



Promotional Products' Impact On Brand/Company Image

An Experimental Study

Research Conducted by:

Kathleen H. Gruben, Ph.D.

Director, Center for Retail Studies

Associate Professor of Marketing

Georgia Southern University

Statesboro, Georgia

PPAI Research

APRIL 2005

PPAI

Research Conducted by:
Kathleen H. Gruben, Ph.D.
Director, Center for Retail Studies
Associate Professor of Marketing
Georgia Southern University
Statesboro, Georgia

Research Report

Using Promotional Products to Enhance Brand/Company Image

Report on a Study Executed for
Incentive Performance Center and PPAI

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Introduction.....	3
Overview of the Study.....	3
Background	3
Experimental Design	4
What Was Measured?.....	4
Profile of Company Selected.....	5
Where Was the Study Conducted?	6
Pre-Test.....	6
Who Participated in the Pre-Test?.....	6
Demographic Information.....	7
Measurement of Familiarity with the Business.....	8
Nature of Comments Respondents Made	9
Dimensions Measured	10
Overall Image	10
Uniqueness	13
Perception.....	14
Patronage Likelihood for Lunch.....	15
Patronage Likelihood for Dinner.....	15
Pre-Test Summary.....	16
Post-Test.....	17

Demographic Information.....	17
Measurement of Familiarity with the Business.....	19
Likelihood of Recommending the Business.....	22
Dimensions Measured	23
Overall Image	24
Uniqueness	25
Perception.....	26
Patronage Likelihood for Lunch.....	26
Patronage Likelihood for Dinner.....	27
Post-Test Summary	28
Was the Promotional Product Effective?	29
Return on Investment (ROI).....	29
APPENDIX A	30
APPENDIX B	36

Executive Summary

An experiment was conducted to test the impact of promotional products on brand/company image through a pre-test/post-test design. After taking the pre-test survey, the experimental group was given a promotional product reflecting the image of the participating business. The control group received nothing. The research was based on a hypothesis that anticipated that, after a period of time, the group that received the promotional product would have a more positive image of the business than the group that did not receive anything. This research report provides the results of the study.

Five factors were examined, including:

- Image
- Uniqueness
- Perceptions
- Likelihood of Patronizing the Café for Lunch
- Likelihood of Patronizing the Café for Dinner

The results of the pre-test indicate that the sample group was appropriate.

- A diverse set of interests was found in the sample.
- The majority of the respondents were in their first or second year at the university.
- A broad range of income brackets was represented.
- No significant differences were found between the control and experimental groups for any of the overall factors.

The fact that no significant differences existed indicated that the study did not have any pre-existing bias between the groups. This similarity provided a stronger foundation for testing the hypothesis.

The results of the post-test revealed that the experimental group (the one that received a promotional product after the pre-test) and the control group (the one that received nothing) had significantly different opinions for three factors:

- Image
- Perceptions
- Likelihood of Patronizing the Café for Lunch

In all three cases, the experimental group had significantly more positive impressions than the control group. For the remaining two dimensions:

- Uniqueness

- Likelihood of Patronizing the Café for Dinner

No significant differences were found. Interpretation of the results of the uniqueness factor is left open to the individual's interpretation because of the difference in types of restaurants different people prefer. Some people like casual dining while others like a more upscale experience. The greatest benefit of having this information is to show that no bias exists between the two groups. This particular scale is the only one would not be impacted by a promotional product.

Both groups maintained a positive attitude for all dimensions, even when significant differences existed between the groups.

The hypothesis was supported. **The study showed that promotional products have a positive impact on a company/brand image.** Although ROI was not included in the study, the participating business shared information that indicated a positive impact on sales, including a 10-15 percent increase in sales the months following the study.

Introduction

Over the past few years, marketers have heightened their awareness of the need to enhance brand and/or company image. This awareness has created a dilemma. Companies are scrutinizing essentially every line in their budgets to determine which expenses are important and which can be eliminated or reduced. Many of these cuts are made to advertising and promotions because their effectiveness is difficult to assess. This tendency is reflected in the sales figures reported by the promotional products industry in the first two years of this decade. The United States experience economic hardships in 2001 and 2002. The hardship was accompanied by a decline in sales for the promotional products industry in 2001, the first experienced by the industry in almost three decades. This was followed by a second decline in 2002. The industry began to rebound in 2004, but the downturn emphasized the importance of confirming that promotional products have a positive impact on consumers' perceptions of a brand or company.

Unfortunately, the person evaluating the bottom line may not recognize the importance of promotion, but, in reality, eliminating these efforts may place a company at risk. When businesses fail to expose customers to their brand names, they risk succumbing to the "out-of-sight, out-of-mind" mentality. In other words, eliminating potentially valuable assets such as promotional efforts may give these companies a false sense of security. This tendency places an emphasis on determining the effectiveness of promotional products. This report provides the results of a study designed to assess this effectiveness.

Overview of the Study

Background

A study was conducted by Dr. Kathleen H. Gruben, Associate Professor of Marketing at Georgia Southern University, to test the impact of promotional products on brand/company image through a pre-test/post-test experimental design. A pre-test study was conducted to determine the level of awareness consumers had of the selected business and establish a benchmark for the post-test. This pre-test was conducted in a controlled environment – one in which the researcher was assured that the participants would be available for the post-test. The participants were divided into an experimental group and a control group. After completing the pre-test survey, the experimental group was given a promotional product imprinted with the company's logo. The control group received nothing. The post-test was conducted approximately one month later to identify image differences/similarities between the groups' perceptions. The

promotional product's effectiveness would be confirmed if the group that received a product had a more positive impression of the participating company than the group that received nothing.

The overview of the post-test results shows that the promotional product in this study was effective.

Experimental Design

An experimental design with promotional products works similarly to medical experiments in which researchers have a control group and an experimental group. In medical experiments, the control group is either given a placebo or nothing, and the experimental group is given the actual medication or treatment. With this experiment, the control group received nothing. After taking the pre-test survey, the experimental group received an inexpensive promotional product that complemented the firm's logo. A three-dimensional, chrysanthemum shaped stress toy with the Leigh Ann's logo imprinted in the center of the flower was given. This shape was ideal because it resembled the flower dotting the "i" in the logo and continued out the color theme as shown below.



What Was Measured?

The effectiveness of promotional products on brand/company image was assessed through comparing the experimental and control groups' opinions about a company's:

- Overall Image
- Uniqueness

Other dimensions included the respondents'

- Perception of the firm
- The likelihood of them patronizing the business for:
 - Lunch
 - Dinner

The respondents' propensity to make positive, negative, and/or neutral statements was also measured. Finally, the respondents' likelihoods of recommending the business to someone else were assessed.

The following hypothesis was used to test the effectiveness.

H₁: Participants who receive a promotional product will have a greater positive image of a brand/company than those who do not receive a promotional product

Profile of Company Selected

An experiment was conducted to determine the impact of promotional products on the image of a business. To measure the impact of the promotional product rather than something else, such as brand recognition or familiarity with the business, a company whose brand was not well established within the sample group was needed. The ideal type needed was one with a local flair that was owned and operated by an individual or small group of individuals. In other words, the company needed to be one with which only permanent or long-term residents had a high level of familiarity with the restaurant. Special care was taken to select such a business. A locally-owned restaurant agreed to be the focus of the experiment. Incentives for their participation included:

- promotional products that complemented the firm's logo were supplied by the researcher,
- the business gained exposure to an audience that had limited awareness of it prior to the study, and
- the results of the study were provided to the business.

Ideally, the promotional product and exposure would lead to greater market potential. The firm was only required to provide the researcher some insight to the business, information about the target market, and a copy of the logo.

The participating restaurant offers two different types of dining experiences with all menu items made with fresh ingredients. Lunchtime offers a quick meal with a menu featuring a daily special as well:

- Wraps
- Salads
- Pizzas (pizza made with a pita)
- Vegetarian items

Prices range from \$6 to \$8.

The evening meal is a more relaxed environment with a dinner menu that features a wine list and entrees in the following categories:

- Poultry
- Seafood
- Steak
- Vegetarian
- Desserts

Desserts and sauces are made fresh; beef is certified Angus; and seafood is never frozen. Prices range from \$12 to \$25.

Its logo does not indicate the type of business, which was a plus in the experimental design. Respondents could not easily guess the nature of the business.

Where Was the Study Conducted?

The study was conducted in a college town in the southeast. The easiest group to recruit for participation was students for several reasons. First, the university provided a potential pool of more than 16,000 students. Because they are students, they're expected to attend scheduled classes over a sixteen-week period. This type of environment provided the consistency required for a successful pre-test/post-test design. The majority of the respondents were available for both tests.

Pre-Test

Who Participated in the Pre-Test?

Six hundred forty-seven students registered in 27 sections of an introductory economics course participated in the pre-test. This group of students was selected for two primary reasons.

- The course is required of all students so these classes represented the entire student population.
- The course is typically taken by students within the first year or two of their studies on the campus.

This situation was ideal because a wide range of personal interests were represented, and the students would have little or no familiarity with the business. These factors reduced the potential for bias in the results. Sections of the course were randomly assigned to the experimental and control groups rather than assigning individual respondents. This methodology ensured equal treatment of

participants within each class. It also made it possible to match the groups from the pre-test and post-tests while assuring the participants' anonymity.

Demographic Information

Basic demographic information was collected to ensure the sample group was primarily comprised of participants who satisfied the above criteria. All classifications were represented, but, as anticipated, the majority of the students were in their first or second year of studies. Table 1 reflects the distribution of student classifications.

Table 1: Student Classifications – Pre-test

Classification	Number	Percent
Freshman	287	44.5
Sophomore	265	41.1
Junior	87	13.5
Senior	4	.6
Graduate Student	2	.3
Total	645	100.0

Although the majority of the students were underclassmen, they represented a broad range of ages as reflected in Table 2.

Table 2: Student Ages – Pre-test

Age Groups	Number	Percent
Under 18	11	1.7
18-19	448	69.5
20-21	152	23.6
22-23	18	2.8
24-25	4	.6
26-35	9	1.4
36-45	2	.3
56-65	1	.2
Over 65	0	0
Total	645	100.0

The gender composition of the sample group was of little importance other than to determine if the sample was balanced. If the distribution was uneven, a larger portion of females would be desired because the café's customer base consists of more females than males. The group had slightly more females than males, as reflected in Table 3.

Table 3: Gender Distribution of Respondents – Pre-test

Gender	Number	Percent
Male	296	47.5
Female	327	52.5
Total	623	100.0

The business offers a moderately priced menu for both lunch and dinner; therefore, a broad cross-section of income levels was desired. The respondents made such a representation with the largest portion of the participants from middle-income families as seen in Table 4.

Table 4: Income Brackets of Respondents – Pre-test

Income	Number	Percent
\$25,000 or Less	59	9.5
\$25,001 - \$50,000	122	19.7
\$50,001 - \$75,000	141	22.8
\$75,001 - \$100,000	121	19.5
More than \$100,000	176	28.4
Total	619	100.0

As anticipated, the students participating in the study represented a vast array of interests. All colleges within the university were represented in the sample group. The distribution very closely followed the proportions found campus-wide. Table 5 reflects the distribution.

Table 5: Colleges Represented – Pre-test

	Number	Percent
Business	152	23.5
Education	70	10.8
Health & Human Sciences	159	24.7
Information Technology	38	5.9
Liberal Arts & Social Sciences	121	18.7
Undeclared/Undecided	72	11.4
Unknown	21	2.3
Total	633	100.0

Measurement of Familiarity with the Business

Before the initial image was assessed, it was essential to determine what portion of the students believed they were aware of the business. To know if they were truly aware, it was important to evaluate how many of them could actually name the type of business. Collectively, only 19.9 percent of the respondents reported that they were familiar with the business. An examination of the results to determine the similarities or difference between the control and experimental groups revealed very similar statistics as illustrated in Table 6.

Table 6: How Many Were Familiar with the Business?

	Control Group Did Not Receive Promotional Product	%	Experimental Group Received Promotional Product	%
Familiar	60	18.8	68	20.9
Not Familiar	259	81.2	257	79.1
Total	319	100.0	325	100.0

Participants were asked to state the type of business based on their perceptions from seeing the logo. Only 75.8 percent of the people who said they were familiar with the business were actually able to correctly identify the type of business. **In other words, not as many respondents were familiar with the business as they reported.** Of those who stated they were not familiar with the business, 20.9 percent were able to guess the correct business type. Table 7 categorizes the businesses identified and reflects the distribution of the responses based on whether respondents indicated that they were familiar with the business.

Table 7: How Did Respondents Identify the Type of Business?

	Familiar	%	Not Familiar	%
Café/Restaurant	97	75.8	108	20.9
Clothing Store	5	3.9	97	18.8
Florist	3	2.3	98	19.0
Arts/Crafts	1	.8	9	1.7
Shoe	1	.8	1	.2
Hair/Tan Salon	0	0	9	1.7
Gift Shop	1	.8	27	5.2
Other	7	5.5	67	13.1
Don't Know	13	10.2	100	19.4
Total	128	100.0	516	100.0

Nature of Comments Respondents Made

In addition to determining the level of familiarity of the business, obtaining cognitive responses was important to provide insight about the degree of positive, neutral, and negative thoughts the participants had about the business prior to answering the image questions. No significant differences were found between the control and experimental groups in the number of positive, neutral, and negative comments they made, which is indicated by the “—” in the Significant Difference column. On average, respondents made slightly more than 1.2 positive comments, between .7 and .8 neutral comments, and fewer than .5 negative comments. Table 8 shows a comparison between the two groups and indicates that the differences are not statistically different.

Table 8: Nature of Comments

	Control Group Did Not Receive Promotional Product	Experimental Group Received Promotional Product	Significant Difference
Positive	1.22 responses	1.28 responses	—
Neutral	.80 responses	.71 responses	—
Negative	.43 responses	.37 responses	—

— Indicates no significant difference was found

* Indicates a significant difference

Dimensions Measured

A brand's or company's image is an intangible aspect of an entity based upon perceptions rather than realities. The complexities of these perceptions required that several factors be examined rather than merely overall image. This project studied five:

- Overall Image
- Uniqueness
- Perceptions
- Patronage Likelihood for Two Situations
 - Lunch
 - Dinner

It was important for the participants to have similar opinions about the business prior to the study, regardless of whether they would receive a promotional product. The similarities indicate that **no bias existed prior to the study**. The results of this examination are presented in the following sections.

Overall Image

Once the respondents' frames of minds were established, it was important to determine the image the participants had of the business. To do this, a validated image scale was used. Respondents were asked to rate the following items on a scale of 1 to 7 with 7 representing a positive response and 1 representing a negative one.

- Good/Bad
- Like/Dislike
- Pleasant/Unpleasant
- High Quality/Poor Quality
- Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory
- Favorable/Unfavorable
- Distinctive/Not Distinctive

- Positive Opinion/Negative Opinion
- Desirable/Undesirable
- Nice/Awful
- Superior/Inferior
- Interesting/Boring
- Like Extremely/Dislike Extremely
- Sophisticated/Plain

Scales, such as the one used in this study, are designed to examine in the aggregate. However, examination of the individual items can provide insight as to which are strong areas and which need improvement. Because the rating was on a scale of 1 to 7, a neutral rating was 4. Any number higher than 4 means the rating is better than average and score lower than 4 means the rating is worse than average. All items rated neutral or better for both the group that received a promotional product and the one that did not.

More important than the knowing individual item ratings was knowing if the two groups gave similar evaluations of each item. The average scores for each group on each item are reflected in Table 9. To have similar ratings for each item, the average does not need to be exact. A statistical comparison is required to determine if the differences are significant. To adequately test the hypothesis, the two groups' responses needed to be similar. An examination of Table 9 shows that the groups only had significantly different responses for two out of 14 items. These differences are indicated in the table with an “*” in the significant difference column.

Table 9: Image Item Mean Scores – Pre-test

	Control Group Did Not Receive Promotional Product	Experimental Group Received Promotional Product	Significant Difference
Good/Bad	5.32	5.40	—
Like/Dislike	4.82	4.80	—
Pleasant/Unpleasant	5.53	5.52	—
High Quality/Poor Quality	5.04	5.03	—
Satisfactory/ Unsatisfactory	5.13	5.18	—
Favorable/Unfavorable	5.08	5.14	—
Distinctive/Not Distinctive	4.36	4.65	*
Positive Opinion/ Negative Opinion	5.27	5.40	—
Desirable/Undesirable	5.07	5.17	—
Nice/Awful	5.55	5.60	—
Superior/Inferior	4.43	4.33	—
Interesting/Boring	4.87	5.06	*
Like Extremely/ Dislike Extremely	4.50	4.62	—
Sophisticated/Plain	4.49	4.62	—

— Indicates no significant difference was found * Indicates a significant difference
 A scale of 1-7, with 1 representing a negative response and 7 a positive response, was used. Any response with a score above 4 was positive, at 4 was neutral, less than 4 was negative.

It was also important to examine the results of the image scale in the aggregate for two reasons.

- The scale has little statistical value unless examined as one dimension.
- It was particularly important to examine the results for the total image scale because of the significant differences for two items.

Examination of the overall scale determined if the differences for the two items were of concern. Table 10 shows that both groups had a slightly positive image of the business and that the two groups had similar opinions, which is indicated by the “—“in the significant difference column. The overall similar opinions were essential to the overall results of the study.

Table 10: Overall Image Mean Scores – Pre-test

	Control Group Did Not Receive Promotional Product	Experimental Group Received Promotional Product	Significant Difference
Total Image Factor	4.97	5.05	—

— Indicates no significant difference was found * Indicates a significant difference
 A scale of 1-7, with 1 representing a negative response and 7 a positive response, was used. Any response with a score above 4 was positive, at 4 was neutral, less than 4 was negative.

Uniqueness

Image is a multi-dimensional factor. This study examined two of those dimensions, general image and uniqueness. The uniqueness aspect contained four items including:

- Unusual/Usual
- Home Cooking/Gourmet Food
- Upscale/Middle of the Road
- Common/Unique

As with the overall image, the possible scale responses ranged from 1 to 7 so the neutral point was 4. Because each of these items can be construed as either positive or negative based on an individual's opinion, no connotation about the direction from the neutral point was made. The purpose was merely to determine if the two groups had similar opinions. A statistical analysis indicated that the images were not significantly different.

Table 11: Uniqueness Item Mean Scores – Pre-test

	Control Group (Did Not Receive Promotional Product)	Experimental Group (Received Promotional Product)	Significant Difference
Usual/Unusual	4.41	4.34	—
Home Cooking/Gourmet Food	4.27	4.16	—
Middle of the Road/Upscale	3.71	3.74	—
Common/Unique	4.26	4.22	—

— Indicates no significant difference was found * Indicates a significant difference
A scale of 1-7, with 1 representing a negative response and 7 a positive response, was used. Any response with a score above 4 was positive, at 4 was neutral, less than 4 was negative.

With the lack of significant differences between the groups for any of the items, similar results were expected for the uniqueness dimension of image. The results were as anticipated. Table 12 shows that no significant difference was found between the groups.

Table 12: Uniqueness Factor Mean Scores – Pre-test

	Control Group (Did Not Receive Promotional Product)	Experimental Group (Received Promotional Product)	Significant Difference
Total Uniqueness Factor	4.10	4.07	—

— Indicates no significant difference was found * Indicates a significant difference
A scale of 1-7, with 1 representing a negative response and 7 a positive response, was used. Any response with a score above 4 was positive, at 4 was neutral, less than 4 was negative.

Perception

Image is an intangible element of a brand or company that is based on perceptions. No study about image would be complete without an examination of the respondents' perceptions about the brand or company being evaluated. Perceptions were determined through a three item scale with a rating of 1 to 7. Anchors for the scale included the following statements:

- My feelings toward Leigh Ann's are good (bad)
- My feelings toward Leigh Ann's are pleasant (unpleasant)
- I like (dislike) Leigh Ann's

The statements with good, pleasant, and like were at the high end of the scale. The low end of the scale contained the bad, unpleasant, and dislike anchors. Any mean score above the median point of 4 was considered positive. Both groups had positive responses for each of the perception items. No significant differences were found between the groups for any of the items.

Table 13: Perception Item Mean Scores – Pre-test

	Control Group (Did Not Receive Promotional Product)	Experimental Group (Received Promotional Product)	Significant Difference
Good Feelings	5.39	5.37	—
Pleasant Feelings	5.51	5.52	—
Like	4.94	4.97	—

— Indicates no significant difference was found * Indicates a significant difference
 A scale of 1-7, with 1 representing a negative response and 7 a positive response, was used. Any response with a score above 4 was positive, at 4 was neutral, less than 4 was negative.

The examination of the overall perception factor revealed mean scores that were so similar that one would know that no real difference existed by looking at the averages without a statistical analysis.

Table 14: Perception Factor Mean Scores – Pre-test

	Control Group (Did Not Receive Promotional Product)	Experimental Group (Received Promotional Product)	Significant Difference
Total Perception Factor	5.28	5.29	—

— Indicates no significant difference was found * Indicates a significant difference
 A scale of 1-7, with 1 representing a negative response and 7 a positive response, was used. Any response with a score above 4 was positive, at 4 was neutral, less than 4 was negative.

Patronage Likelihood for Lunch

It was also important to determine the respondents' propensity to patronize the restaurant. The participants were presented the question "how likely are you to eat lunch at Leigh Ann's?" A set of three potential answers were provided:

- It is likely (unlikely).
- It is possible (impossible).
- It is probable (improbable).

Likely, possible, and probably were on the high end of the scale. The low end of the scale included unlikely, impossible, and improbable as anchors. Both groups had average scores above the median point of 4, which indicated both groups had a positive outlook about dining at the business for lunch. No significant differences were found between the groups on any of the items or the overall scale, as reflected in Tables 15 and 16.

Table 15: Lunch Patronage Likelihood Item Mean Scores – Pre-test

	Control Group (Did Not Receive Promotional Product)	Experimental Group (Received Promotional Product)	Significant Difference
Likely Lunch	4.41	4.55	—
Possible Lunch	5.27	5.32	—
Probable Lunch	4.64	4.73	—

— Indicates no significant difference was found * Indicates a significant difference
 A scale of 1-7, with 1 representing a negative response and 7 a positive response, was used. Any response with a score above 4 was positive, at 4 was neutral, less than 4 was negative.

Table 16: Lunch Patronage Likelihood Factor Mean Scores – Pre-test

	Control Group (Did Not Receive Promotional Product)	Experimental Group (Received Promotional Product)	Significant Difference
Total Lunch Factor	4.77	4.87	—

— Indicates no significant difference was found * Indicates a significant difference
 A scale of 1-7, with 1 representing a negative response and 7 a positive response, was used. Any response with a score above 4 was positive, at 4 was neutral, less than 4 was negative.

Patronage Likelihood for Dinner

As stated earlier, the restaurant has an entirely different product offering for the evening meal. The lunch prices fit better within a typical student's budget than

the dinner menu; therefore, the same questions needed to be asked about dinner. The groups had similar opinions for the likelihood and possibility of having dinner at the restaurant but significantly different opinions about the probability of having dinner there. In all cases, the score was on the positive end of the scale indicating the respondents were more likely to try having dinner at the restaurant than not. Table 17 provides an overview of the results.

Table 17: Dinner Patronage Likelihood Item Mean Scores – Pre-test

	Control Group (Did Not Receive Promotional Product)	Experimental Group (Received Promotional Product)	Significant Difference
Likely Dinner	4.15	4.34	—
Possible Dinner	4.89	4.99	—
Probable Dinner	4.30	4.53	*

— Indicates no significant difference was found * Indicates a significant difference
 A scale of 1-7, with 1 representing a negative response and 7 a positive response, was used. Any response with a score above 4 was positive, at 4 was neutral, less than 4 was negative.

As with the image dimensions, this was a scale intended for examination as a whole. Although one item, the probability of having dinner at the restaurant, revealed a significant difference, the mean score of the scale revealed the groups had similar opinions.

Table 18: Dinner Patronage Likelihood Factor Mean Scores – Pre-test

	Control Group (Did Not Receive Promotional Product)	Experimental Group (Received Promotional Product)	Significant Difference
Total Dinner Factor	4.44	4.62	—

— Indicates no significant difference was found * Indicates a significant difference
 A scale of 1-7, with 1 representing a negative response and 7 a positive response, was used. Any response with a score above 4 was positive, at 4 was neutral, less than 4 was negative.

Pre-Test Summary

The results of the pre-test indicate that the sample group was appropriate.

- A diverse set of interests was found in the sample.
- The majority of the respondents were in their first or second year at the university.
- A broad range of income brackets was represented.
- No significant differences were found between the control and experimental groups for any of the overall factors.

The fact that no significant differences existed indicated that the study did not have any pre-existing bias between the groups. This similarity provided a stronger foundation for testing the hypothesis.

Post-Test

Demographic Information

The same sections of the economics course were included in the post-test which provided the consistency for a successful experiment; however, the number of participants who participated in the post-test was a little smaller than for the pre-test. This difference can be explained through the following:

- Not all students attend every class.
- The pre-test was conducted prior to the last day to drop a class. In other words, students not doing well in the class may not have been enrolled during the post-test.
- The post-test data were collected during the last two weeks of the semester. Students tend to have lower attendance rates during that time because they have so many projects due, and they focus more on the projects than class.

These issues made it important to determine if the post-test group was similar to the previous group. Although exactly which individuals participated in both studies cannot be determined, the following table shows that the pre-test and post-test participants were very similar with variations of only a few points between the two periods of data collection.

Only slight differences were found for student classifications. The pre-test included 44.5 percent freshmen and 41.1 percent sophomores with 41.3 freshmen and 43.9 sophomores participating in the post-test. The numbers were almost reversed for the post-test, as can be seen in Table 19.

Table 19: Student Classifications – Post-test

Classification	Number	Percent
Freshman	224	41.3
Sophomore	238	43.9
Junior	73	13.5
Senior	5	.9
Graduate Student	2	.4
Total	538	100.0

Table 20 shows that a similar flip-flop took place between the 18-19 and 20-21 age groups. The pre-test had 69.5 percent between the ages of 18 and 19 and 23.6 percent ages 20 to 21. The post-test contained 64.6 percent and 27.7

percent for the same groups, respectively. This reverse correlates with the student classifications, as it should.

Table 20: Student Ages – Post-test

Age Groups	Number	Percent
Under 18	7	1.3
18-19	350	64.6
20-21	150	27.7
22-23	14	2.6
24-25	12	2.2
26-35	7	1.3
36-45	2	.4
56-65	0	0
Over 65	0	0
Total	542	100.0

Only a slight change took place in the gender composition of the groups. As reflected in Table 21, the percentage of males in the post-test increased to 47.5 percent compared to 46.1 percent in the pre-test. Females in the post-test decreased from 53.9 percent to 52.5 percent. This change provided a more balanced composition.

Table 21: Gender Distribution of Respondents – Post-test

Gender	Number	Percent
Male	218	46.1
Female	255	53.9
Total	473	100.0

The income brackets in the post-test varied only slightly. The majority remained in income brackets exceeding \$50K annually, as reflected in Table 22.

Table 22: Income Brackets of Respondents – Post-test

Income	Number	Percent
\$25,000 or Less	56	10.9
\$25,001 - \$50,000	95	18.5
\$50,001 - \$75,000	105	20.4
\$75,001 - \$100,000	104	20.2
More than \$100,000	154	30
Total	514	100.0

Table 23 shows that the distribution of the majors of the students participating in the study made only nominal shifts as well.

Table 23: Colleges Represented – Post-test

	Number	Percent
Business	121	22.5
Education	69	12.8
Health & Human Sciences	137	25.5
Information Technology	31	5.4
Liberal Arts & Social Sciences	113	21.0
Undeclared/undecided	50	9.3
Unknown	17	3.2
Total	538	100.0

A review of the demographics of the pre- and post-tests indicates only slight variations between the participants in the two data collection processes, which indicated the situation was appropriate for a successful experiment.

Measurement of Familiarity with the Business

The second survey began with the statement **“earlier in the semester you were asked to complete a survey about you opinions of Leigh Ann’s. Today we would like for you to tell us about your current familiarity and opinions of the business.”** They were asked to indicate which of the following statements best described their familiarity with the business:

- I was familiar with Leigh Ann’s before the survey.
- I was not familiar with Leigh Ann’s before the survey.
- I have not heard of Leigh Ann’s before now.

The results of the control and experimental groups, shown in Table 24, show the number who thought they were familiar with the café before the initial survey more than doubled with the second survey. With the first survey the 18.8 percent of the control group and 20.9 percent of the experimental group reported they were familiar with the business compared to 39.4 percent and 44.4 percent in the post-test.

Table 24: How Many Were Familiar with the Business?

	Control Group (Did Not Receive Promotional Product)	%	Experimental Group (Received Promotional Product)	%
Familiar Before 1 st Survey	97	39.4	126	44.4
Not Familiar Until 1 st Survey	116	47.2	130	45.7
Still Not Familiar	33	13.4	28	9.9
Total	246		284	

Participants were asked to state the type of business based on their perceptions from seeing the logo. This information was needed to determine if the ability to identify the business was greater in the post-test than in the pre-test. The

percentage of both groups that were able to correctly identify the business increased; however, the group that received the promotional product had a much greater improvement than the group that received nothing. Only 74.8 percent of the people who were in the control group were able to correctly identify the type of business but 90.5 percent of those in the experimental group were correct. The overall number of incorrect business types mentioned declined (see Table 25).

Table 25: How Did Respondents Identify the Type of Business?

	Control Group (Did Not Receive Promotional Product)		Experimental Group (Received Promotional Product)	
	#	%	#	%
Café/Restaurant	184	74.8	257	90.5
Clothing Store	10	4.1	0	0
Florist	11	4.5	3	1.1
Arts/Crafts	2	.8	0	0
Hair/Tan Salon	2	.8	0	0
Other	9	4.4	2	.8
Don't Know	26	10.6	22	7.7
Total	246		284	

When cross tabulating the responses to the familiarity question and the business type identification, similar improvements were found.

- Of those who stated they were familiar with the business before the pre-test, 90.7 percent in the control group correctly identified it as a café/restaurant compared to 99.2 percent of the experimental group (see Table 26).
- For those who stated they were not familiar with the business until the first survey, 79.3 percent of the control group correctly identified the type compared to 93.8 percent of the experimental group (see Table 27).
- The portion of the control group that stated that they still were not familiar with the business was less able to identify the type of business than in the pre-test, a drop from 20.9 percent in the pre-test to 12.1 percent in the post-test (see Table 28).

The experimental group, on the other hand, improved from 20.1 to 35.7 percent. These results indicate that **the group that received the promotional product was more likely to talk about the business and could remember it better than the group that received nothing.**

Table 26: How Did the Familiar Respondents Identify the Type of Business?

	Control Group (Did Not Receive Promotional Product)		Experimental Group (Received Promotional Product)	
	#	%	#	%
Café/Restaurant	88	90.7	125	99.2
Clothing Store	1	1.0	0	0
Florist	2	2.1	0	0
Arts/Crafts	1	1.0	0	0
Hair/Tan Salon	0	0	0	0
Other	4	4.2	1	.8
Don't Know	1	1.0	0	0
Total	97		126	

Table 27: How Did Respondents Who Became Familiar After the Pre-test Identify the Type of Business?

	Control Group (Did Not Receive Promotional Product)		Experimental Group (Received Promotional Product)	
	#	%	#	%
Café/Restaurant	92	79.3	122	93.8
Clothing Store	7	6.0	0	0
Florist	5	4.3	1	.8
Arts/Crafts	1	.9	0	0
Hair/Tan Salon	1	.9	0	0
Other	4	3.4	0	0
Don't Know	6	5.2	7	5.4
Total	116		130	

Table 28: How Did Respondents Who Were Not Familiar Identify the Type of Business?

	Control Group (Did Not Receive Promotional Product)		Experimental Group (Received Promotional Product)	
	#	%	#	%
Café/Restaurant	4	12.1	10	35.7
Clothing Store	2	6.1	0	0
Florist	4	12.1	2	7.1
Arts/Crafts	0	0	0	0
Hair/Tan Salon	1	3.0	0	0
Other	3	9.1	1	3.6
Don't Know	19	57.6	15	53.6
Total	33		28	

Interestingly, only around 20 percent of the respondents in the pre-test reported that they were familiar with the business prior to the study. The response changed during the post-test. Of those who did not receive a promotional product, 39.4 percent reported they were familiar with the business prior to the first survey — more than double what they reported in the pre-test. The increase was even larger for the group that received a product. In the post-test, 44.4 percent of this group reported they were familiar with the café before the first survey. Table 29 shows the cross tabulation.

Table 29: Familiarity Comparison – Pre-test/Post-test

	Control Group (Did Not Receive Promotional Product)					Experimental Group (Received Promotional Product)				
	Pre		Post		% Chg	Pre		Post		% Chg
	#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%	
Familiar	60	18.8	97	39.4	+20.6	68	20.9	126	44.4	+23.5
Not Familiar	259	81.2	149	60.6	-20.6	257	79.1	158	55.6	-23.5
Total	319		246			325		284		

Likelihood of Recommending the Business

Respondents were asked to indicate how likely they were to recommend Leigh Ann's Café to someone else. Although the average score was not as high as one would hope, only 7.2 percent of the respondents had eaten lunch at the café and 7.1 had been there for dinner. In other words, the willingness to recommend the business was based on their perceptions rather than on experience. Many made statements such as "how can I recommend someplace if I've never been there?" The key point is that ***the group that received a promotional product was***

significantly more likely to recommend the business than the group that received nothing. Table 30 compares the mean score for the two groups.

Table 30: Likelihood of Recommending the Business – Post-test

	Control Group (Did Not Receive Promotional Product)	Experimental Group (Received Promotional Product)	Significant Difference
Likelihood of Recommending	2.80	3.14	*

— Indicates no significant difference was found * Indicates a significant difference
 A scale of 1-7, with 1 representing a negative response and 7 a positive response, was used. Any response with a score above 4 was positive, at 4 was neutral, less than 4 was negative.

In addition to knowing the difference in the likelihood of recommending the café, it was important to know the difference in the propensity to have positive, negative, or neutral thoughts. The **participants who received the promotional product after the pre-test made significantly more positive comments about the business than those who did not receive a product.** The mean scores indicate that the experimental group also made fewer negative or neutral comments than the control group although the difference was not statistically significant.

Table 31: Nature of Thoughts – Post-test

	Control Group (Did Not Receive Promotional Product)	Experimental Group (Received Promotional Product)	Significant Difference
Positive	.88 responses	1.11 responses	*
Negative	.27 responses	.25 responses	—
Neutral	.40 responses	.34 responses	—

— Indicates no significant difference was found * Indicates a significant difference

The results from these two questions indicate that **the promotional product was effective.**

Dimensions Measured

Respondents were asked to answer identical questions for balance of the survey. Data were collected for the following items and factors:

- Image
- Uniqueness
- Perceptions
- Likelihood of Patronizing the Café for Lunch
- Likelihood of Patronizing the Café for Dinner

Overall Image

Responses between the group with no product and the group that received a product were significantly different for 7 out of the 14 items. The experimental group's opinions were more positive than the control group's, as indicated by the larger number.

Although the opinions were not significantly different for the remaining seven items, the experimental group had slightly more positive opinions for all. The items with a significant difference are indicated with an "*" in the Significant Difference column. Similarities are indicated with a "—" in the column.

Both groups maintained average scores greater than 4, which means that both groups had positive opinions. The group that received the promotional product had a more positive opinion than the group that did not receive one. Table 32 reveals the results of this analysis.

Table 32: Image Item Mean Score Comparison – Post-test

	Control Group (Did Not Receive Promotional Product)	Experimental Group (Received Promotional Product)	Significant Difference
Good/ Bad	5.01	5.05	—
Like/ Dislike	4.43	4.60	*
Pleasant/ Unpleasant	5.03	5.10	—
High Quality/ Poor Quality	4.64	4.89	*
Satisfactory/ Unsatisfactory	4.67	4.93	*
Favorable/ Unfavorable	4.71	4.86	—
Distinctive/ Not Distinctive	4.46	4.54	—
Positive Opinion/ Negative Opinion	5.03	5.12	—
Desirable/ Undesirable	4.78	4.91	—
Nice/ Awful	5.18	5.27	—
Superior/ Inferior	4.17	4.35	*
Interesting/ Boring	4.63	4.83	*
Like Extremely/ Dislike Extremely	4.93	4.53	—
Sophisticated/ Plain	4.36	4.58	*

— Indicates no significant difference was found * Indicates a significant difference

A scale of 1-7, with 1 representing a negative response and 7 a positive response, was used. Any response with a score above 4 was positive, at 4 was neutral, less than 4 was negative.

When examined in the aggregate for the total image factor, the seven items for which the two groups had significantly different opinions were strong enough to overcome those that had only slight differences. ***The experimental group had a significantly more positive overall image of the café than the control group.***

Table 33: Overall Image Mean Score Comparison – Post-test

	Control Group (Did Not Receive Promotional Product)	Experimental Group (Received Promotional Product)	Significant Difference
Total Image Factor	4.69	4.84	*

— Indicates no significant difference was found * Indicates a significant difference
 A scale of 1-7, with 1 representing a negative response and 7 a positive response, was used. Any response with a score above 4 was positive, at 4 was neutral, less than 4 was negative.

Uniqueness

No significant differences were found between the control group and the experimental group for any of the uniqueness items or the overall uniqueness factor. Tables 34 and 35 show that all of the mean scores hover around the neutral point of 4.

Table 34: Uniqueness Item Mean Score Comparison – Post-test

	Control Group (Did Not Receive Promotional Product)	Experimental Group (Received Promotional Product)	Significant Difference
Usual/Unusual	4.26	4.13	—
Home Cooking/Gourmet Food	4.33	4.28	—
Middle of the Road/Upscale	3.75	3.66	—
Common/Unique	4.02	4.14	—

— Indicates no significant difference was found * Indicates a significant difference
 A scale of 1-7, with 1 representing a negative response and 7 a positive response, was used. Any response with a score above 4 was positive, at 4 was neutral, less than 4 was negative.

Table 35: Overall Uniqueness Mean Score Comparison – Post-test

	Control Group (Did Not Receive Promotional Product)	Experimental Group (Received Promotional Product)	Significant Difference
Total Uniqueness Factor	4.08	4.16	—

— Indicates no significant difference was found * Indicates a significant difference
 A scale of 1-7, with 1 representing a negative response and 7 a positive response, was used. Any response with a score above 4 was positive, at 4 was neutral, less than 4 was negative.

Perception

Respondents were also asked to indicate their feelings toward the business. With all three statements, the experimental group (the ones who received a product) had significantly more positive responses than the control group (the ones who did not receive a product.)

Table 36: Perception Item Mean Score Comparison – Post-test

	Control Group (Did Not Receive Promotional Product)	Experimental Group (Received Promotional Product)	Significant Difference
Good Feelings	5.08	5.25	—
Pleasant Feelings	5.16	5.37	*
Like	4.68	4.86	—

— Indicates no significant difference was found * Indicates a significant difference

A scale of 1-7, with 1 representing a negative response and 7 a positive response, was used. Any response with a score above 4 was positive, at 4 was neutral, less than 4 was negative.

Table 37: Overall Perception Mean Score Comparison – Post-test

	Control Group (Did Not Receive Promotional Product)	Experimental Group (Received Promotional Product)	Significant Difference
Total Perception Factor	4.98	5.16	*

— Indicates no significant difference was found * Indicates a significant difference

A scale of 1-7, with 1 representing a negative response and 7 a positive response, was used. Any response with a score above 4 was positive, at 4 was neutral, less than 4 was negative.

Patronage Likelihood for Lunch

The restaurant participating in the study offers two entirely different menus for lunch and dinner. A person who is likely to patronize the business at lunch may or may not be likely to patronize it at dinner. The same holds true for those who dine in the evening. Because of this difference, a set of questions was designed to address the likelihood of the groups patronizing the business at lunch and another for dinner. The experimental group had significantly more positive opinions for the likelihood, possibility, and probability of having lunch at the restaurant. Tables 38 and 39 provide the specifics of the results.

Table 38: Lunch Patronage Likelihood Item Comparison – Post-test

	Control Group (Did Not Receive Promotional Product)	Experimental Group (Received Promotional Product)	Significant Difference
Likely Lunch	4.68	4.86	*
Possible Lunch	4.10	4.48	*
Probable Lunch	4.14	4.46	*

— Indicates no significant difference was found * Indicates a significant difference
 A scale of 1-7, with 1 representing a negative response and 7 a positive response, was used. Any response with a score above 4 was positive, at 4 was neutral, less than 4 was negative.

Table 39: Overall Lunch Patronage Likelihood Comparison – Post-test

	Control Group (Did Not Receive Promotional Product)	Experimental Group (Received Promotional Product)	Significant Difference
Total Lunch Factor	4.36	4.69	*

— Indicates no significant difference was found * Indicates a significant difference
 A scale of 1-7, with 1 representing a negative response and 7 a positive response, was used. Any response with a score above 4 was positive, at 4 was neutral, less than 4 was negative.

Patronage Likelihood for Dinner

When asked about dining for dinner, the experimental group indicated that the probability of their having dinner at the café was significantly greater than the control group. However, the differences between the two groups for likely and possibly were not significant. When the overall factor was examined, the significant difference for the probable item was not enough to make a difference in the overall factor. No significant difference was found between the control and experimental groups for the dinner patronage factor. Both group’s scores were slightly on the positive side of neutral.

Table 40: Dinner Patronage Likelihood Comparison – Post-test

	Control Group (Did Not Receive Promotional Product)	Experimental Group (Received Promotional Product)	Significant Difference
Likely Dinner	3.91	4.16	—
Possible Dinner	4.64	4.68	—
Probable Dinner	3.89	4.22	*

— Indicates no significant difference was found * Indicates a significant difference
 A scale of 1-7, with 1 representing a negative response and 7 a positive response, was used. Any response with a score above 4 was positive, at 4 was neutral, less than 4 was negative.

Table 41: Overall Dinner Patronage Likelihood Comparison – Post-test

	Control Group (Did Not Receive Promotional Product)	Experimental Group (Received Promotional Product)	Significant Difference
Total Dinner Factor	4.14	4.35	—

— Indicates no significant difference was found * Indicates a significant difference

A scale of 1-7, with 1 representing a negative response and 7 a positive response, was used. Any response with a score above 4 was positive, at 4 was neutral, less than 4 was negative.

Post-Test Summary

Five factors were examined, including:

- Image
- Uniqueness
- Perceptions
- Likelihood of Patronizing the Café for Lunch
- Likelihood of Patronizing the Café for Dinner

The experimental group (the one that received a promotional product after the pre-test) and the control group (the one that received nothing) had significantly different opinions for three factors:

- Image
- Perceptions
- Likelihood of Patronizing the Café for Lunch

In all three cases, the experimental group had significantly more positive impressions than the control group. For the remaining two dimensions:

- Uniqueness
- Likelihood of Patronizing the Café for Dinner

No significant differences were found. Interpretation of the results of the uniqueness factor is left open to the individual's interpretation because of the difference in types of restaurants different people prefer. Some people like casual dining while others like a more upscale experience. The greatest benefit of having this information is to show that no bias exists between the two groups. The uniqueness factor is the only one that would not be impacted by a promotional product.

Both groups maintained a positive attitude for all dimensions, even when significant differences existed between the groups.

Was the Promotional Product Effective?

Yes, the product was effective. The hypothesis in the study was supported.

- The groups had similar opinions about the company **prior** to the experiment. After the experiment, the group that received a promotional product had a significantly more positive image of the business than the group that received nothing.
- The group that received a promotional product was significantly more likely to recommend the business to someone else.
- The group that received a promotional product made significantly more positive comments about the business, but no difference was found between the two groups when it came to making negative or neutral comments.

In the pre-test, no differences were found between the groups in these areas.

Return on Investment (ROI)

Return on investment was not designed as a part of the study so specific data were not collected to assess ROI. However, the business owner shared the following information to show the positive impact of the study had on the café:

- The café experienced a **10-15 percent increase in sales the month following the study**. The increase has continued in the months following.
- Students were only a small portion of the café's customer base. The owner reports **an increase of 5-10 percent in customers who are university students**.
- The café opened a second location approximately six weeks after the post-test was complete. The new location, which is on the university campus, has exceeded all sales projections made by the business, its accountant, and the university. The owner reported **the study was a key factor in the final decision to open the campus location**.
- A new customer the morning after the study began reported he/she learned about the business as a result of taking the survey the day before.
- A job applicant reported learning about the business through the study.
- Although the sample group consisted of students, students who received the promotional product talked about it and showed it to faculty members on campus. As a result, the café has had a similar increase in new customers who are faculty members.

Finally, and probably most importantly, **the business has experienced a positive impact on its sales, increase in new customers, and growth as a result of the study.**

APPENDIX A

Pre-Test Survey

You are being asked to voluntarily participate in a study to determine consumer perceptions of a local business. You have been selected as a participant based on your enrollment in the course in which you are receiving this information. Please be assured that your responses are completely anonymous. No individually identifying information will be collected. Participating in the study should take no more than 10 minutes. Should you elect not to participate, you will not be penalized in any way. You may refuse to answer any question or withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. Completion and return of the survey will indicate permission to use the data in the study.

The study is being conducted by Dr. Kathleen H. Gruben of Georgia Southern University. If you any questions regarding the study or you would like to obtain the study results please feel free to contact Dr. Kathleen H. Gruben at kgruben@GeorgiaSouthern.edu If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Coordinator of Georgia Southern University's Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the Office of Research Services at (912) 681-5465.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I realize your time is valuable and limited.

INSTRUCTIONS

Please begin by looking at the logo for a local business.



Are you familiar with the business?

Yes

No

What type of business do you believe it is? _____

Please Continue on the Following Page

PART 1

INSTRUCTIONS: In the space below, please list all the thoughts, reactions, ideas, feelings, and emotions that you had while you were examining the logo. Please write down anything that went through your mind, no matter how simple, complex, relevant, or irrelevant it may seem to you. There are no right or wrong responses. Remember, list all thoughts that occurred to you during the same time you were looking at the logo. Once you have recorded your thoughts return to your list and examine each thought separately and do the following:

- Classify each of your thoughts as positive (POS), negative (NEG), or neutral (NTL)
- Place the appropriate abbreviation POS, NEG, or NTL next to your response.

<u>Thought</u>	<u>POS/NEG/NTL</u>

PART 2

INSTRUCTIONS: Now, we would like you to respond to a series of questions that indicate your feelings toward the restaurant based your knowledge of the restaurant if you were aware of it before this survey or the description given above if you have no prior knowledge of the business.

Please indicate your thoughts about and impressions of Leigh Ann's by checking the appropriate place on each scale. Remember, please use one 'X' for each scale and **please respond to each and every item.**

good	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	bad
dislike very much	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	like very much
pleasant	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	unpleasant
poor quality	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	high quality
unsatisfactory	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	satisfactory
favorable	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	unfavorable
very distinctive	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	not very distinctive
positive opinion	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	negative opinion
desirable	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	undesirable
nice	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	awful
unusual	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	usual
inferior	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	superior
interesting	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	boring
like extremely	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	dislike extremely
sophisticated	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	plain
home cooking	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	gourmet food
upscale	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	middle of the road
common	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	unique

PART 3

INSTRUCTIONS: Here, we would like you to fill out a series of scales that examine your personal opinions of the restaurant. Again, **please respond to every scale** and never put more than one 'X' mark on a single scale. Make each item a separate and independent judgment. Remember, it is your true impression we want. There are no right or wrong answers.

My feelings toward Leigh Ann's are good.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	My feelings toward the Leigh Ann's are bad.
My feelings toward Leigh Ann's are pleasant.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	My feelings toward Leigh Ann's are unpleasant.
I like Leigh Ann's.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	I dislike Leigh Ann's.

Please answer the following questions for each of the following three items. How likely are you to eat at Leigh Ann's for lunch?

It is likely.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	It is unlikely.
It is possible.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	It is impossible.
It is probable.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	It is improbable.

Please answer the following questions for each of the following three items. How likely are you to eat at Leigh Ann's for dinner?

It is likely.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	It is unlikely.
It is possible.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	It is impossible.
It is probable.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	It is improbable.

PART 4

Next, we would like you to answer some questions about yourself. As with all responses, **anonymity is assured**. You will not and cannot be individually identified.

Have you ever eaten lunch at Leigh Ann's? Yes No

Have you ever eaten dinner at Leigh Ann's? Yes No

What is your classification?

Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior Graduate Student

In which college is your major?

Business Education
 Health & Human Sciences Information Technology
 Liberal Arts & Social Sciences Undeclared/Undecided
 Don't Know

What is your age? Under 18 18-19 20-21 22-23
 24-25 26-35 36-45 46-55
 56-65 Over 65

What is your gender? Male Female

Approximately what is your family's annual income?

\$25,000 or less \$25,001-\$50,000 \$50,001-\$75,000
 \$75,001-\$100,000 Over \$100,000

What is your ethnicity?

Caucasian African American Hispanic Asian

Other, please specify _____

Thank you for completing the survey!

APPENDIX B

Post-Test Survey

Earlier in the semester you were asked to complete a survey about your opinions of Leigh Ann's.



Today, we would like for you to tell us about your current familiarity and opinions of the business. Please indicate which of the following three statements best describes your familiarity with Leigh Ann's.

What type of business is Leigh Ann's? _____

- 9 I was familiar with Leigh Ann's before the survey.
- 9 I was not familiar with Leigh Ann's before survey.
- 9 I have not heard of Leigh Ann's before now.

Please continue on the following page

Basic Information about Leigh Ann’s (You may skip to the Experience with Leigh Ann’s section if you are familiar with the business.)

Leigh Ann’s Café is a locally owned restaurant located on Brannen St. across from Winn Dixie. It offers two different types of dining experiences with all menu items made with fresh ingredients.

Lunchtime offers a quick meal with a menu featuring a daily special as well as:

- Wraps
- Salads
- Pizzas
- Vegetarian items

Prices range from \$6 to \$8.

The evening meal is a more relaxed environment with a dinner menu that features a wine list and entrees in the following categories:

- Poultry
- Seafood
- Steak
- Vegetarian
- Desserts

Desserts and sauces are made fresh; beef is certified Angus; and seafood is never frozen. Prices range from \$12 to \$25.

Experience with Leigh Ann’s

Please indicate the level of your patronage to Leigh Ann’s Café by placing by indicating the number of times you have eaten at the restaurant for each indicated situation.

	Lunch	Dinner	Neither
Before the first survey.			
After the first survey			

On a scale of 1 – 7, with 1 representing not likely at all to 7 representing extremely likely, please indicate how likely you are to recommend Leigh Ann’s café to someone else.

Not likely at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Extremely Likely

Please Continue on the Following Page

Instructions: This survey contains several sections. Each has its own set of instructions. However, while completing the questionnaire, remember the following:

1. All responses are anonymous.
2. The questionnaire responses cannot be used unless every item is complete.
3. Your opinions are what we want. The questions have no right or wrong answers.
4. You may work at your own pace throughout the questionnaire but please work through the questionnaire at a fairly high speed. We really want your first impressions because these are usually the most accurate.
5. DO NOT READ AHEAD into the questionnaire.
6. Once you have completed a section, DO NOT TURN BACK to a previous section.
7. When you respond to a series of scales, please use the following guide and examples:

If your opinion is very closely related to one end of the scale or the other, place your 'X' as follows:

This is good X _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ This is bad
 This is good _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ X _____ This is bad

If your opinion is closely related to one end of the scale or the other (but not extremely), place your 'X' as follows:

This is good _____ X _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ This is bad
 This is good _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ X _____ _____ This is bad

If your opinion is slightly related to one end of the scale or the other (but not really neutral), place your 'X' as follows:

This is good _____ _____ X _____ _____ _____ _____ This is bad
 This is good _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ X _____ _____ This is bad

If your opinion is neutral, place your 'X' as follows:

This is good _____ _____ _____ X _____ _____ _____ This is bad

IMPORTANT: Never put more than one 'X' on a single scale.

PART 1

INSTRUCTIONS: In the space below, please list all the thoughts, reactions, ideas, feelings, and emotions that you have when you see the Leigh Ann's Logo. Please write down anything that went through your mind, no matter how simple, complex, relevant, or irrelevant it may seem to you. There are no right or wrong responses. Once you have recorded your thoughts return to your list and examine each thought separately and do the following:

- Classify each of your thoughts as positive (POS), negative (NEG), or neutral (NTL)
- Place the appropriate abbreviation POS, NEG, or NTL next to your response.

<u>Thought</u>	<u>POS/NEG/NTL</u>

PART 2

INSTRUCTIONS: Now, we would like you to respond to a series of questions that indicate your feelings toward the restaurant based your knowledge of the restaurant if you were aware of it before this survey or the description given above if you have no prior knowledge of the business.

Please indicate your thoughts about and impressions of Leigh Ann's by checking the appropriate place on each scale. Remember, please use one 'X' for each scale and **please respond to each and every item.**

Good	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	bad
dislike very much	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	like very much
Pleasant	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	unpleasant
poor quality	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	high quality
Unsatisfactory	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	satisfactory
Favorable	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	unfavorable
very distinctive	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	not very distinctive
positive opinion	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	negative opinion
Desirable	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	undesirable
Nice	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	awful
Unusual	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	usual
Inferior	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	superior
Interesting	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	boring
like extremely	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	dislike extremely
Sophisticated	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	plain
home cooking	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	gourmet
Upscale	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	middle of the road
Common	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	unique

PART 3

INSTRUCTIONS: Here, we would like you to fill out a series of scales that examine your personal opinions of the restaurant. Again, **please respond to every scale** and never put more than one 'X' mark on a single scale. Make each item a separate and independent judgment. Remember, it is your true impression we want. There are no right or wrong answers.

My feelings toward Leigh Ann's are good.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	My feelings toward the Leigh Ann's are bad.
My feelings toward Leigh Ann's are pleasant.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	My feelings toward Leigh Ann's are unpleasant.
I like Leigh Ann's.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	I dislike Leigh Ann's.



The Resource Center For Industry Professionals.

3125 Skyway Circle North • Irving, TX 75038

www.ppa.org/bookstore