

# INFLUENCE OF IN-STORE FACTORS ON IMPULSE BUYING

<sup>1</sup>Dr. Ramesh Kumar Chaturvedi <sup>2</sup>Sanjay Kumar Yadav

## ABSTRACT

*Buying behaviour of each and every consumer is different and mostly driven by personal and social characteristics. It not only for fulfils the needs of individuals but it urges desire, needs and motivations. Arousal of needs and wants may be physiological, cognitive or emotionally rooted. The need fulfilling behaviour of a consumer could be based on logic and fact. Or at times it could be unreasonable, irrational and impulsive. Consumer's impulse buying attitude is mostly set by cognitive and non-cognitive leanings and experiences. This present research has tried to understand divergence in attitude of consumer groups on the basis of five marketing variables namely: Price factor, Trial factor, Staff Attitude, Visual merchandising and Convenience & Store images on impulse purchase tendency grouped through demographic variables- Gender, Education and Age. A self-administered questionnaire is prepared and a total of 67 University students as respondents are interviewed with it. Using SPSS tool, collected data is tabulated, coded analysed and ANOVA is applied to study the variance in attitude of respondents. It is found that the attitude of consumer groups has no significant relationship.*

**Key words:** *Consumer attitude, Impulsive buying, In-store shopping environment (Price factor, Trial factor, Staff attitude, Visual merchandising and Convenience & Store images).*

## INTRODUCTION

Peter & Olson, 1999, found that there is a strong relationship between college education and income level or purchasing power. In general it has been observed that the purchasing needs of Males and Females are different and they have different attitudes towards shopping. Male consumers mostly see and think before buying, but women "try to shop each and everything till they drop" (Flat World Knowledge). Kollat and Willett (1967) stated that usually purchasing tendency of women is more in comparison to men and in fact women enjoy shopping. Rook and Hoch (1985) found that females are more impulsive. From these findings it can be explained that higher percentage of products are purchased on unplanned basis by Women. With the variance of economic behaviour of consumer at different stages of life, changes in a country's age, the structural changes can have significant effects on its economic performance. A certain composition of the country's population is shifting towards the age group of 25-55, which means more working population with immense purchasing power. Impulse buying is a rapid convincing, hedonically compound purchase behaviour in which the quickness of the impulse

purchase decision precludes any thoughtful, intentional contemplation of alternatives (Kacen, 2002). Findings of early researches (Bellenger *et al.* 1978) have shown that impulse buying accounts for substantial sales across a broad range of product categories.

## PURPOSE OF RESEARCH

In the present study, the purpose of the researcher is to check and understand the influence of Demographic variables (Gender, Education, and Age) on attitude towards impulse buying of university students at Bilaspur city. Researchers will check the influence of these variables on the basis of findings and add to the existing theories, on the basis of marketing variables. This research work will assist retail companies in making business strategies for increasing their sales. It can also help the retail consumers to understand their buying behaviour.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Literature review has been carried out to identify the previous research and directions related to the present topic. Stern (1962), argued that impulse buying largely depends on resources such as money, time, physical and mental effort. A person's moods could also influence their impulse buying. Hoch and Lowenstein (1991) studied that there is a tendency for consumers to buy impulsively when they are hedonistic and enjoy shopping. Rook and Gardner (1993) defined impulse buying as an unplanned behaviour

---

<sup>1</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Management Studies, Guru Ghasidas Vishwavidyalaya, Bilaspur, (C.G.)

<sup>2</sup> Research Scholar, Department of Management Studies, Guru Ghasidas Vishwavidyalaya, Bilaspur, (C.G.)

involving quick decision-making and tendency for immediate acquisition of the product. Impulse buying is a pervasive aspect of consumers' behaviours and a focal point for strategic marketing plans (Rook, 1987). Rook and Gardner (1993) defined impulse buying as an unplanned behaviour involving quick decision-making and tendency for immediate acquisition of the product. Rook and Fisher (1995) defined impulsive buying as a consumer's tendency to buy spontaneously, unreflectively, immediately and kinetically. Environmental regulations have differential effect on impulse buying behaviours. Beatty and Ferrell (1998) described that Impulse buying refers to immediate purchases which are without any pre-shopping objective either to purchase the specific product category or to fulfil a specific need. Bayley and Nancarrow (1998) defined impulse buying as a "sudden, compelling, hedonically complex buying behaviour in which the rapidity of an impulse decision process precludes thoughtful and deliberate consideration of alternative information and choices."

Rook and Fisher (1995) also defined impulsive buying as a consumer's tendency to buy spontaneously, unreflectively, immediately and kinetically. Different buying situations lead to different impulse buying behaviours. Impulse buying is a pervasive aspect of consumers' behaviours and a focal point for strategic marketing plans (Rook, 1987). Beatty and Ferrell (1998) described that Impulse buying refers to immediate purchases which are without any pre-shopping objective either to purchase the specific product category or to fulfil a specific need. Bayley and Nancarrow (1998) defined impulse buying as a "sudden, compelling, hedonically complex buying behaviour in which the rapidity of an impulse decision process precludes thoughtful and deliberate consideration of alternative information and choices." Kacen and Lee (2002) stated that impulsive buying behaviour are more arousing and irresistible but less deliberative when compared to planned purchasing behaviour.

Fox *et al.*, (2004) examined the effect of demographics on format choice. They found that the size of household, income and educational level influence consumers' format choices. Banerjee and Saha.(2012) found that **Gender** does not impact the frequency of shopping. Also gender has no effect on Impulse buying behaviour of consumers. Studies of the Grocery industry indicate that 60 to 70 percent of

purchases by both genders are unplanned (Underhill, 1999). Kollat and Willett (1967) suggest that Impulse buying behaviour of females is more than that of males and also younger person are more likely to shop impulsively than older persons.

Wood (1998) found a non-linear relationship between age and impulsive buying in his United States adult sample. The relationship suggests that impulsive buying increases slightly from age 18 to 39, and declines thereafter.

Bratko, et al., (2007); Gutierrez,( 2004) found that impulse buying is not associated with education. However Wood (1998) stated in his research that there is a relationship with education wherein he put forward that education has a significant association with education.

Offering an item on sale or at a promotional price encouraged slightly more impulse purchases compared to non-promotionally priced goods (Williams and Dardis 1972). The availability of money has been shown to drive impulse purchases (Beatty and Ferrell, 1998). According to Shilpa & Amit (2012), pricing of products has an impact on deriving consumer perception and the extent to which perception is influenced and derived from the nature of consumer behaviour. Priti Salvi (2013) said that the discount and price off scheme induced the customers to visit store and influenced their purchase decision. Price induced impulsive buying can be explained by the mental accounting activity concept Janakiraman et al. (2006).

Blattberg Robert & Scott Neslin (1990) have stated the benefits of free trial premium. They found that such activity enhances the value of a product and adds to the benefits. Blackwell et al (2001) identified that price discounts play a significant role in influencing consumer product trial behaviour which indirectly attracts new consumer.

**Visual merchandising** can be best defined as "everything the customer sees, both exterior and interior that creates a positive image of a business and result in attention, interest, desire and action on the part of the customer" (Bastow-Shoop *et al.* 1991).Abbrat and Goodey (1990) defined Impulse purchase in terms of visual merchandising as, impulsive purchasing as a reason made in shopping malls to obtain goods outside prior scheme - to obtain them because the goods have been designed in a way in the mall to attract and

appeal to customers, people end up buying them impulsively. Visual merchandising ranges from window display to include forum display and floor merchandising along with promotion signage (Mills *et al.* 1995). Bread and milk, for instance, will most likely be displayed at the two most opposite ends of the store which will force the consumer past a host of products encouraging impulsive buying en route to the other essential products (Terrazas, 2006).

Banerjee and Saha.(2012) stated that, “**The attitude** and perception of customers towards impulse buying is largely shaped by the factors of visual merchandising and sensory cues of sight”. Consumers enjoy shopping more without the presence of an overbearing salesperson although they do, however appreciate when a salesperson is nearby and helpful Jones (1999). Tendai and Crispen (2009) in their research found the behaviour of shop staff emerged as the second most important factor after price in influencing consumers’ decisions. Staff training by retailers might be essential in ensuring that shop assistants strike a balance between being persuasive and helpful to shoppers and avoid being over bearing as was suggested by Jones (1999).

Arons (1961) defined store image as complex of meanings and relation that make consumers distinguish the store from others. Thus, store image is an overall attitude of a consumer to the store, its attributes mean various things, and each store has a relative location in the consumer’s mind. Zinkhan (2006),stated that various indicators (e.g., service, product selection, quality) have strong relationship with shoppers’ store choice, whereas others (e.g., store attitude, store image) are important antecedents of shopping frequency. (Reichheld, 1993; 2001; Jones & Sasser, 1995;Heskett, Jones, Loveman, Sasser, & Schlesinger,1994) have examined the relationship between store loyalty and long-term performance of a firm.

## OBJECTIVE

To study the role of Price, Visual merchandising, Staff attitude, Store image and Trial facility on impulse buying of respondents with respect to their demographic profile such as Gender, Education and Age.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This is a descriptive research involving quantitative analysis for drawing inferences. Data

were collected through questionnaire from the UG, PG and Ph.D. students studying at Guru Ghasidas Vishwavidyalaya, Bilaspur,( C.G.). Data is collected from students at common facilities of the University such as Library, Canteen Lab etc. Overall, 67students participated in this particular survey in which most of the respondents (65.7%) were between the age of 20 to 25.The questionnaire has been divided in two parts. The first part consists of demographic data Age ( with class interval of five years in which lower range is 15 years and upper range is above 35: Since in this university most of the students get admission at the age of 17 to 18 years and some Ph.D. students are of the age of more than 35 years, on the basis of age, interval has been decided), Gender (Male (36), Female (31)) and Education {UG (20), PG (26) and Ph.D (21)} of respondents. The second part consists of questions related to the measure of attitude towards the factors mentioned in objectives influencing impulse buying. Total 14 items are used for collecting data on three factors mentioned above. To measure {attitude of the respondents on each variable,5-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly agree =1to strongly disagree=5,isused. After collecting the complete questionnaires, data are coded (Male-1, Female-2), Undergraduate-1, Post graduate-2 Ph.D.-3 and Age interval 15-20=1(3), 20-25=2 (44), 25-30=3(16), 30-35=4 (3) and above 35=5 (1), and then entered into SPSS data sheet for analysis.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

ANOVA test is applied to measure the attitude of the university students on impulse buying behaviour.

**H<sub>01</sub>-There is no significant difference in influence of Price factor on attitude towards impulse buying of male and female students.**

**Analysis-** The outcome of the ANOVA analysis from table no.1 (A) between the gender Male and Female as categorical variable has significance value (p) 0.59, which is greater than 0.05. Hence we fail to reject the null hypothesis H<sub>01</sub> as stated above. Therefore converse may be inferred that male and female respondents show similar influence of price factor on attitude towards impulse buying. Dr.Surekha Rana, Jyoti Tirthani (2012) hypothesized a positive relationship between gender (female) and impulse buying tendency is not supported. The relationship though as predicted is positive but it is not significant.

**H<sub>02</sub>-There is no significant difference in influence of Price factor on attitude towards impulse buying of students at different education levels.**

**Analysis-** The ANOVA results of this research show that there is no major association at 5% significance level between Education and impulse buying behaviour as the p-value is greater than 0.05, from (table no 1(B)). Hence H<sub>02</sub> cannot be rejected and concludes that there is no significant relationship between these variables.

**H<sub>03</sub>-There is no significant difference in influence of discount and offers on attitude towards impulse buying of students of different age groups.**

**Analysis-** The outcome of the ANOVA analysis from table no.1(C) shows that the Age factor of students have p-value 0.891 which denotes that there is no significant relationship with impulse buying behaviour as the  $p > 0.05$ . Hence the H<sub>03</sub> cannot be rejected.

**H<sub>04</sub>-There is no significant difference in influence of Convenience and Store image on attitude towards impulse buying of male and female students.**

**Analysis-** The independent variable male and female students show the p-value 0.662 from table no 2(A), which indicates that there is no significant relationship with impulse buying behaviour. Hence the Null hypothesis H<sub>04</sub> cannot be rejected.

**H<sub>05</sub>-There is no significant difference in influence of Convenience and Store image on attitude towards impulse buying of students at different educational levels.**

**Analysis-** The outcome of the ANOVA test from table no 2(B), shows that different educational level of students scored the p-value which 0.683 denotes that there is no significant relationship with impulse buying behaviour as the  $p > 0.05$ . Hence we cannot reject the null hypothesis. Dr. Surekha Rana, Jyoti Tirthani (2012), hypothesized a negative relationship between education and impulsive behaviour of consumers. It means that less educated customers are more impulsive in taking their buying decisions than the more educated.

**H<sub>06</sub>- There is no significant difference in influence of Convenience and Store image on attitude towards impulse buying of students of different age groups.**

**Analysis-** According to the result from table no 2(C), attitude towards reference factor on impulse buying of different education level of students have p- which 0.784, denotes that it has no significant impact on attitude of different educational level of students on impulse buying behaviour of respondents towards impulse buying at 5% significant level. Hence, the result of this research shows that the education level of students has no strong influences with the respondents' impulse purchase. Hence H<sub>06</sub> is accepted.

**H<sub>07</sub>-There is no significant difference in influence of Staff attitude on attitude towards impulse buying of male and female students.**

**Analysis-** As shown in table no 3(A), influence of staff attitude on attitude towards impulse buying of male and female students has significance value (p) 0.208 which is greater than 0.05. It denotes that this factor has not a significant relationship with the impulse buying behaviour. On the basis of findings we fail to reject the assumed hypothesis H<sub>07</sub>.

**H<sub>08</sub>- There is no significant difference in influence of Staff attitude on attitude towards impulse buying of students at different education levels.**

**Analysis-** From table no 3(B), influence of staff attitude on attitude towards impulse buying of the education level of students which has a significance value (p) 0.607, which is greater than 0.05. On the basis of findings we fail to reject the assumed hypothesis H<sub>08</sub>. It denotes that there is no any significant relationship between the attitude of male and female students on impulse buying behaviour.

**H<sub>09</sub>- There is no significant difference in influence of Staff attitude on attitude towards impulse buying of students of different age groups.**

**Analysis-** According to the result from table no 3(C), influence of staff attitude on attitude towards impulse buying of different age group of students have p-value 0.349, which denotes that it has no significant impact on attitude of different education level of students on impulse buying

behaviour of respondents towards impulse buying at 5% significance level. Hence the result of this research shows that the different Age group of students have no strong influences with the respondents' impulse purchase. Hence  $H_{09}$  is accepted.

**$H_{010}$ -There is no significant difference in influence of Trial factor on attitude towards impulse buying of male and female students.**

**Analysis-**The outcome of the ANOVA analysis from table no.4 (A) between the gender Male and Female as categorical variable has significance value (p) 0.358 which is greater than 0.05. Hence we fail to reject the null hypothesis  $H_{010}$  as stated above. Therefore converse may be inferred that male and female respondents show that there is similar influence of Trial factor on attitude towards impulse buying.

**$H_{011}$ -There is no significant difference in influence of Trial factor on attitude towards impulse buying of students at different education levels.**

**Analysis-** The ANOVA results of this research show that there is no major association at 5% significance level between Education and impulse buying behaviour as the p-value (.758) is greater than 0.05, from table no 4(B). Hence  $H_{011}$  cannot be rejected and concludes that there is no significant relationship between these variables.

**$H_{012}$ - There is no significant difference in influence of Trial factor on attitude towards impulse buying of students of different age groups.**

**Analysis-**According to the result from table no 4(C), attitude towards reference factor on impulse buying of different education level of students have p-value 0.689, which denotes that it has no significant impact on attitude of different education level of students on impulse buying behaviour of respondents towards impulse buying at 5% significant level. Hence, the result of this research shows that the different age group of students have no strong influences with the respondents' impulse purchase. Hence  $H_{012}$  is accepted.

**$H_{013}$ -There is no significant difference in influence of Visual merchandising on attitude towards impulse buying of male and female students.**

**Analysis-** As shown in table no 5(A), influence of Visual Merchandising on attitude towards impulse buying of male and female students have significance value (p) 0.474 which is greater than 0.05. It denotes that this factor has not a significant relationship with the impulse buying behaviour. On the basis of findings we fail to reject the assumed hypothesis  $H_{013}$ .

**$H_{014}$ - There is no significant difference in influence of Visual Merchandising on attitude towards impulse buying of students at different education levels.**

**Analysis-**From table no 5(B), influence of Visual Merchandising on attitude towards impulse buying of the education level of students which has a significance value (p) 0.942, which is greater than 0.05. On the basis of findings we fail to reject the assumed hypothesis  $H_{014}$ . It denotes that there is no significant relationship with the impulse buying behaviour.

**$H_{015}$ - There is no significant difference in influence of Visual Merchandising on attitude towards impulse buying of students of different age groups.**

**Analysis-**According to the result from table no 5(C), influence of Visual Merchandising on attitude towards impulse buying of different age groups of students has p-value 0.879, which denotes that it has no significant impact on attitude of different Age group of students on impulse buying behaviour of respondents towards impulse buying at 5% significance level. Hence the result of this research shows that the Age group of students has no strong influences with the respondents' impulse purchase. Hence  $H_{015}$  is accepted.

## CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This research reveals the role of Price factor, Trial factor, Staff Attitude, Visual merchandising and Convenience & Store images on impulse buying of respondents with respect to their demographic profile such as Gender, Education and Age. At university level education does not play an important role in the process of framing the marketing strategies by the retailers. On the basis of the above findings, the researcher concludes that there is no significant difference in attitude of university students with respect to Gender, Age and Education.

Table no-1(A)

ANOVA with Gender					
AVG_PF					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.436	1	1.436	3.680	.059
Within Groups	25.360	65	.390		
Total	26.796	66			

Table no-1(B)

ANOVA with Education					
AVG_PF					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.406	3	.135	.323	.809
Within Groups	26.390	63	.419		
Total	26.796	66			

Table no-1(C) :

ANOVA with Age					
AVG_PF					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.473	4	.118	.279	.891
Within Groups	26.323	62	.425		
Total	26.796	66			

Table no-2(A)

ANOVA with Gender					
AVG_CSI					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.714	1	.714	.193	.662
Within Groups	239.762	65	3.689		
Total	240.476	66			

Table no-2(B)

ANOVA with Education					
AVG_CSI					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	6.549	4	1.637	.434	.683
Within Groups	233.926	62	3.773		
Total	240.476	66			

Table no-2(C)

ANOVA with Age					
AVG_CSI					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	5.605	3	1.868	.501	.784
Within Groups	234.871	63	3.728		
Total	240.476	66			

Table no-3(A)

ANOVA with Gender					
AVG_SA					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.169	1	1.169	1.614	.208
Within Groups	47.083	65	.724		
Total	48.252	66			

Table no-3(B)

ANOVA with Education					
AVG_SA					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.375	3	.458	.616	.607
Within Groups	46.877	63	.744		
Total	48.252	66			

Table no-3(C)

ANOVA with Age					
AVG_SA					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3.290	4	.823	1.134	.349
Within Groups	44.962	62	.725		
Total	48.252	66			

Table no-4(A)

ANOVA with Gender					
AVG_TF					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2.507	1	2.507	.858	.358
Within Groups	190.033	65	2.924		
Total	192.541	66			

Table no-4(B)

ANOVA with Education					
AVG_TF					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3.537	3	1.179	.393	.758
Within Groups	189.004	63	3.000		
Total	192.541	66			

Table no-4(C)

ANOVA with Age					
AVG_TF					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	6.763	4	1.691	.564	.689
Within Groups	185.778	62	2.996		
Total	192.541	66			

Table no-5(A)

ANOVA with Gender					
AVG_VM					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.524	1	.524	.518	.474
Within Groups	65.774	65	1.012		
Total	66.299	66			

Table no-5(B)

ANOVA with Education					
AVG_VM					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.405	3	.135	.129	.942
Within Groups	65.893	63	1.046		
Total	66.299	66			

Table no-5(C)

ANOVA with Age					
AVG_VM					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.245	4	.311	.297	.879
Within Groups	65.053	62	1.049		
Total	66.299	66			

PF - Price factor

TF- Trial factor

SA-Staff Attitude

VM- Visual merchandising

CS-Convenience &amp; store images

## REFERENCES

Banarji, Sonali.,&Saha,Sunetra.(2012). Impulse buying behaviours in retail stores triggering the senses, *Asia pacific Journal of business management review* vol. 2, ISSN2319-283.

www.indianresearchjournals.com.

Blattberg Robert C., & Scott, A. N. (1990). *Sales Promotion: Concepts, Methods and Strategies*, Englewood Cliffs. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Bratko, D., Bandl, A., Bosnjak, M. (2007): Impulsive buying and the *big five* model of personality factors. *XX. CROMAR Congress: Marketing in Knowledge Society and Contemporary Business Reality*, October 25-27, 2007. Rijeka, pp. 414-425.

Consumer Behaviour: How People Make Buying Decisions from *Principles of Marketing - Chapter 3* Publisher: Flat World Knowledge

Dr. Surekha Rana, Jyoti Tirthani (2012) Effect of Education, Income a Gender on Impulsive Buying Among Indian Consumer an Empirical Study of Readymade Garment Customers .

E.M. Steenkamp, Katrijn Gielens Jan-Benedict (2003). Consumer and Market Drivers of the Trial Probability of New Consumer Packaged Goods, *journal of consumer research*, DOI 368-384 First published online: 1 December.http:// dx.doi.org/ 10.1086/378615.

Gutierrez, B. P. (2004): Determinants of Planned and Impulse Buying: The Case of the Philippines. *Asia Pacific Management Review*, pp. 1061-1078.http:// www.upd.edu.ph/~cba/docs/ APM Rbpbg01.pdf

Janet, H., & Leon, R. (1991). Some Effects of Price Discounting on Discounted and Competing Brands' Sales. *Marketing Bulletin*, 2, 55-59.

Janakiraman N, Meyer RJ, Morales AC (2006). Spillover effects: How consumers respond to unexpected changes in price and quality. *J. consumer. Res.*, 33: 361-69.

Jones MA (1999). Entertaining Shopping Experiences: An Exploratory Investigation. *J. Retailing and Consum. Serv.*, 6: 129-139.

Mariri Tendai\* and Chipunza Crispen (2009). In-store shopping environment and impulsive buying, *African Journal of Marketing Management* Vol. 1(4) pp. 102-108 July, 2009

Available online <http://www.academicjournals.org/ajmm> ©2009 Academic Journals *Indian journal of applied research* Volume: 1 | Issue : 12 | September 2012 ISSN - 2249-555X.

Peter, J.P., & Olson, J.C. (1999). *Consumer Behaviour and Marketing Strategy*. Boston Irwin: Mc Graw-Hill

Pan, Y., Zinkhan, G.M.(2006)“Determinants of retail patronage: a meta-analytical perspective”, *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 82, No.3, pp.229-43.

Salvi, P. (2013). Effectiveness Of Sales Promotional Tools: A Study On Discount, Price Off And Buy One Get One Free Offers In Branded Apparel Retail Industry In Gujarat. *ELK Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Retail Management*, 4(4).

Shilpa Agargwal & Amit Aggrawal (2012). A Critical Analysis of Impact of Pricing on Consumer buying behaviour in Apparel Retail Sector: A Study of Mumbai City. *International Journal Of Multidisciplinary Educational Research*, 1(1), 34-44.

Wood Michael (1998), “Socio-economic status, delay of gratification, and impulse buying”, *Journal of Economic Psychology*, Vol.19 (3), pp. 295-320.

\*\*\*