Europe's Journal of Psychology
ejop.psychopen.eu | 1841-0413

Research Reports

How Personality Traits Predict Design-Driven Consumer Choices

Nils Myszkowski*[a], Martin Storme[a]

[a] Université Paris Descartes, Paris, France.

Abstract

To further understand why a consumer's choices are influenced by the aesthetic value of products (Hollins & Pugh, 1990; Bloch, 1995; Schmitt & Simonson, 1997), individual differences in design-driven consumer choices must be investigated. Previous empirical work suggests that the extent to which one pays attention and is responsive to the aesthetic value of products (Bloch, Brunel, & Arnold, 2003) and Openness to experience (Sharpe & Ramanaiah, 1999) are both linked with materialism. This study aims to provide new elements to understand why consumers choose and value well-designed products, using the framework of the Big Five model of personality (John & Srivastava, 1999; McCrae & Costa, 1999), focusing more particularly on Openness to experience. 158 adult participants completed the Centrality of Visual Product Aesthetics questionnaire (CVPA; Bloch, Brunel, & Arnold, 2003), along with the Big Five Inventory (BFI; John, 1990; John & Srivastava, 1999). As hypothesized, personality significantly predicted the individuals' tendency to prefer products with a superior design. More specifically, every subscale of the CVPA was significantly negatively correlated with Openness to experience. Implications, limitations and potential uses of these results in marketing are discussed.

Keywords: marketing, design, personality, five-factor model

Europe's Journal of Psychology, 2012, Vol. 8(4), 641–650, doi:10.5964/ejop.v8i4.523

Received: 2012-09-10. Accepted: 2012-10-23. Published: 2012-11-30.

*Corresponding author at: Université Paris Descartes (Laboratoire Adaptation Travail-Individu, LATI – EA4469), 71, Avenue Edouard Vaillant, 92100 Boulogne Billancourt, email: nilsmyszkowski@yahoo.fr

Introduction

As the quality and the reliability of the products increase, the choices of consumers tend to be more influenced by their aesthetic qualities (Schmitt & Simonson, 1997). Undeniably, the visual aspect of a product is usually one of the most important connectors between the consumer and the product (Hollins & Pugh, 1990). Moreover, greatly designed products help brands and their products acquire fame in a crowd of concurrent brands and products (Bloch, 1995). Furthermore, the buying impulse might often be closely connected to the aesthetic visual design and styling of products (Rook, 1987).

Individual Differences in Design-Driven Consumer Choices

Desmet's (2003) model proposes that product emotions can be classified in five classes: instrumental emotions, surprise emotions, social emotions, interest emotions and aesthetic emotions. In this model, aesthetic emotions are the product of the appealingness of the product to an individual, which is produced by the interaction between both the characteristics of the stimulus (the product) and the individual's dispositional likings (e.g. liking round shapes). However, as one may study which design triggers positive or negative aesthetic emotions, one might also consider studying the tendency to make (or not) consumer choices based on these aesthetic emotions.

Indeed, as suggested theoretically (Loewy, 1951) and empirically (Bloch, Brunel, & Arnold, 2003), one should consider individual differences in the importance that consumers hold for the visual aestheticism of the design of products. These differences can be efficiently measured, notably by aesthetic judgment tests, which invite subjects to see visual stimuli and record their preference/reaction/sensitivity, such as the Graves Design Judgment Test (Graves, 1948), the Meier Art Tests (Meier, 1963), the Visual Aesthetic Sensitivity Test (Götz, Borisy, Lynn, & Eysenck, 1979; Eysenck, 1983; Götz, 1985) or the Aesthetic Judgement Ablity Test (Bamossy, Johnston, & Parsons, 1985). Individual differences in the significance that consumers hold for the visual aestheticism of the design of products may also be measured more explicitly by self-report scales, especially the Centrality of Visual Product Aesthetics scale (Bloch et al., 2003), which differentiates valuing design in choosing products ("Value"), skillfully evaluating product designs ("Acumen"), and feeling the urge to buy products with superior designs ("Response").

Design-Driven Consumer Choices and Personality

While not extensively supported by empirical studies, personality variables are often considered crucial for predicting consumer behavior, which is why marketers use them in order to help companies define market segments (Haugtvedt, Petty, & Cacioppo, 1992; Chan, 2001). However, concerning design, one's ability to distinguish objectively harmonious and non-harmonious designs was found to be uncorrelated with personality traits (Götz, Borisy, Lynn, & Eysenck, 1979; Frois & Eysenck, 1995), which may lead to describing the sensitivity to harmony in design as an ability which is for the most part independent of personality.

Nevertheless, recent framework on aesthetic experience (Leder, Belke, Oeberst, & Augustin, 2004) suggests that aesthetic appreciation is not only the result of the cognitive processing of a stimulus, but it is also the result of affective processes, which implies that aesthetic appreciation might be influenced by dispositional variables, such as values or personality. According to the authors, such implications apply to the design of products. Indeed, one's response to design may not only depend on one's cognitive understanding of design, but also on one's tendency to be emotionally influenced by design. For example, previous results suggest that personal life values (Desmet, Hekkert, & Hillen, 2003) and culture (Desmet, Hekkert, & Jacobs, 2000) are correlated with emotional responses produced by automotive designs. Concerning personality traits, the Centrality of Visual Product Aesthetics was notably found to be positively correlated with materialism (Bloch et al., 2003), suggesting that, when it comes to choose products based on aesthetic value, one's personality may have to be taken into consideration.

Although there is no study which explores the relation between the Big Five factor model of personality and the Centrality of Visual Product Aesthetics, earlier framework (Bloch et al., 2003; Sharpe & Ramanaiah, 1999) allowed us to draw hypotheses concerning the relationship between the Centrality of Visual Product Aesthetics and personality. Indeed, the Openness personality trait was empirically defined by having wide interests and unusual thoughts, showing original behaviors, as well as having unconventional judgments (McCrae & John, 1992). Because high Openness individuals might tend to disregard the appearance of a product and to inquisitively focus on more various aspects of a product, it was hypothesized that Openness is negatively correlated with the tendency to respond to superiorly designed products. Besides, supporting this hypothesis, the authors of the CVPA Scale showed that the Centrality of Visual Product Aesthetics is correlated with materialism (Bloch et al., 2003), while previous research revealed that materialism is negatively correlated with Openness to experience (Sharpe & Ramanaiah, 1999).

Method

Participants

The sample was composed of 158 adult students (138 females, 20 males) with ages between 18 and 49 years old (M = 21.15 ; SD = 4.89). All the participants were second-year psychology students, who did not have any course about self-presentation measures or consumer psychology during their university studies.

Measures

Personality. The Big Five multi-dimensional model of personality traits – Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, Neuroticism, Openness and Extraversion – provides a general overview of personality and it benefits from extensive empirical support (John & Srivastava, 1999; McCrae & Costa, 1999). In this study, the Big Five Inventory (John, 1990; John & Srivastava, 1999), a 44-item measure of the Big Five factors (Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, Neuroticism, Openness and Extraversion) was used. Although the most wide-ranging instrument to measure the Big Five personality factors is probably Costa and McCrae's (1992) 240-item NEO Personality Inventory Revised (NEO-PI-R), the BFI has proven to be a good compromise between briefness and psychometric qualities (Plaisant, Srivastava, Mendelsohn, Debray, & John, 2005). In this study, the internal consistency of the different scales was satisfying, as Cronbach's alphas were .80 for Conscientiousness, .77 for Agreeableness, .79 for Neuroticism, .74 for Openness and .80 for Extraversion.

Design-Driven Consumer Choices. Because visual aesthetic judgment measures (Graves, 1948; Meier, 1963; Götz et al., 1979; Eysenck, 1983; Götz, 1985; Bamossy et al., 1985) focus on general aesthetic judgment but not specifically on the individual's response to a product's design, design-driven consumer choices were measured using the Centrality of Visual Product Aesthetics (CVPA, Bloch et al., 2003). The CVPA (Bloch et al., 2003) is a five-point Likert format 11-item self-report questionnaire which measures the "salience of visual design in a consumer's relationships with products" (Brunel & Swain, 2008). It comprises three subscales, which allow to further understand how one responds to design. The subscale "Value" measures the extent to which an individual values design in products (e.g. "A product's design is a source of pleasure to me."). The subscale "Acumen" measures the extent to which an individual skillfully assesses design in products (e.g. "Being able to see subtle differences in product designs is one skill that I have developed over time."). Finally, the subscale "Response" measures the extent to which an individual feels the urge to buy products that have an appealing design (e.g. "If a product's design really "speaks" to me, I feel that I must buy it."). Indeed, one may value design but may not necessarily feel competent at identifying superior design. Likewise, one may value design but may not feel the urge of buying products with a superior design. The internal consistency of the CVPA, as estimated by previous research (Bloch et al., 2003), is around .89. The external validity and the construct validity of the scale are also satisfying (Bloch et al., 2003), allowing the use of both the subscale scores and the score of the whole scale. In addition, as the aim of this study is to examine the links between personality traits and the CVPA, it is important to note that previous results (Bloch et al., 2003) suggest that the CVPA is not biased by social desirability. Cronbach's alphas of the subscales and the whole scale found in this study were satisfying, especially considering the conciseness of the CVPA, as they ranged between .74 and .80 (see Table 1). The internal consistency of the whole scale was .87.

Procedure

The participants were asked to complete two self-report questionnaires: The Big Five Inventory (John, 1990; John & Srivastava, 1999) was chosen in order to measure the Big Five personality factors, whereas the Centrality of

Visual Product Aesthetics questionnaire (Bloch et. al., 2003) was used in order to measure of the tendency to value and choose products for their aesthetic properties. The order of the questionnaires was randomized.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Univariate descriptive statistics of all the tests and questionnaires are reported in Table 1, along with bivariate correlation coefficients.

Table 1

Univariate Descriptive Statistics, Internal Consistencies and Bivariate Correlation Coefficients

	Mean	S.D.	Cronbach's α	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
BFI										
1. Conscientiousness	30.2	6.22	.80							
2. Agreeableness	33.1	5.94	.77	.24**						
3. Neuroticism	26.6	6.27	.79							
4. Openness	36.1	5.97	.74							
5. Extraversion	24.8	5.86	.80			-.28***	.30***			
CVPA										
6. Value	11.4	3.31	.78		.19*		-.19*			
7. Acumen	11.2	2.97	.74			.18*	-.26**		.59***	
8. Response	9.3	2.77	.80				-.18*		.53***	.46***

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001. Non-significant correlations are not reported.

As expected, the results of this study suggest that the three subscales of the CVPA are moderately correlated. These results indicate that, as proposed by the authors (Bloch et al., 2003) the Centrality of Visual Aesthetic Products, though allowing the use of a composite score, can also be considered as a multidimensional construct, which was done in this study.

Predicting the Centrality of Visual Aesthetic Products

First, in order to test our hypotheses, bivariate correlations between each CVPA subscale and the predictors (the Big Five personality dimensions) were computed (see Table 1).

Second, focusing on our hypothesis on differentiating the predictors of the dimensions of the CVPA, we used Generalized Linear Modeling (GLM) in order to compare the unique contribution of each predictor to individual differences in CVPA. To do so, for each CVPA subscale score, all possible combinations of level 1 predictors went through a process of model selection, using the *glmulti* R library (Calcagno & De Mazancourt, 2010). The *glmulti* R library allows computing, comparing, and ranking an exhaustive list of models, using information criteria[1]. This methodology may be used both for exploratory and for confirmatory analyses. In this study, because previous results on the link between the CVPA and any of the Big Five personality factors were lacking, such a model selection procedure allowed us to make sure that the theoretical hypothesized model (Openness predicts the Centrality of Visual Product Aesthetics) was the optimal model, among all other possible combinations of personality predictors.

More precisely, in this study, for each CVPA subscale, an exhaustive list of all the possible models was computed. To avoid an incomputable combinatorial explosion (Grafen & Hails 2002; Orestes Cerdeira, Duarte Silva, Cadima, & Minhoto, 2009), the computed models did not include interaction terms. The fit of all the possible models was subsequently ranked using each model's Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC). The BIC-based optimal model was chosen for predictor selection, and for further interpretation. Table 2, Table 3 and Table 4 report parameter estimates and fit indices for the full linear model, including all the predictors, and the BIC-based optimal model.

Value. As shown in Table 1, Value was significantly ($p < .05$) negatively correlated with Openness to experience, suggesting that, as hypothesized, the more one values the visual design of products, the less one is open to experience. Moreover, Value was unexpectedly positively correlated ($r = .19$; $p < .05$) with Agreeableness, suggesting that extent to which one values visual design is related the extent to which one tends to be agreeable.

Confirming this, the BIC-based model selection procedure lead to selecting an optimal model that included only Openness ($\beta = -.18$; $p < .05$) and Agreeableness ($\beta = .18$; $p < .05$) as predictors of Value, accounting for 7% ($R^2 = .07$; $p < .01$) of the variance of Value (see Table 2).

Table 2

Regression Results for Predicting Centrality of Visual Aesthetic Products - Value, Using glmulti to Exhaustively Fit All Possible Models

	Full model	BIC-based optimal model
Beta estimates		
Conscientiousness (BFI)	-.12	
Agreeableness (BFI)	.19*	.18*
Neuroticism (BFI)	-.13	
Openness (BFI)	-.17*	-.18*
Extraversion (BFI)	-.11	
Model fit index		
AIC	822.57	822.12
BIC	844.01	834.37
Multiple R^2	.10**	.07**

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Acumen. As reported in Table 1, Acumen was modestly significantly negatively correlated with Openness to experience ($r = -.26$; $p < .01$), suggesting that, as hypothesized, the (self-reported) ability to evaluate design is related to low Openness to Experience.

The BIC-based model selection procedure lead to selecting an optimal model that included only Openness ($\beta = -.26$; $p < .001$) as a predictor of Acumen, accounting for 7% ($R^2 = .07$; $p < .001$) of the variance of Acumen (see Table 3).

Response. As shown in Table 1, Response was significantly negatively correlated with Openness to experience ($r = -.18$; $p < .05$), suggesting that, as hypothesized, the urge to buy that one may feel when in front of a greatly designed product is related to low Openness.

Table 3

Regression Results for Predicting Centrality of Visual Aesthetic Products - Acumen, Using glmulti to Exhaustively Fit All Possible Models

	Full model	BIC-based optimal model
Beta estimates		
Conscientiousness (BFI)	-.01	
Agreeableness (BFI)	.12	
Neuroticism (BFI)	.17*	
Openness (BFI)	-.25**	-.26***
Extraversion (BFI)	.06	
Model fit index		
AIC	788.15	786.57
BIC	809.58	795.76
Multiple R^2	.11**	.07***

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Table 4

Regression Results for Predicting Centrality of Visual Aesthetic Products - Response, Using glmulti to Exhaustively Fit All Possible Models

	Full model	BIC-based optimal model
Beta estimates		
Conscientiousness (BFI)	.04	
Agreeableness (BFI)	.04	
Neuroticism (BFI)	-.04	
Openness (BFI)	-.18*	-.18*
Extraversion (BFI)	-.02	
Model fit index		
AIC	777.35	770.33
BIC	798.78	779.52
Multiple R^2	.04	.03*

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

The BIC-based model selection procedure lead to selecting an optimal model that included only Openness to experience (β = -.18 ; p < .05) as a predictor of Response, accounting for 3% (R^2 = .03 ; p < .05) of the variance of Response (see Table 4).

Total CVPA score. Complementally, the same BIC-based linear model selection procedure was applied to predict the total CVPA score. The procedure lead to selecting a BIC-based optimal model that included only Openness as a predictor of the Centrality of Visual Aesthetic Products (β = -.25 ; p < .01), accounting for 6% (R^2 = .06 ; p <.01) of the variance of Response (see Table 5), and suggesting that, as hypothesized, the significance that design holds for an in his/her relationship with products is especially related to having a low Openness to experience. However, though not included in the BIC-based optimal model, the results also point to the fact that Agreeableness may play a role in predicting the Centrality of Visual Aesthetic Products.

Table 5

Regression Results for Predicting Centrality of Visual Aesthetic Products (Total Score), Using glmulti to Exhaustively Fit All Possible Models

	Full model	BIC-based optimal model
Beta estimates		
Conscientiousness (BFI)	-.04	
Agreeableness (BFI)	.15	
Neuroticism (BFI)	-.00	
Openness (BFI)	-.24**	-.25**
Extraversion (BFI)	-.03	
Model fit index		
AIC	1084.38	1080.26
BIC	1105.82	1089.44
Multiple R^2	.09*	.06**

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Discussion

As hypothesized, low Openness significantly predicted the individuals' tendency to prefer and respond to greatly designed products. More specifically, based on the regression results, the extent to which one values design (value), the (self-reported) ability to evaluate design (acumen) and the urge to buy products with a great design (response) were primarily predicted by low Openness to experience. Indeed, the results of this study suggest that individuals with a low Openness to experience tend to have an increased intensity of the response to the appearance of a product, amplifying design-driven product choices. Oppositely, high Openness individuals may tend to focus more inquisitively on other aspects of products, leading them to disregard aesthetic characteristics. Besides, agreeableness was found to be positively correlated with Value, which was not expected. Such a result could be explained by the fact that both Agreeableness and Valuing design imply taking into consideration specific common values such as harmony and balance. Indeed, superiorly designed products may be more valued by agreeable individuals because such aesthetic characteristics would be regarded as an effort from brands to make their products more pleasant. Though previous results indicate that the CVPA is not biased by social desirability (Bloch et al., 2003), this result could also be explained by the fact that both Agreeableness and Valuing design could be part of a general strategic self-presentation. More generally, the results suggest that more empirical research is needed to further understand the relationships between Agreeableness and design-driven consumer choices.

This study has some limitations. In particular, it has been conducted on a sample of students, mostly female. Further studies should focus on the replication of this result on other samples, such as more typical highly designed products consumers than students. Moreover, personality and the tendency to make design-driven consumer choices were here measured using rather short – though psychometrically robust – self-report scales. Further research might try to further investigate the link between personality and buying or appreciating well-designed products using other measures, notably more in-depth measures such as the NEO-PI-R. As previous research indicates that a consumer's behavior is related to the extent to which he/she is sensitive to social comparison information (Netemeyer, Bearden, & Teel, 1992; Bearden & Rose, 1990; Bearden, Hardesty, & Rose, 2001), further studies could also focus on the influence of other personality traits, such as self-esteem, conformity, self-presentation strategies, on the tendency to prefer well-designed products.

Because this study might provide some useful elements to further understand and to further predict the design-driven consumer choices, the results of this research may lead to different field applications, particularly in the areas of advertising and marketing. Indeed, here, preferring well-design products seems to be related to personality, and advertisers might focus on specific arguments when aiming at selling products with a superior design. Future research could focus on the impact of using specific arguments to sell well-designed products. Finally, this study could help marketers and advertisers identify the target markets of greatly designed products, which can help them better match the spending of time and money on design research and production, as well as how much is spent on design-focused advertising, with the characteristics of the target market segments.

Notes

1) Another option that is commonly used is the use of stepwise backward or forward model selection. However, the results of stepwise model selection procedures depend on arbitrary decisions, such as the choice of the starting point and the stopping rules, may not always converge to the best model, and possibly lead to selecting different models (Venables & Ripley 1997; Grafen & Hails 2002). Such issues are eliminated by testing an exhaustive list of models.

References

Bamossy, G., Johnston, M., & Parsons, M. (1985). The assessment of aesthetic judgment ability. *Empirical Studies of the Arts, 3*(1), 63-79. doi:10.2190/1U13-U2DB-0BE3-A4FN

Bearden, W. O., Hardesty, D. M., & Rose, R. L. (2001). Consumer self-confidence: Refinements in conceptualization and measurement. *Journal of Consumer Research, 28*(1), 121-134. doi:10.1086/321951

Bloch, P. H. (1995). Seeking the ideal form: Product design and consumer response. *Journal of Marketing, 59*, 16-29. doi:10.2307/1252116

Bloch, P. H., Brunel, F. F., & Arnold, T. J. (2003). Individual differences in the centrality of visual product aesthetics: Concept and measurement. *Journal of Consumer Research, 29*(4), 551-565. doi:10.1086/346250

Bearden, W. O., & Rose, R. L. (1990). Attention to social comparison information: An individual difference factor affecting consumer conformity. *Journal of Consumer Research, 16*, 461-471. doi:10.1086/209231

Brunel, F., & Swain, S. D. (2008). A moderated perceptual model of product aesthetic evaluations. *European Advances in Consumer Research, 8*, 444-445.

Calcagno, V., & De Mazancourt, C. (2010). glmulti: An R package for easy automated model selection with (generalized) linear models. *Journal of Statistical Software, 34*(12). Retrieved from http://www.jstatsoft.org/v34/i12.

Chan, R. Y. K. (2001). Determinants of Chinese consumers' green purchase behavior. *Psychology and Marketing, 18*(4), 389-413. doi:10.1002/mar.1013

Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Desmet, P. M. A. (2003). A Multilayered model of product emotions. *The Design Journal, 6*(2), 4-13. doi:10.2752/146069203789355480

Desmet, P. M. A., Hekkert, P., & Hillen, M. G. (2003). Values and emotions: An empirical investigation in the relationship between emotional responses to products and human values. In *Proceedings of Techné: Design Wisdom 5th European Academy of Design conference,* Barcelona, Spain.

Desmet, P. M. A., Hekkert, P., & Jacobs, J. J. (2000). When a car makes you smile: Development and application of an instrument to measure product emotions. In S. J. Hoch & R. J. Meyer (Eds.), *Advances in Consumer Research* (Vol. 27, pp. 111-117). Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.

Eysenck, H. J. (1983). Visual aesthetic sensitivity and its measurement. In M. Russ (Ed.), *The arts: A way of knowing* (pp. 105-125). Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.

Frois, J. P., & Eysenck, H. J. (1995). The Visual Aesthetic Sensitivity Test applied to Portuguese children and fine arts students. *Creativity Research Journal, 8*, 277-284. doi:10.1207/s15326934crj0803_6

Götz, K. O., Borisy, A. R., Lynn, R., & Eysenck, H. J. (1979). A new visual aesthetic sensitivity test: I. construction and psychometric properties. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 49*(3), 795-802. doi:10.2466/pms.1979.49.3.795

Götz, K. O. (1985). *VAST: Visual Aesthetic Sensitivity Test* (4th ed.). Düsseldorf, Germany: Concept Verlag.

Graves, M. (1948). *Design Judgment Test.* New York: Psychological Corp.

Grafen, A., & Hails, R. (2002). *Modern statistics for the life sciences*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Haugtvedt, C. P., Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1992). Need for cognition and advertising: Understanding the role of personality variables in consumer behavior. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 1*(3), 239-260. doi:10.1016/S1057-7408(08)80038-1

Hollins, B., & Pugh, S. (1990). *Successful product design*. London: Butterworths.

John, O. P. (1990). The 'Big Five' factor taxonomy: Dimensions of personality in the natural language and in questionnaires. In O. P. John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 66-100). New York: Guilford Press.

John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In O. P. John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 102–138). New York: Guilford Press.

Leder, H., Belke, B., Oeberst, A., & Augustin, D. (2004). A model of aesthetic appreciation and aesthetic judgments. *British Journal of Psychology, 95*, 489-508. doi:10.1348/0007126042369811

Loewy, R. (1951). *Never leave well enough alone*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

McCrae, R. M., & John, O. P. (1992). An introduction to the Five-Factor Model and its applications. *Journal of Personality, 60*(2), 175-215. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.1992.tb00970.x

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1999). A Five-Factor theory of personality. In O. P. John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 139–153). New York: Guilford Press.

Meier, N. C. (1963). *The Meier Art Test II, aesthetic perception: Preliminary manual*. Iowa City: Bureau of Educational Research and Service, University of Iowa.

Netemeyer, R., Bearden, W., & Teel, J. (1992). Consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence and attributional sensitivity. *Psychology and Marketing, 9*, 379-394. doi:10.1002/mar.4220090504

Orestes Cerdeira, J., Duarte Silva, A. P., Cadima, J., & Minhoto, M. (2009). *Subselect: Selecting variable subsets. R package version 0.10-1*. Retrieved from http://CRAN.R- project.org/package=subselect

Plaisant, O., Srivastava, S., Mendelsohn, G. A., Debray, Q., & John, O. P. (2005). Relations entre le Big Five Inventory français et le manuel diagnostique des troubles mentaux dans un échantillon clinique français. *Annales Médico-Psychologiques, 163*(2), 161-167. doi:10.1016/j.amp.2005.02.002

Rook, D. W. (1987). The buying impulse. *Journal of Consumer Research, 14*(2), 189-199. doi:10.1086/209105

Schmitt, B. H., & Simonson, A. (1997). *Marketing aesthetics: The strategic management of brands, identity and image*. New York: Free Press.

Sharpe, J. P., & Ramanaiah, N. V. (1999). Materialism and the Five-Factor Model of personality. *Psychological Reports, 85*, 327-330.

Venables, W. N., & Ripley, B. D. (1997). *Modern applied statistics with S-PLUS* (3rd ed.). New York: Springer Verlag.

About the Authors

Mr. **Nils Myszkowski** is a PhD candidate in creativity psychology. He works in the laboratory LATI (Université Paris Descartes, Paris, France), which focuses on organizational psychology, creativity and individual differences psychology. He teaches people management in a business school and psychology at the Université Paris Descartes (Paris, France). His thesis, directed by Pr. Todd Lubart and Dr. Franck Zenasni, focuses on creativity, personality and aesthetics.

Mr. **Martin Storme** is a PhD candidate in individual differences psychology. He works in the LATI (Université Paris Descartes, Paris, France), which focuses on organizational psychology, creativity and individual differences psychology. His thesis, directed by Pr. Todd Lubart, focuses on information integration in creativity judgment.