Became successful at dealing with business within the streets</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was able to acquire cars while living in the streets</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believes that a great number of sexual conquest translates into being respected</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.5: 40 Item EFA; Five Factor Rotated Component Matrix (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brags about sexual conquest</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boast about sexual exploits</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers having a string of women as a measure of a man's success</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built a reputation based on sexual conquest</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a string of men/women</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been to jail</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been to prison</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a criminal past</td>
<td>-0.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been involved in a violent crime</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total % Variance Explained</strong></td>
<td>16.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.5: 40 Item EFA; Solution Stability Across Celebrities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>50 Cent</th>
<th>Eminem</th>
<th>Li Kim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is weak</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a push over</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be easily pushed around</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a wimp</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is known for backing down</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td>.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is soft</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a failure</td>
<td>.553</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is naive</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a snitch</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a poser</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was extremely poor at one time</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is from a poor family</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was extremely poor but now is wealthy</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comes from a place that is dangerous and violent</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has lived in an impoverished area</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grew up in a place where there was widespread violence</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grew up in an upper class neighborhood</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is from a rich family</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a true “rags to riches” story</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grew up in an area where he/she had to be ready to fight to survive</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.5: 40 Item EFA; Solution Stability Across Celebrities (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>50 Cent</th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has come from the bottom and made it to the top</td>
<td>-0.352</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>-0.331</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>-0.362</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>-0.072</td>
<td>-0.378</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>-0.111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was able to acquire financial power while living in the streets</td>
<td>-0.139</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>-0.093</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>-0.123</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.668</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is admired by his/her peers for the amount of money he/she could make in the streets</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.642</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was able to acquire power in the streets</td>
<td>-0.339</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>-0.251</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At one time held physical, sexual, and financial power in the streets</td>
<td>-0.264</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>-0.166</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.548</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once ruled the streets of an inner city</td>
<td>-0.154</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>-0.120</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>-0.112</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Became successful at dealing with business within the streets</td>
<td>-0.140</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>0.601</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.677</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>-0.145</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was able to acquire cars while living in the streets</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believes that a great number of sexual conquest translates into being respected</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brags about sexual conquest</td>
<td>-0.077</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boast about sexual exploits</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers having a string of women as a measure of a man's success</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>-0.120</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built a reputation based on sexual conquest</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>-0.088</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a string of men/women</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been to jail</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been to prison</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.757</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a criminal past</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>-0.151</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been involved in a violent crime</td>
<td>-0.131</td>
<td>0.529</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Variance Explained</td>
<td>18.04</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>13.06</td>
<td>10.36</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>17.05</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>10.19</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>15.01</td>
<td>13.98</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Variance Explained In Initial 40 item solution</td>
<td>-1.91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.57</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.6: 40 Item EFA; Solution Stability Across Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is weak</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td>-.159</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>-.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a push over</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be easily pushed around</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>-.216</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a wimp</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td>-.240</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>-.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is known for backing down</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>-.147</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is soft</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>-.174</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a failure</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>-.265</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>-.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is naive</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>-.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a snitch</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>-.202</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>-.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a rat</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>-.170</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a poser</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>-.250</td>
<td>-.216</td>
<td>-.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was extremely poor at one time</td>
<td>-.138</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is from a poor family</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was extremely poor but now is wealthy</td>
<td>-.204</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comes from a place that is dangerous and violent</td>
<td>-.145</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has lived in an impoverished area</td>
<td>-.189</td>
<td>.701</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grew up in a place where there was widespread violence</td>
<td>-.154</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grew up in an upper class neighborhood</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>-.735</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>-.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is from a rich family</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>-.708</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a true “rags to riches” story</td>
<td>-.320</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grew up in an area where he/she had to be ready to fight to survive</td>
<td>-.194</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has come from the bottom and made it to the top</td>
<td>-.345</td>
<td>.622</td>
<td>-.167</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was able to acquire financial power while living in the streets</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is admired by his/her peers for the amount of money he/she could make in the streets</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was able to acquire power in the streets</td>
<td>-.192</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At one time held physical, sexual, and financial power in the streets</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once ruled the streets of an inner city</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Became successful at dealing with business within the streets</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was able to acquire cars while living in the streets</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believes that a great number of sexual conquests translates into being respected</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td>.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brags about sexual conquest</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brags about sexual exploits</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers having a string of women as a measure of a man’s success</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built a reputation based on sexual conquest</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a string of women</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been to jail</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>-.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been to prison</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a criminal past</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been involved in a violent crime</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>-.311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of Variance Explained around solution: 15.7 15.61 11.47 11.29 7.50
% of Variance Explained in Initial 40 Item solution: 0.43 -0.08 0.02 -1.02 -0.57 -0.13 -0.52 -0.53 1.21 0.575
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Table 3.7: 40 Item EFA; Solution Stability Across Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Middle Class</th>
<th>Lower Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Component</td>
<td>Component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is weak</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>-.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a push over</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td>-.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be easily pushed</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>-.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>around</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td>-.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a wimp</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td>-.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is known for backing</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>-.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>down</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td>-.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is soft</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>-.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is naive</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>-.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a snitch</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td>-.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a rat</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>-.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a poser</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was extremely poor at</td>
<td>-.183</td>
<td>.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one time</td>
<td>-.213</td>
<td>.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is from a poor family</td>
<td>-.160</td>
<td>.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was extremely poor but</td>
<td>-.178</td>
<td>.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>now is wealthy</td>
<td>-.215</td>
<td>.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comes from a place that</td>
<td>-.337</td>
<td>-.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is dangerous and violent</td>
<td>-.150</td>
<td>.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has lived in an</td>
<td>-.245</td>
<td>.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impoverished area</td>
<td>-.327</td>
<td>.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grew up in a place</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where there was</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>widespread violence</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grew up in an area</td>
<td>-.245</td>
<td>.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where he/she had to</td>
<td>-.327</td>
<td>.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be ready to fight</td>
<td>-.138</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to survive</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was able to acquire</td>
<td>-.878</td>
<td>.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>financial power while</td>
<td>-.636</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>living in the streets</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe that a great</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of sexual</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>-.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conquest translates</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>into being respected</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brags about sexual</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conquest</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>-.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a string of women</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been to jail</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been to prison</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a criminal past</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been involved in a</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violent crime</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Variance Explained</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in initial 40 item</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>Age 30 and Below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is weak</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>-.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a push over</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>-.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be easily pushed around</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>-.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a wimp</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td>-.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is known for backing down</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>-.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is soft</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td>-.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a failure</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>-.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is naive</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>-.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a snitch</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td>-.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a rat</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>-.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a poser</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>-.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was extremely poor at one time</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is from a poor family</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was extremely poor but now is wealthy</td>
<td>-.228</td>
<td>.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comes from a place that is dangerous and violent</td>
<td>-.172</td>
<td>.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has lived in an impoverished area</td>
<td>-.150</td>
<td>.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grew up in a place where there was widespread violence</td>
<td>-.258</td>
<td>.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grew up in an upper class neighborhood</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>-.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is from a rich family</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>-.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a true &quot;rags to riches&quot; story</td>
<td>-.375</td>
<td>-.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grew up in an area where he/she had to be ready to fight to survive</td>
<td>-.287</td>
<td>.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has come from the bottom and made it to the top</td>
<td>-.350</td>
<td>.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was able to acquire financial power while living in the streets</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is admired by his/her peers for the amount of money he/she could make in the streets</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was able to acquire power in the streets</td>
<td>-.237</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At one time held physical, sexual, and financial power in the streets</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once ruled the streets of an inner city</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Became successful at dealing with business within the streets</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was able to acquire cars while living in the streets</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believes that a great number of sexual conquest translates into being respected</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brags about sexual conquest</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boast about sexual exploits</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers having a string of women as a measure of a man's success</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built a reputation based on sexual conquest</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>-.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a string of women</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>-.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been to jail</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been to prison</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a criminal past</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been involved in a violent crime</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Variance Explained</td>
<td>17.08</td>
<td>14.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Variance Explained in Initial 40 item solution</td>
<td>-.95</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.9: 40 Item EFA; Solution Stability Across Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is weak</td>
<td>-2.36</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.853</td>
<td>-1.83</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a push over</td>
<td>-2.10</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be easily pushed around</td>
<td>-2.19</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td>-2.39</td>
<td>-2.01</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a wimp</td>
<td>-2.20</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-1.91</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>-2.23</td>
<td>-2.07</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is known for backing down</td>
<td>-2.40</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>-1.54</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is soft</td>
<td>-2.57</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-1.73</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a failure</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>-2.19</td>
<td>-2.95</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is naive</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>-2.05</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a snitch</td>
<td>-1.81</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a rat</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
<td>-2.46</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a poser</td>
<td>-3.03</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>-1.10</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was extremely poor at one time</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>-1.37</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is from a poor family</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>1.124</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was extremely poor but now is wealthy</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>-2.56</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>-2.93</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comes from a place that is dangerous and violent</td>
<td>.715</td>
<td>-1.69</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>-.260</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has lived in an impoverished area</td>
<td>.710</td>
<td>-2.42</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grew up in a place where there was widespread violence</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>-1.98</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>-.291</td>
<td>-.230</td>
<td>-.508</td>
<td>-.202</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grew up in an upper class neighborhood</td>
<td>-.717</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td>-.173</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>-.440</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>-.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is from a rich family</td>
<td>-.698</td>
<td>-.344</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>-.184</td>
<td>-.469</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a true &quot;rags to riches&quot; story</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>-.303</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>-.586</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grew up in an area where he/she had to be ready to fight to survive</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>-.241</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>-.305</td>
<td>-.427</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has come from the bottom and made it to the top</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>-.395</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>-.336</td>
<td>-.319</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>-.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was able to acquire financial power while living in the streets</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>-.135</td>
<td>-.204</td>
<td>-.766</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is admired by his/her peers for the amount of money he/she could make in the streets</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>-.754</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was able to acquire power in the streets</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>-.293</td>
<td>-.729</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At one time held physical, sexual, and financial power in the streets</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>-.212</td>
<td>-.615</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>-.310</td>
<td>.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once ruled the streets of an inner city</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>-.749</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Became successful at dealing with business within the streets</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>-.763</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was able to acquire cars while living in the streets</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.758</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believes that a great number of sexual conquest translates into being respected</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>-.260</td>
<td>-.203</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brags about sexual conquest</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.879</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boast about sexual exploits</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers having a string of women as a measure of a man's success</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-.268</td>
<td>-.211</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>-.666</td>
<td>-.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built a reputation based on sexual conquest</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>-.263</td>
<td>.715</td>
<td>-.183</td>
<td>-.272</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>-.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a string of women</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.130</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been to jail</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.225</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been to prison</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.794</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-.449</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a criminal past</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>-.435</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been involved in a violent crime</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.626</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.509</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.524</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of Variance Explained: 15.67 15.28 10.95 10.66 7.11
Variance Explained in Initial 40 item solution: 0.46 0.25 0.54 -0.39 -0.14
Table 3.10: Cronbach’s Alpha for the Five Factors of Street Credibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale Factor</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Subscale Factor</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Subscale Factor</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Subscale Factor</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Subscale Factor</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tough</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>Street Origins</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>Criminal History</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>Has been to jail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is weak</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td>Is a push over</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td>.644</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>Has been to prison</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a push over</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>Is from a poor family</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is easily pushed around</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>Is from a poor family</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a wimp</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>Is from a rich family</td>
<td>.918</td>
<td>.594</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is known for backing down</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>Is from a rich family</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is soft</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>Is from a rich family</td>
<td>.904</td>
<td>.594</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a failure</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>Is a snitch</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a rat</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>Is a snitch</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a poser</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>Is a snitch</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subscale Factor 1: Tough Cronbach’s Alpha = .91
Subscale Factor 2: Street Origins Cronbach’s Alpha = .874
Subscale Factor 3: Street Power Cronbach’s Alpha = .863
Subscale Factor 4: Sexual Persona Cronbach’s Alpha = .863
Subscale Factor 5: Criminal History Cronbach’s Alpha = .863
Table 3.11: Cronbach's Alpha for Final 15-item Street Credibility Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is weak</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a push over</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is naïve</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was extremely poor but now is wealthy</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comes from a place that is dangerous and violent</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is from a poor family</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brags about sexual conquest</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boast about sexual exploits</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built a reputation based on sexual conquest</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been to prison</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a criminal past</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been involved in a violent crime</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was able to acquire financial power while living in the streets</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once ruled the streets of an inner city</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Became successful at dealing with business within the streets</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>.726</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach's Alpha = .817
Table 3.12: Five Factor -15-item Street Credibility Scale EFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is weak</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a push over</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is naive</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was extremely poor but now is wealthy</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comes from a place that is dangerous and violent</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is from a poor family</td>
<td>-.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brags about sexual conquest</td>
<td>.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boast about sexual exploits</td>
<td>.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built a reputation based on sexual conquest</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been to prison</td>
<td>.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a criminal past</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been involved in a violent crime</td>
<td>.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was able to acquire financial power while living in the streets</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once ruled the streets of an inner city</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Became successful at dealing with business within the streets</td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.13: Fantasy Three Factor EFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rotated Component Matrix</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Feel like I am being transported to a distant place</td>
<td>.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Feel as though I were one of the characters</td>
<td>.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Visualize the events that are taking place in a world different from my own</td>
<td>.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Imagine how I would feel if the events in the story were happening to me</td>
<td>.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Get completely caught up in their story</td>
<td>.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Really get involved with the main character’s feelings</td>
<td>.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Know how the main character feels</td>
<td>.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Feel like they are telling my story</td>
<td>.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Am affected emotionally</td>
<td>.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Find my mind wandering</td>
<td>.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Reminds me of events that I have actually seen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Allows me to escape from my everyday life</td>
<td>.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Shows me things that I never imagine existed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Takes me away from the everyday</td>
<td>.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Allows me to leave my worries behind</td>
<td>.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Shows a mirror image of some part in my life</td>
<td>.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Is strikingly different or unusual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Takes me someplace that I physically could not go to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Is my window for viewing a world beyond my own</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Allows me to easily picture the events taking place</td>
<td>.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Makes me picture myself in the scenes of the events being described in the narrative</td>
<td>.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Can very easily put myself in the place of a leading character</td>
<td>.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Am reminded of a similar events in my life</td>
<td>.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Shows the kind of things that I have personally gone through</td>
<td>.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Feel as if I am getting a glimpse into another world that is very different from my own</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Presents a dangerous and exciting world</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Provides me with a passport to a place I would not normally be allowed to visit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.14: Fantasy Two Factor EFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rotated Component Matrix(^a)</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Feel like I am being transported to a distant place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Feel as though I were one of the characters</td>
<td>.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Visualize the events that are taking place in world different than my own</td>
<td>.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Imagine how I would feel if the events in the story were happening to me</td>
<td>.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Really get involved with the main character's feelings</td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Know how the main character feels</td>
<td>.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Feel like they are telling my story</td>
<td>.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Reminds me of events things that I have actually seen</td>
<td>.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Shows me things that I never imagine existed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Shows a mirror image of some part in my life</td>
<td>.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Is strikingly different or unusual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Takes me someplace that I physically could not go to</td>
<td>.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Is my window for viewing a world beyond my own</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Can very easily put myself in the place of a leading character</td>
<td>.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Am reminded of a similar events in my life</td>
<td>.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Shows the kind of things that I have personally gone through</td>
<td>.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Feel as if I am getting a glimpse into another world that is very different from my own</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Presents a dangerous and exciting world</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Provides me with a passport to a place I would not normally be allowed to visit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Covariance matrix.
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### Table 3.15: Final 6-item Scale EFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rotated Component Matrix³</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Can very easily put</td>
<td>0.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myself in the place of a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leading character</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Am reminded of a similar</td>
<td>0.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>events in my life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Shows the kind of things</td>
<td>0.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that I have personally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gone through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Feel as if I am getting</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a glimpse into another</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>world that is very</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different from my own</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Presents a dangerous</td>
<td>0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and exciting world</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provides me with a</td>
<td>0.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passport to a place I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would not normally be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allowed to visit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Factor 1: Identity</td>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha = .840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</td>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Can very easily put myself in the place of a leading character</td>
<td>.651 .834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Am reminded of a similar events in my life</td>
<td>.749 .733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Shows the kind of things that I have personally gone through</td>
<td>.720 .767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.17: Fantasy Study Across Entertainment Genres, Two Factor EFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rotated Component Matrix^a</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides me with a passport to a place I would not normally be allowed to visit</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presents a dangerous and exciting world</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt as if I was getting a glimpse into another world that is very different from my own</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>-.154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows the kind of things that I have personally gone through</td>
<td>-.255</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was reminded of a similar events in my life</td>
<td>-.215</td>
<td>.881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could very easily put myself in the place of a leading character</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.18: Street Credibility Discriminant Validity EFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is cool</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td>-.182</td>
<td>.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>-.278</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td>-.178</td>
<td>-.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Power</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>-.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Origins</td>
<td>-.145</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>-.382</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>-.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex_Rep</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>-.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tough</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>.867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.19: Brand Personality EFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is wholesome</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is down to earth</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is honest</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is cheerful</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is spirited</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is caring</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is imaginative</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is up to date</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.604</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.20: Study 11 MANOVA Multivariate Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Pillai's Trace:</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>5558.982*</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>726.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilks' Lambda:</td>
<td>016</td>
<td>5558.982*</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>726.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotelling's Trace:</td>
<td>61.256</td>
<td>5558.982*</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>726.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roy's Largest Root:</td>
<td>61.256</td>
<td>5558.982*</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>726.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCVC</td>
<td>Pillai's Trace:</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>123.075*</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>726.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilks' Lambda:</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>123.075*</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>726.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotelling's Trace:</td>
<td>1.356</td>
<td>123.075*</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>726.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roy's Largest Root:</td>
<td>1.356</td>
<td>123.075*</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>726.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CelebSet</td>
<td>Pillai's Trace:</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>19.187</td>
<td>16.000</td>
<td>1454.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilks' Lambda:</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>19.850*</td>
<td>16.000</td>
<td>1452.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotelling's Trace:</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>20.515</td>
<td>16.000</td>
<td>1450.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roy's Largest Root:</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>32.994*</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>727.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCVC * CelebSet</td>
<td>Pillai's Trace:</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>7.756</td>
<td>16.000</td>
<td>1454.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilks' Lambda:</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td>7.834*</td>
<td>16.000</td>
<td>1452.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotelling's Trace:</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>7.911</td>
<td>16.000</td>
<td>1450.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roy's Largest Root:</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>12.114*</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>727.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Exact statistic
b. The statistic is an upper bound on F that yields a lower bound on the significance level.
c. Design: Intercept + SCVC + CelebSet + SCVC * CelebSet
Table 3.21: Study 11, Test of Between Subject Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>Street_Cred</td>
<td>441.095</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>88.219</td>
<td>191.433</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cred</td>
<td>223.205</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44.641</td>
<td>44.313</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cool</td>
<td>303.907</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60.781</td>
<td>31.497</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excite</td>
<td>154.785</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30.957</td>
<td>24.237</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>357.291</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.456</td>
<td>59.310</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>86.730</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.346</td>
<td>10.680</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trans_Fantasy</td>
<td>115.139</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.028</td>
<td>14.489</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ID_Fantasy</td>
<td>122.657</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24.531</td>
<td>13.855</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Street_Cred</td>
<td>11884.027</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11884.027</td>
<td>25354.578</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cred</td>
<td>13301.161</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13301.161</td>
<td>13203.510</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cool</td>
<td>14033.542</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14033.542</td>
<td>6419.324</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excite</td>
<td>17174.809</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17174.809</td>
<td>13430.026</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>12136.453</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12136.453</td>
<td>10075.911</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>5128.212</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5128.212</td>
<td>3080.614</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trans_Fantasy</td>
<td>11507.934</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11507.934</td>
<td>7245.816</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ID_Fantasy</td>
<td>5786.402</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5786.402</td>
<td>3268.209</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCVC</td>
<td>Street_Cred</td>
<td>283.767</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>283.767</td>
<td>854.531</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cred</td>
<td>156.308</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>156.308</td>
<td>154.158</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cool</td>
<td>150.415</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150.415</td>
<td>66.003</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excite</td>
<td>31.307</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.307</td>
<td>24.481</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>289.812</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>289.812</td>
<td>240.548</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>69.143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69.143</td>
<td>41.536</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trans_Fantasy</td>
<td>63.598</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63.598</td>
<td>40.041</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ID_Fantasy</td>
<td>19.857</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.857</td>
<td>11.134</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CelaS/set</td>
<td>Street_Cred</td>
<td>57.987</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.998</td>
<td>82.275</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cred</td>
<td>32.940</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.470</td>
<td>16.349</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cool</td>
<td>83.992</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41.991</td>
<td>18.172</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excite</td>
<td>50.574</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.287</td>
<td>22.951</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>4.355</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.177</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>7.631</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.816</td>
<td>2.292</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trans_Fantasy</td>
<td>16.333</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.166</td>
<td>5.142</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ID_Fantasy</td>
<td>57.197</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.598</td>
<td>16.155</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCVC*CelaS/set</td>
<td>Street_Cred</td>
<td>2.833</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.447</td>
<td>3.138</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cred</td>
<td>62.135</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31.067</td>
<td>30.833</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cool</td>
<td>152.103</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>75.081</td>
<td>32.295</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excite</td>
<td>66.327</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.163</td>
<td>25.932</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>100.272</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.136</td>
<td>41.613</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>19.211</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.066</td>
<td>6.577</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trans_Fantasy</td>
<td>19.091</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.546</td>
<td>6.010</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ID_Fantasy</td>
<td>46.805</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23.403</td>
<td>13.184</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Error               | Street_Cred         | 337.731                  | 733 | 461         | 1.087  | .300   |
|                    | Cred                | 730.419                  | 733 | 1.097       | 2.311  | .103   |
|                    | Cool                | 1693.750                 | 733 | 2.311       | 1.279  | .264   |
|                    | Excite              | 637.387                  | 733 | 1.279       | 1.205  | .271   |
|                    | Sincere             | 803.119                  | 733 | 1.205       | 1.665  | .178   |
|                    | Similar             | 1220.204                 | 733 | 1.665       | 1.588  | .196   |
|                    | Trans_Fantasy       | 1164.196                 | 733 | 1.588       | 1.770  | .196   |
|                    | ID_Fantasy          | 1297.581                 | 733 | 1.770       |        |        |
Figure 3.1: Street Credibility Exploratory Factor Analysis Scree Plot
Figure 3.2: Five Factor Street Credibility Scale CFA

* = Reversed coded; * = p<.05; all coefficients are standardized and appear above the associated path; dotted lines represent correlations.
Figure 3.3: Four Factor Street Credibility Scale CFA

- Is weak
- Is a push over
- Is naive
- Was extremely poor but now is wealthy
- Is from a poor family
- Comes from a place that is dangerous and violent
- Became successful with dealing with business in the streets
- Once ruled the street of an inner city
- Was able to acquire financial power while living in the streets
- Has a criminal past
- Has been to prison
- Has been involved in a violent crime

Street Wise

Street Origins

Power in the Streets

Crime

- .79*
- .79*
- .61*
- .77*
- .76*
- .76*
- .76*
- .57*
- .53*
- .81*
- .67*
- .66*

* = Reversed coded; * = p<.05; all coefficients are standardized and appear above the associated path; dotted lines represent correlations
Figure 3.4: Test Re-Test; Five Factor Street Credibility Scale CFA

- Is weak *
- Is a push over *
- Is naïve *
- Was extremely poor but now is wealthy
- Is from a poor family
- Comes from a place that is dangerous and violent
- Became successful with dealing with business in the streets
- Once ruled the street of an Inner city
- Was able to acquire financial power while living in the streets
- Brags about sexual conquest
- Boast about sexual exploits
- Built a reputation based on sexual conquest
- Has a criminal past
- Has been to prison
- Has been involved in a violent crime

Street Wise
Street Origins
Power in the Streets
Sexual Reputation
Crime

* = Reversed coded; * = p < .05; all coefficients are standardized and appear above the associated path; dotted lines represent correlations.
Figure 3.5: Test Re-Test; Four Factor Street Credibility Scale CFA

Is weak *

Is a push over *

Is naïve *

Was extremely poor but now is wealthy

Is from a poor family

Comes from a place that is dangerous and violent

Became successful with dealing with business in the streets

Once ruled the street of an inner city

Was able to acquire financial power while living in the streets

Has a criminal past

Has been to prison

Has been involved in a violent crime

Street Wise

Street Origins

Power in the Streets

Crime

* = Reversed coded; *p < 0.05; all coefficients are standardized and appear above the associated path; dotted lines represent correlations
Figure 3.6: Fantasy Exploratory Factor Analysis Scree Plot
Figure 3.7: Two Factor Fantasy Scale CFA

I am reminded of similar events in my life  
Shows the kind of things that I have personally gone through  
I can easily put myself in the place of the leading character  
Presents a dangerous and exciting world  
Provides me with a passport to a place I would not normally be allowed to visit  
I feel as if I am getting a glimpse into another world that is very different from my own

Identity
Transportation

*.86*
*.83*
*.73*
*.68*
*.83*
*.60*

*= Reversed coded, *= p<.05, all coefficients are standardized and appear above the associated path, dotted lines represent correlations.
Figure 3.8: Two Factor Fantasy Scale Cross Genre CFA

- I am reminded of similar events in my life
- Shows the kind of things that I have personally gone through
- I can easily put myself in the place of the leading character
- Presents a dangerous and exciting world
- Provides me with a passport to a place I would not normally be allowed to visit
- I feel as if I am getting a glimpse into another world that is very different from my own

* = p < .05; all coefficients are standardized and appear above the associated path; dotted lines represent correlations
Figure 3.9: Brand Personality Scale CFA

* = Reversed coded; * = p<.05; all coefficients are standardized and appear above the associated path; dotted lines represent correlations.
Figure 3.10: Study 11, Figure 10 Main Effects, Street Credibility (Street Cred)

![Bar chart showing mean street credibility for Street Cred Celeb and Traditional Cred Celeb in Music and Sports categories.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Sports</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Cred Celeb</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Cred Celeb</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.205</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.10: Study 11, Interaction Profile Plot, Street Credibility (Street Cred)
Figure 3.12: Study 11, Main Effect, Traditional Credibility (Cred)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Sports</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Cred Celeb</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Cred Celeb</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.13: Study 11, Interaction Profile Plot, Traditional Credibility (Cred)
Figure 3.14: Study 11, Main Effects, Cool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Sports</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Cred Celeb</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Cred Celeb</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>5.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.755</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.15: Study 11, Interaction Profile Plot, Cool
Figure 3.16: Study 11, Main Effects, Exciting Brand Personality (Excite)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Sports</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Cred Celeb</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Cred Celeb</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5.075</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.17: Study 11, Interaction Profile Plot, Exciting Brand Personality (Excite)
Figure 3.18: Study 11, Main Effects, Sincere Brand Personality (Sincere)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Sports</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Cred Celeb</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Cred Celeb</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>4.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.19: Study 11, Interaction Profile Plot, Sincere Brand Personality (Sincere)
Figure 3.20: Study 11, Main Effect, Similarity to the Celebrity Endorser (Similar)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Sports</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Cred Celeb</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Cred Celeb</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.21: Study 11, Interaction Profile Plot, Similarity to the Celebrity Endorser (Similar)
Figure 3.22: Study 11, Main Effect, Transportation Fantasy (Trans Fantasy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Sports</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Cred Celeb</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Cred Celeb</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.825</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.23: Study 11, Interaction Profile Plot, Transportation Fantasy (Trans Fantasy)
Figure 3.24: Study 11, Main Effects, Identification Fantasy (ID Fantasy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Sports</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Cred Celeb</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Cred Celeb</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.045</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.25: Study 11, Interaction Profile Plot, Identification fantasy
Figure 3.26: Study 12, Street Credibility, Transpiration Fantasy and Similarity

Indirect Effect Paths $axb = -0.0749^*$

Path $a = -0.3426^*$

Path $b = 0.2186^*$

Street Credibility $\rightarrow$ Similarity to the Endorser $\rightarrow$ Transportation Fantasy

Direct Effect Path $c = 0.5037^*$

Total Effect Path $c'(axb+c) = 0.4288$

*p < .001
Figure 3.27: Study 12, Street Credibility, Identification Fantasy and Similarity

Indirect Effect Paths $axb = -0.1895^*$

Path $a = -0.3426^*$

Similarity to the Endorser

Path $b = 4.036^*$

Street Credibility

Direct Effect Path $c = 0.1707^*$

Total Effect Path $c' (axb+c) = 0.019$

Identification Fantasy

*p < .001
Figure 3.28: Study 12, Traditional Credibility, Identification Fantasy and Similarity

Indirect Effect Paths axb = .1953*

Path a = 0.5310*

Path b = .3678*

Traditional Credibility

Direct Effect Path c = .3858*

Total Effect Path c’ (axb+c) = 0.5811

Identification Fantasy

*p<.001
Figure 3.29: Study 12, Traditional Credibility, Transportation Fantasy and Similarity

Indirect Effect Paths $axb = -0.0014$

Path $a = -0.5310^*$

Similarity to the Endorser

Path $b = 0.3675^*$

Traditional Credibility $\rightarrow$ Direct Effect Path $c = 0.2905^*$

Total Effect Path $c' (axb + c) = 0.2919$

Transportation Fantasy

*p < 0.001
CHAPTER 4:
LIMITATIONS, GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONTRIBUTIONS

4.1 Summary of Research

Overall, our research suggests that street credibility is a form of respect given to those who have survived and thrived within cultures of terror such as the “streets” of large metropolitan cities. The construct is characterized chiefly by authentic origins within the inner city. These origins provide these individuals with unique experiences that result in knowledge, skills, and the tough persona needed for the acquisition of power within these areas. We find that street credible characters are typically male and that the construct is generally masculine. In addition, the construct is more salient among inner city consumers, minorities, and males.

Street credibility is not the same as being cool. The two constructs may coexist or may be acquired and maintained independently. Further, while cool is defined differently by different individuals and may be learned or even bought, street credibility is defined as being acquired by authentic life experiences that are often filled with crime and violence. This creates a caste type system, making street credibility available only to a select few.

Street credible celebrities appear to hold different meanings for different consumers. For some, they are role models and cultural leaders, while for others, the celebrity’s life narratives allow for escape into fantasy. In this role, these celebrities are held to different standards than traditional celebrities. Consumers’ affinity for street credible endorsers is not easily explained by existing research on endorsers. The anomaly of the street credible celebrity is that their persona is based on the type of negative information that would be detrimental to the careers of mainstream celebrities. Therefore,
alternative models and scales must be employed to understand how consumers relate to street credible celebrities.

The Relationships, Feelings, Fantasy, and Experiential Consumption Model describes consumers’ attraction to street credible endorsers as being based on the ability of these celebrities to help consumers escape their everyday lives through fantasy. This model posits that the purchase and consumption of products endorsed by these celebrities provides further fantasy based experiences. This model can be a useful tool for better understanding many aspects of the meaning and uses of street credible endorsers. In order to do so, scales were needed to measure street credibility and types of fantasy.

To measure street credibility, a 15-item scale was developed. The scale reflects five dimensions (tough, street origins, street power, and sexual persona. To measure street credible endorsers’ ability to evoke fantasy, a 6-item scale was created. The scale measures transportation and identification fantasy. These scales proved useful in further understanding how consumers relate to street credible endorsers.

This research indicates that street credible endorsers are more able to evoke transportation fantasy than traditional endorsers. Our research indicates that street credible endorsers are less similar to consumers than traditionally credible endorsers are. We find that street credible endorsers’ ability to evoke transformational fantasy is mediated by consumers’ similarity to the celebrity. Here the lack of similarity makes the street credible endorser exotic and sublime and allows the celebrity to evoke fantasies of a foreign nature in consumer. We also find that similarity to the traditionally credible endorser allows this endorser to to evoke identification fantasies in consumers that bring about feelings of empathy.
4.2 Limitations

Attempts were made to conduct both qualitative and quantitative studies without the influence of instrument bias or confounds. However, some limitations inherently existed. Within the qualitative studies, as the research instrument, the primary researcher’s own gender and race may have led to levels of comfort or discomfort resulting in biases within respondent's answers. Within the quantitative studies, pretest for stimuli suggested that male celebrities from the music industry best captured the essence of street credibility. As such male exemplars from this genre were used heavily throughout these studies. It is possible that this may limit the generalizability of findings regarding the construct of street credibility, and the effect endorsers have on fantasy. More research is needed on the construct of street credibility and the relationship between street credible and traditional endorsers and fantasy that include more endorsers outside of the music industry.

4.3 Practical Implications

This research has several practical implications. The Relationships, Feelings, Fantasy, and Experiential Consumption model may be used by firms to gain further insight into the meanings and uses consumers have for celebrities. Furthermore, this model and the subsequent scales may be used to understand, measure, and ultimately activate experiential consumption. The street credibility scale promises to be useful in providing insight as to which celebrities are considered street credible by different consumer groups. The street credibility scale may be used to further understand which
celebrities have street credibility and the effect of street credibility on consumer, branding, and advertising metrics. The fantasy scale may be used to gain an understanding of consumer, brand, and advertisement attributes as well as the relationship that different types of fantasies play in consumer behavior.

4.4 Future Research

Our research on street credibility is only a starting point for better understanding the meaning and uses of these celebrities outside of traditional frameworks. To this end, we suggest the following areas of research. First, there is a need to expand upon our proposed model and further test our theories to ascertain whether consumers’ relationships with the non-traditional celebrity is consistent with the Relationships, Feelings, Fantasy, and Experiential Consumption Model. In addition, research is needed to determine whether a consumer’s application of this model is moderated by race and social-economic status. Second, we must seek to understand the effect of negative information on street credible celebrities. While it appears that negative information increases the celebrity’s street credible status, we must further delineate which types of negative information have such an effect and which do not. Third, we need to gain further insight into what type of brands and products are best suited to the street credible endorser. Fourth, while we have applied an alternative model to explain consumer affinity for street credible endorsers, this model is still in its infancy and needs to be further developed, tested and defined. Finally, our findings suggest that traditional endorsers also provide meaning through identification fantasy but stops short of
providing more insight into the relevance of such fantasies within the context of marketing additional research is needed in this area.

4.5 Contributions

This dissertation contributes to the field of marketing by identifying anomaly within the traditional endorser credibility models and introducing the construct of street credibility and a related model to explain the anomaly. In addition, this line research introduces two separate scales to measure street credibility and types of fantasy and validates the use of the brand personality scale to measure celebrities. This dissertation explores the role that similarity to the endorser plays in the relationship between endorser type and fantasy type. Next, each of these contributions is discussed.

Amos et al. (2008) explore the role that source effects play in celebrity credibility. They find that negative information or celebrity transgressions have the most impact on celebrity credibility. To this end, Amos and colleagues call for research on why some celebrities are able to survive, perhaps even thrive, despite past and current transgressions. This dissertation answers this call by introducing the notion of street credibility and the street credible endorser. These endorsers hold celebrity personas that are built on transgression. These studies contribute to the greater body of work by both elucidating this anomaly and by providing a construct and related models to explain its existence. In doing so, we heed McCracken’s (1989) assessment that the traditional endorsement literature needs to be expanded to account for existing anomalies.

The explanation of consumer affinity with street credible endorsers is explained through the model of Relationships, Feelings, Fantasy, and Experiential Consumption. This dissertation further adds to the literature through the development of two valid
scales. The first scale measures street credibility in celebrities and the second measures the type of fantasy. These scales should prove fruitful to both scholars and practitioners in the further understanding of celebrity effects as well as the effects of branding, advertising and other forms of communication. In addition, this dissertation provides evidence that Aaker’s (1987) brand personality scale may be used to explain the celebrity’s personality based on the premise that celebrities are indeed human brands.

In the future, we expect to use our model to understand other types of celebrity endorsers who violate the rules of traditional credibility and endorsement models, yet flourish as endorsers. We also hope to understand when traditional sources of credibility (such as performance in sports) work best for persuading endorsers and when other aspects of the meaning provided by the endorser lead to effective endorsement.

Finally, this dissertation clarifies the mediating role that similarity to the endorser plays in the relationships between street credibility, traditional credibility, transportation fantasy and identification fantasy. In doing so, this dissertation highlights the role that similarity plays in the endorser’s ability to create meaning and relationships with consumers. These studies point to areas of further theory and model development for understanding a broad variety of endorser types, what products and brands they best match up with, and how consumers relate to them.
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