

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11 We Do What We Are:
12
13
14
15 Representation of the Self-Concept and Identity-Based Choice
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Stephanie Y. Chen

25
26
27 Oleg Urminsky

28
29
30 Jiaqi Yu

31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40 Forthcoming, Journal of Consumer Research
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

Stephanie Y. Chen (stephaniechen@london.edu) is an Assistant Professor of Marketing at London Business School, Regent's Park, London NW1 4SA, UK. Oleg Urminsky (oleg.urminsky@chicagobooth.edu) is a Professor of Marketing at the University of Chicago Booth School of Business, 5807 S. Woodlawn Ave, Chicago IL 60637, USA. Jiaqi Yu (jiaqi.yu@chicagobooth.edu) is a PhD student in Marketing at the University of Chicago Booth School of Business, 5807 S. Woodlawn Ave, Chicago IL 60637, USA. Correspondence regarding this article should be addressed to Stephanie Y. Chen. The authors thank Dan Bartels, Alex Shaw, and Abby Sussman for helpful comments on this research and thank Nicholas Herzog, Abby Bergman, and Jieyi Chen for help with data collection and technical assistance. Financial support from the University of Chicago Booth School of Business, London Business School, and MSI Research Grant #4-1943 is gratefully acknowledged. Supplementary materials are included in the web appendix.

Running Head: CHEN, URMINSKY, AND YU

Editors: Amna Kirmani and June Cotte

Associate Editor: Stefano Puntoni

ABSTRACT

The current research proposes a novel approach to identity-based choice that focuses on consumers' representations of the self-concept, as captured by the perceived cause-effect relationships among features of an individual consumer's self-concept. More specifically, the studies reported here test the proposal that the *causal centrality* of an identity—the number of other features of a consumer's self-concept that the consumer believes influenced or were influenced by the identity—underlies identity importance and is a determinant of identity-based consumer behaviors. Across seven studies, using both measured and manipulated causal centrality, the current research provides evidence for the role of causal centrality in identity-based choice. Among consumers who share an identity (belong to the same social category), those who believe that the identity is more causally central perceive the identity as more important and are more likely to engage in behaviors consistent with the norms of the social category.

Keywords: causal reasoning, identity, identity-based choice, self-concept

1
2
3
4
5
6 “We do what we do, because of who we are. If we did otherwise, we would not be ourselves.” -
7 Neil Gaiman, The Kindly Ones
8

9 Consumer’s identities, the social categories that they belong to, are the basis of a broad
10 range of consumer behaviors (see Reed II et al. 2012 for a detailed review). Consumers who
11 belong to a given social category are more likely to act in accordance with the norms of the
12 category than non-members (Akerlof and Kranton 2000, 2010; Markus and Wurf 1987; Turner
13 1987). For example, consumers who consider themselves Apple-users will be more likely to
14 follow the norms of that group (e.g., wait in line for the newest iPhone, pay the price premium
15 for Apple products) than those who have similar preferences for Apple products but do not self-
16 ascribe to the Apple-user identity.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 Of course, two self-proclaimed Apple-users can display large differences in identity-
28 consistent behaviors. Such differences have been predicted by identity importance—consumers
29 who have high scores on identity importance scales are more likely to act in identity consistent
30 ways (LeBoeuf, Shafir, and Bayuk 2010; Markus and Wurf 1987; Reed II 2004). Identity
31 importance scales ask questions like how strongly consumers identify with a social category, or
32 how well consumers believe a social category reflects who they are and provide little insight on
33 how social identities become important or how to influence identity importance (e.g., see
34 LeBoeuf, Shafir, and Bayuk 2010; Reed II 2004). In fact, identity importance has almost
35 exclusively been studied as a measured individual difference measure (but see Reed II 2004). In
36 the absence of understanding what underlies identity importance, the usefulness of the construct
37 to both marketing practitioners and academics remains limited and a greater understanding of the
38 psychological basis of identity importance would afford the ability to influence both perceptions
39 of identity importance and a wide range of consumer behaviors.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

To address these key gaps in the literature, we propose a new theoretical approach to understanding identity-based behavior, that focuses on consumers' representations of specific social identities within the self-concept. We draw on research from cognitive psychology on conceptual representation, which suggests that the aspects that are most defining of a concept are those that are seen as more *causally central* (i.e., seen as influencing or being influenced by many other aspects; Rehder and Hastie 2001). We hypothesize (and find) that the causal centrality of an identity underlies identity importance. More specifically, we propose that a consumer who sees a given social identity as causally central—causally connected to other important features of the consumer's own subjective self-concept (e.g., other identities, memories, moral qualities, and personality traits)—will see that social identity as more important and be more likely to act in identity-consistent ways than a consumer who believes that the same social identity is more causally peripheral (e.g., linked to fewer features). For example, an Apple-user who sees her Apple-user identity as more connected to other features of her self-concept (e.g., her profession, her hobbies, etc.) will feel that her Apple-user identity is more important and be more likely to follow the norms of the Apple-user group than an Apple-user who sees the same identity as less connected to other features of her self-concept.

THEORETICAL DEVELOPMENT

Social Categories, Identity Importance, and Choice

Theories in psychology and economics hold that people are more likely to behave in ways that are consistent with their social identities, the social categories that they belong to. In particular, these theories posit that people have multiple social identities with potentially

1
2
3 conflicting norms (Akerlof and Kranton 2000, 2010; LeBoeuf, Shafir, and Bayuk 2010; Markus
4 and Wurf 1987; Oyserman 2009). Thus, increasing the salience of one social identity prioritizes
5 the norms associated with that social identity among those holding the identity, resulting in a
6 greater likelihood of performing behaviors consistent with the social group norms than when the
7 identity is not salient (Broughs et al. 2016; Chen, Ng, and Rao 2005; Forehand, Despande, and
8 Reed II 2002; LeBoeuf, Shafir, and Bayuk 2010; Shang, Reed II, and Croson 2008).

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17 While situational factors influence consumer's tendency to display identity-consistent
18 behaviors, two consumers facing the same situational constraints may nevertheless demonstrate
19 very different behaviors. Identity importance, sometimes referred to as strength of identification,
20 has been used to explain individual differences in identity-based consumption among consumers
21 who share a social identity. Theoretical and empirical research investigating the effect of social
22 identities on behavior suggests that the subjective importance of an identity is a relatively stable
23 individual difference, unaffected by the salience of the identity, that predicts how likely a
24 consumer is to act in identity-consistent ways (Forehand et al. 2002; Markus and Wurf, 1987).
25 For example, consumers who rate a social identity as more important have more favorable
26 attitudes towards products geared towards that social identity (Reed II 2004) and show greater
27 sensitivity to identity salience effects on behavior (LeBoeuf et al. 2010).

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Despite the fact that identity importance is a critical construct in the identity-based
consumption literature, its explanatory power and marketers' ability to influence it are limited
because its psychological underpinnings are not well understood. For example, scales that
measure identity importance are quite general, asking about attitudes result from perceiving an
identity as important, such as "How much does [social identity] describe who you are?" and
"How much do you identify with [social identity]?" (Luhtanen and Crocker 1992; Reed II 2004,

1
2
3 see web appendix C). While these measures capture useful differences in people's attitudes about
4
5 a given social identity, the importance construct does not provide a psychological process that
6
7 underlies identity importance and thus, does not explain why an identity is perceived as
8
9 important, how consumers who see an identity as important differ from those who see the same
10
11 identity as unimportant, and how to influence identity importance. Next, we review literature on
12
13 the representation of the self-concept and on causal reasoning in conceptual representation to
14
15 develop an account of identity-based consumption that provides a psychological account of
16
17 identity importance and a more nuanced explanation of who is more and less likely to display
18
19 identity-consistent behaviors.
20
21
22

23 Representation of the Self-Concept

24
25
26 In the social psychology, consumer behavior, and economics literatures, an *identity* (or a
27
28 *social identity*) generally refers to a social category that a person belongs to. However, a broad
29
30 literature from philosophy and psychology on people's beliefs about what defines the self-
31
32 concept instead defines personal identity in terms of individual-level psychological traits (such as
33
34 memories and moral qualities) that are not necessarily associated with social categories (see
35
36 Molouki, Chen, Urminsky, and Bartels 2020 for a review). Some views have defined continuity
37
38 of the self in terms of specific features, particularly memories (Locke 1694/1979; Blok,
39
40 Newman, and Rips 2005; Nichols and Bruno 2010) and moral qualities (Strohinger and
41
42 Nichols 2014, 2015). Additionally, research on psychological connectedness to the future self
43
44 suggests that a consumer's self-concept is defined by a wide range of psychological traits (see
45
46 Urminsky 2016 for a review). Indeed, research has found that inducing consumers to think that
47
48 their individual-level psychological characteristics will change leads to less psychological
49
50 connectedness to the future self and less willingness to make farsighted choices (Bartels and Rips
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

2010; Bartels and Urminsky 2011; 2015; Ersner-Hershfield et al. 2009).

Integrating these diverse perspectives, we propose that differences in consumers' beliefs about how the various features of their self-concept relate to each other predict differences in identity importance and identity-consistent behaviors. In particular, we propose that it is specifically the perceived *cause-effect relationships* between a social identity and other features of one's self-concept that predict the likelihood of displaying identity-consistent behavior. We use the term *social identity* to refer specifically to a social category and use the broader terms *feature* or *aspect*¹ to refer to social categories and also individual-level properties of a self-concept (such as memories, moral qualities, personality traits, etc.), adopting terminology from the concepts and categories literature (e.g., Smith and Medin 1981; Tversky 1977). We use the term *self-concept* to refer to the full set of all the social identities and features, and the relationships among them, that a consumer believes makes them who they are as a person.

Causally Central Aspects of the Self-Concept

Causal relationships are used to understand the world and to structure knowledge, beginning in early childhood (Gopnik and Schulz 2004). Much research has suggested that knowledge is represented as intuitive theories about the world that include causal relationships (Keil 1989; Murphy and Medin 1985). For example, consumers' knowledge of Apple products not only includes the knowledge that the products are high quality, have great customer service, and are expensive but also incorporates theories about how these features are causally related—e.g., Apple products are expensive *because* of their superior quality and customer service.

Recent research has found that causal beliefs about aspects of the self-concept are also a critical part of how people think about the self. Chen, Urminsky, and Bartels (2016) proposed

¹ We use the terms *feature* and *aspect* interchangeably to refer to any property of the self-concept, including social categories as well as other properties of the self, such as memories, personality traits, and moral qualities.

1
2
3 that features of the self-concept are seen as defining of the self to the extent that they are seen as
4
5 causally central—i.e., causally linked to many other features of the self-concept, either as a cause
6
7 or as an effect (Rehder and Hastie 2001). Consistent with their predictions, Chen et al. (2016)
8
9 found that participants believed that they would be more of a different person when causally
10
11 central features were changed than causally peripheral ones.
12
13

14
15 As an example, imagine two Apple-users who are both graphic designers, Ari and Mark.
16
17 Ari believes that being an Apple-user influenced her choice of career and many of her aesthetic
18
19 preferences. Mark instead believes that it was his career in graphic design that shaped his
20
21 aesthetic preferences and led him to be an Apple-user. As a result, even though the features of
22
23 Ari and Mark's self-concepts are identical, the differences in their causal beliefs lead to
24
25 differences in what they believe is important to their self-concept. Because she believes that
26
27 being an Apple-user is connected to more features of her self-concept (her aesthetic preferences
28
29 *and* her profession), Ari will see it as more defining of her self-concept (i.e., as more important)
30
31 than Mark does (since he sees being an Apple-user as connected to his profession *only*).
32
33

34 35 The Role of Causes and Effects in Causal Conceptualization of the Self-Concept

36
37
38 The relative importance of causes vs. effects in causal centrality has long been debated,
39
40 with some models suggesting that only causes matter for determining feature importance (e.g.,
41
42 Ahn et al. 2000; Sloman et al. 1998) but others suggesting that causes and effects matter
43
44 similarly (e.g., Rehder and Hastie 2001; Rehder 2003). From the perspective of psychological
45
46 essentialism (Medin and Ortony 1989), category membership is defined by an essence that is
47
48 causally responsible for the key features of the category. Causes are closer to the essence (the
49
50 deepest cause in the causal chain) than effects and are therefore more important to category
51
52 representation.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 However, essentialist arguments have mainly been applied to representations of categories
4 (sets of items or individuals) and may not be relevant to the role of causal centrality in a
5 consumer's representation of a single item or individual (e.g., the self). By contrast, research on
6 analogical reasoning suggests that conceptual information is represented in terms of the
7 relationships between items rather than the items themselves (Rehder and Hastie 2001). Thus,
8 since both causes and effects are necessary to retain the relationship between two features, both
9 contribute to conceptual representation (Rehder and Hastie 2001). Further, some theories suggest
10 that people have expectations that causes and effects will be present or absent together dependent
11 on how likely the cause is believed to produce the effect (Rehder 2003), again suggesting that
12 both causes and effects contribute to causal centrality.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 We will start from the baseline assumption that that both causes and effects contribute
27 equally to causal centrality in the self-concept. Consistent with previous work (Chen et al. 2016;
28 Chen and Urminsky 2019), we define causal centrality of an identity in a consumer's self-
29 concept as the number of other aspects seen by the consumer as causes or effects of the focal
30 identity. This measure is similar to "degree centrality" in social network analysis (Freeman,
31 1978), but differs in that the "nodes" here represent different features of the self-concept (e.g.,
32 football fan, Apple-user, gender, etc.) and the links are not simply associative, but represent a
33 belief that one feature caused another. However, we will also return to the relative importance of
34 causes and effects as an empirical question to be tested directly in the General Discussion.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Causal Centrality as an Explanation of Identity Importance and Identity-Consistent Behavior

47 We propose a novel causal centrality account of identity importance and identity-consistent
48 behavior that integrates prior work on how social categories impact behavior, how the self-
49 concept is constructed from individual-level features, and how causal relations structure the self-
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 concept. By integrating these different lines of research, the current research addresses recent
4
5 calls to connect research on identity-based consumption with a theoretical understanding of the
6
7 self-concept as multi-faceted (Reed II and Forehand 2016).
8
9

10 In our approach, each consumer's self-concept is a unique network of subjective causal
11
12 relationships between various aspects, including not only social categories, but also individual-
13
14 level aspects such as memories, goals, moral values, preferences, and personality traits. We
15
16 hypothesize that, across consumers who share a given social identity, consumers who see that
17
18 social identity as causally related to more other aspects of their self-concept will both perceive
19
20 the social identity as more subjectively important and be more likely to engage in identity-
21
22 consistent behaviors. Returning to the example above, our account predicts that Ari, who sees
23
24 her Apple-user identity as more connected to other features of her self-concept than Mark does,
25
26 will perceive her Apple-user identity as more important and be more willing to spend money for
27
28 the newest iPhone or to select Apple over other brands (i.e., follow the norms of being an Apple-
29
30 user). In fact, our first study finds that consumers who see a brand-user identity as more causally
31
32 central are more likely to trade-off the flexibility of an Amazon gift card for a less flexible but
33
34 higher-value brand-specific gift card.
35
36
37
38
39

40 In this paper, we test our causal centrality explanation of identity importance and identity-
41
42 consistent consumption. Across seven studies (and six additional studies reported in web
43
44 appendix B), we demonstrate that—among consumers who self-ascribe to the same social
45
46 identity—differences in the causal centrality of that social identity predict differences in identity
47
48 importance and identity-based consumption. In studies 1A and 1B, we test whether a consumer's
49
50 subjective causal centrality of a brand-user identity predicts both hypothetical and incentive-
51
52 compatible choices of that brand. Next, in study 2, we explore whether causal centrality
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 underlies identity importance and predicts willingness to spend on an identity-relevant
4 experience, among football fans. In study 3, we manipulate identity importance by changing
5 perceptions of an identity's causal centrality. In studies 4-6, we examine whether the causal
6 centrality of an environmentalist identity predicts differences in choices between
7 environmentally-friendly and conventional products, including over time. We distinguish causal
8 centrality from identity salience and from mere (non-causal) associations between social
9 identities and other aspects of the self-concept.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 **STUDIES 1A AND 1B: CAUSAL CENTRALITY OF THE BRAND-USER IDENTITY**

22
23
24
25
26 Studies 1A and 1B provide an initial test of our hypothesis that causal centrality underlies
27 identity importance and thus, consumers who see a social identity as more causally central will
28 be more likely to make identity-consistent consumer choices. As brands are used to express and
29 build consumer's identities at the group and personal level (Belk 1988; Berger and Heath 2007;
30 Escalas and Bettman 2003, 2005; Swaminathan, Page, and Gurhan-Canli 2007), we had
31 participants report a brand that they both use and see as part of their self-concept. Similar to our
32 opening example of the two Apple-users, Mark and Ari, we examined the relationship between
33 the causal centrality of the brand-user identity and choices (consequential in study 1A,
34 hypothetical in study 1B) between receiving a gift card for the brand or an Amazon gift card.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 As previously described, the perceived importance of an identity has been shown to
48 moderate the effect of that social identity's salience on identity-consistent choice (LeBoeuf,
49 Shafir, and Bayuk 2010) and to predict more favorable attitudes towards identity-relevant
50 products (Reed II 2004). Using a brand-user identity proxy for identity importance, the brand-
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 connection scale (Escalas and Bettman 2003), we build on these findings and explore whether
4 consumers who see their brand-user identity as more causally central report greater connection to
5 the brand and whether brand connection scores (as a measure of identity importance) mediates
6 the relationship between causal centrality and identity-consistent choice.
7
8
9
10
11

12 In study 1A, we further distinguish between our causal centrality approach to identity-
13 based consumption and a more general association-based theory. The causal centrality account
14 posits that it is beliefs about specifically causal relationships between a social identity and other
15 features of the self-concept that predict identity-consistent behavior. This is consistent with
16 research that suggests causal relationships are privileged in our representation of concepts,
17 relative to simple associations. People are significantly more likely to recognize that features are
18 correlated when they can describe a causal relationship between them (Ahn et al., 2002; Malt and
19 Smith, 1984). For example, when the fit between a firm and an event is low, consumers are more
20 likely to remember that the company sponsored the event if an explanation for the relationship
21 between the company and the event was provided (Cornwell et al. 2006). An explanation
22 provides a causal basis for the relationship, without which the event and the company are merely
23 associated. Accordingly, in study 1A, we contrast consumers' perceptions of causal centrality
24 from consumers' beliefs about associations as predictors of identity-consistent choices.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Method

43
44 *Participants.* We collected 230 valid responses (study 1A) and 442 valid responses (study
45 1B) from U.S. Mechanical Turk participants after pre-registered exclusions for failing an
46 attention check, making inconsistent gift card choices, or duplicate IP addresses. Pre-registration
47 links for all studies (excluding study 2 which was not pre-registered) can be found in web
48 appendix C. Details of analyses, additional analyses, and all data and materials are posted on
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

OSF.²

Screener and Design. We screened participants to ensure that they saw a brand as part of their self-concept. Participants viewed a list of 12 brands and reported 1) whether they used any of the listed brands (“Are you a user of this brand?”) and, 2) whether they identified with any of the listed brands (“Do you consider being a user of this brand a part of your identity?”). Only participants who answered yes to both questions for at least one brand proceeded to the main study. Participants then confirmed that a single qualifying brand (the target brand in the study, randomly selected if multiple brands matched the criteria) was part of their self-concept.

Study 1A consisted of four main tasks: participants 1) made choices between receiving an Amazon gift card and a gift card from the target brand that they had identified as and confirmed was part of their identity, 2) performed a “listing causal relationships” task with the target brand-user identity and other features of their self-concepts, 3) reported non-causal associative connections between the target brand-user identity and other features of their self-concepts and, 4) completed the self-brand connection scale (Escalas and Bettman 2003). Study 1B omitted the non-causal associations elicitation task.

Choice Task. Participants made ten choices between receiving either a \$50 gift card for the target brand or an Amazon gift card with a value ranging from \$5 to \$50 in increments of \$5 (see web appendix C). In, study 1A, we informed participants that ten participants would have one of their choices picked at random and would receive the option that they had selected in that choice, while the choice was hypothetical in study 1B.

This task measures the premium consumers would pay for the less-restricted Amazon card that is not constrained to brand-specific spending. We predicted that those who saw their brand-

² <https://osf.io/6zcbp/>

1
2
3 user identity as more central would not be willing to pay as large a premium for the ability to
4 spend on non-brand purchases because they have a higher value for spending on the brand than
5
6 those who see their brand-user identity as more peripheral.
7
8
9

10 **FIGURE 1**

11 **EXAMPLE TRIAL OF LISTING CAUSAL RELATIONSHIPS TASK**

12 Think about the following aspect **Being a user of [brand]**

13 Which of the other features of your personal identity listed below, if any, are caused by this
14 aspect, **Being a user of [brand]**. By caused, we simply mean the feature was influenced or
15 shaped by: **Being a user of [brand]**.
16
17

18 You may select as many or as few features as you see fit. In the below list, please select all
19 the features that you believe are caused by the above feature.
20
21

- 22 Goals for personal life
- 23 Important childhood memories
- 24 Intelligence level
- 25 Favorite activities and hobbies
- 26 Close friendships
- 27 Aesthetic preferences
- 28 Level of honesty
- 29 Significant romantic relationships
- 30 Cherished memories of time with family
- 31 Level of loyalty
- 32 None of the above

33 **NOTE.**—Participants saw one trial for each of the features of the self-concept used in each
34 study. For example, in study 1 which used 16 features, participants saw 16 total trials.
35
36

37
38 *Measuring Causal Centrality.* All studies used a “listing causal relationships” task, adapted
39 from Chen et. al (2016), to measure the causal centrality of features of the self-concept. In this
40 task, participants reported the causal relationships between a set of participant-generated and/or
41 experimenter-defined features of the self-concept. In studies 1A and 1B, the features used in the
42 “listing causal relationships” task came from a list of 16 features found to be important to the
43 self-concept in previous research (Chen et al. 2016; Strohmingner and Nichols 2014). Participants
44 viewed this list and selected the 10 features that they saw as most important to their self-
45 concepts. These 10 features, in addition to the participants’ brand-user identity (e.g., Apple-user),
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 were used in the “listing causal relationships” task.
4

5 After completing two practice trials with an unrelated concept, participants completed one
6 trial for each feature (for a total of 16 trials), in which that feature was the target (e.g., in figure
7 1, “Being a user of [brand]” is the target feature). In each trial, participants were shown the target
8 feature at the top of the screen (with the question text) and all of the other features, with check
9 boxes, listed under it. Participants indicated which of the listed features, if any, were caused by
10 the target feature (see figure 1). Participants were required to check at least one option but could
11 check as many as they wanted (unless they selected the “none” option).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 From this series of questions, we calculated each feature’s causal centrality—the number
23 of causal relationships that a feature participates in, either as a cause (the number of other
24 features selected in the trial in which that feature was the target) or as an effect (the number of
25 times the feature was selected across all the other trials in which it was listed as potentially being
26 caused by the target). Our measure of causal centrality was the sum of these cause and effect
27 links for each feature.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 It is important to emphasize that the purpose of the “listing causal relationships” task is to
36 test the basic psychological process that we have proposed underlies consumers’ representation
37 of the self-concept and identity importance. That is, the “listing causal relationships” task is not
38 meant to be another scale to measure individual differences in the attitudinal outcomes of
39 identity importance. Rather, the task is intended to measure the belief structure that we propose
40 underlies identity importance and that leads to the attitudinal differences that are measured by
41 identity importance scales.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 *Measuring Non-Causal Associations (study 1A only).* After the “listing causal relationships
52 task,” participants reported any of the features that they saw as merely associated with their
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

brand-user identity. Participants saw their target brand identity at the top of the screen with a personalized list of features that they had not previously reported as being causally related to their brand-user identity. Participants were asked to select any features from the list that they saw as being associated with (i.e., “somehow going together with or somehow connected to”) the target feature despite not being causally connected with the target feature (see web appendix C).

Measuring Self-Brand Connection. As an initial exploration of whether causal centrality underlies identity importance, we examined whether a related scale that specifically measures integration of a brand into the self-concept, the self-brand connection scale (Escalas and Bettman 2003), mediates the relationship between causal centrality and choice. The scale consists of seven statements ($\alpha = .922$) that describe how much consumers have used a brand to define and create their self-concepts (e.g., *I feel a personal connection to Brand X, I identify with brand X*, see web appendix C). Participants reported how much each statement described them on 7-point scale (*1 = Not at all, 7 = Extremely well*).

Study 1A Results

Descriptive Statistics. On average, participants reported 3.15 causal relationships and an additional 1.49 associative links between the brand-user identity and the other aspects of the self-concept, from an average total of 30.60 links (see tables 1 and 2 in web appendix A for more details). The average number of brand gift card choices was 5.87 (out of 10). Descriptive statistics for all other studies can be found in web appendix A.

Relationship Between Causal Centrality and Brand Choice. Consistent with our theory, consumers who saw the brand-user identity as more causally peripheral were willing to pay a higher premium for the Amazon gift card in a consequential choice task than those who saw the identity as more central. On average, low causal centrality consumers (based on a median split)

1
2
3 selected the brand gift card approximately one fewer time than high centrality consumers
4
5 ($M_{\text{peripheral}} = 5.40$, $M_{\text{central}} = 6.37$, $t(228) = 2.27$, $p = .024$, Cohen's $d = .30$, 95% CI of the
6
7 difference = [.13, 1.8]). As the value of the Amazon gift card increased by \$5 with each
8
9 subsequent choice and the brand gift card value was always \$50, the observed difference
10
11 between the high and low centrality consumers suggests that consumers who saw the brand-user
12
13 identity as more peripheral were, on average, willing to accept \$5 less in Amazon spending for
14
15 the \$50 brand gift card, in a consequential choice, than those who saw the brand-user identity as
16
17 more central.
18
19

20
21 To test the continuous relationship, we fit a linear regression predicting the number of
22
23 brand gift card choices with the causal centrality of the brand-user identity, controlling for total
24
25 number of links (to account for differences in the general tendency to report more links as a
26
27 potential confound). The regression confirmed that consumers for whom the brand-user identity
28
29 was more causally central were more likely to choose the brand gift card over the Amazon gift
30
31 card, indicating a higher valuation for consumption of that brand ($B = .32$, $SE = .09$, $p < .001$). In
32
33 this study (and all other studies), the relationship between causal centrality and behavior
34
35 remained significant controlling for income ($B = .32$, $SE = .09$, $p = .001$, table 3 web appendix
36
37 A). Follow-up analyses also found no significant difference between the effects of cause links
38
39 vs. effect links, when included in the regression as separate predictors (table 15 web appendix
40
41 A).
42
43
44
45
46

47 *Distinguishing Causal Centrality from Non-Causal Associative Links.* To examine the
48
49 relationship between non-causal associative links and choices of the brand gift card, we reran the
50
51 regression, adding the number of non-causal associative links as an additional predictor. Causal
52
53 centrality of the brand-user identity predicted branded gift card choices ($B = .31$, $SE = .09$, $p =$
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

.001), controlling for the number of non-causal associative links to the brand, which was not a significant predictor ($B = -.17$, $SE = .18$, $p = .360$). This supports our theoretical claim that it is specifically *causal* relationships between a social identity and other aspects of the self-concept (as opposed to general associations) that are relevant to identity-consistent behavior.

Mediation Analysis. We conducted a mediation analysis to test whether the relationship between causal centrality and choice operates via self-brand connection (as a proxy for identity importance), controlling for the total links reported. The analysis revealed that those who perceived their brand-user identity as more causally central reported greater connection to the brand ($B = .19$, $SE = .03$, $p < .001$). There was a directional reduction in the strength of the relationship between causal centrality and choice when controlling for self-brand connection ($B = .27$, $SE = .10$, $p = .007$ vs. total effect: $B = .32$, $SE = .09$, $p < .001$). However, the indirect effect of centrality via brand connection was not significant ($B = .05$, 95% CI [-.03 .13]). To explore whether study 1A was underpowered to detect a significant indirect effect, we ran the same analysis with a larger sample in study 1B.


Study 1B Results

The main results of study 1A were replicated in study 1B. A linear regression predicting the number of choices of the branded gift card with the causal centrality of the brand-user identity, controlling for total number of links, revealed that consumers for whom the brand-user identity was more causally central were more likely to choose the brand-specific gift card over the Amazon gift card, ($B = .12$, $SE = .06$, $p = .033$). The relationship between causal centrality and choice remained significant when controlling for income ($B = .13$, $SE = .06$, $p = .026$, table 4 web appendix A). Follow-up analyses found no significant difference between the effects of cause links vs. effect links, when included in the regression as separate predictors (table 16 web

appendix A). We return to this distinction in the General Discussion.

The mediation analysis revealed that those who saw the brand-user identity as more causally central reported greater connection to the brand ($B = .18$, $SE = .02$, $p < .001$). We found a significant indirect effect of causal centrality choice via self-brand connection ($B = .07$, $SE = .01$, 95% Bootstrapped CI = [.02, .13], figure 2). Self-brand connection mediated more than 50% of the effect of causal centrality on choice. Causal centrality did not significantly predict choice when controlling for self-brand connection ($B = .05$, $SE = .06$, $p = .398$).

FIGURE 2
SELF-BRAND CONNECTION MEDIATES RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BRAND-USER CENTRALITY AND CHOICE OF BRAND GIFT CARD, STUDY 1B



NOTE.—Mediation analysis performed using the PROCESS bootstrapping macro (model 4) with 5,000 resamples and total number of links as a covariate. A 95% confidence interval was computed to test the indirect effect (95% CI of the indirect effect = [.02 .13]).

Discussion

The results of studies 1A and 1B support our hypothesis that consumers who see a social identity as more causally central see that identity as more important and are more likely to make identity-consistent choices, including in consequential choices (study 1A). Specifically, consumers who reported more causal links between their brand-user identity and other aspects of the self-concept were more likely to choose a lower-face-value brand-specific gift card over a less restricted higher-value gift card, demonstrating a higher revealed valuation for brand-constrained spending. This was not the case for mere associations between brand identity and

1
2
3 other aspects of their self-concept. Further, consistent with our hypothesis that causal centrality
4 underlies identity importance, in study 1B, the relationship between the causal centrality of the
5 brand-user identity and choice was mediated by self-brand connection, a proxy for identity
6 importance specific to brands.
7
8
9
10

11 **STUDY 2: CAUSAL CENTRALITY AND WILLINGNESS TO PAY WHEN IDENTITY** 12 **SALIENCE IS HIGH** 13

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 In study 2, we test our framework with a new consumer identity, being a fan of a football
23 team. Further, as prior research has shown that identity-consistent behavior increases when a
24 social identity is made situationally salient, we examine whether the causal centrality of an
25 identity can predict identity-consistent behavior even in situations in which the social identity is
26 made highly salient by a real-world event. We conducted study 2 at a time when the football fan
27 identity was highly salient, around the Super Bowl, and examined willingness to pay for an
28 identity-relevant experience, tickets to the Super Bowl. To test robustness of the results, we
29 conducted two waves of the study across two years, one directly after (wave 1) and the other
30 directly before (wave 2) a Super Bowl. We also test of our hypothesis that causally centrality
31 underlies identity importance by examining whether scores on a general identity importance
32 scale (instead of the self-brand connection scale used in studies 1A and 1B) mediate the
33 relationship between causal centrality and willingness to pay.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 In study 1, participants selected the features of the self-concept used in the “listing causal
50 relationships” task from a pre-set list of 16 important features of the self-concept from previous
51 research. As a test of robustness of the results, and to ensure that our results were not due to the
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

specific features used in study 1, participants in study 2 each generated the majority of features used in the “listing causal relationships” task themselves in an open-ended elicitation task.

Method

Participants. In wave 1, 306 football fans who were residents of North Carolina and Colorado (the home states of the two teams in the 2016 Super Bowl) were recruited from an online commercial marketing-research panel, and completed the study one to three days after the Super Bowl. After excluding participants who failed the attention check, provided invalid answers as features of their self-concept (all the same answer or not responding) or their willingness to pay (specifically, WTP of \$1,000,000,000,000,000), the survey yielded 253 valid responses. Results all remain significant when all participants are included in the analysis (table 5 web appendix A).

In wave 2, approximately 4.5 to 2.5 hours prior to the 2017 Super Bowl, we recruited 247 football fans on Amazon Mechanical Turk from throughout the U.S. Five participants were excluded for failing an attention check, yielding 242 valid participants.

Procedure. Participants completed an abbreviated version of the “listing causal relationships” task from study 1, comprised of ten self-generated features that participants listed as defining who they are and six additional pre-specified features: being a fan of the football team they favored, childhood memories, personal life goals, friendships, values and principles, and personality. Wave 2 included an additional control feature, “level of hunger”³.

Participants indicated the causal links to the other features for two target features: the

³ “Level of Hunger” was used as a control feature in wave 2 because in previous studies it consistently participated in very few causal relationships (Chen et al 2016), making it a good measure of participants’ tendency to report relationships merely because that is what the task involved.

1
2
3 behaviorally-relevant feature (being a fan of their favorite football team) and a control feature.
4
5 As a control, we elicited the causal centrality of either the (arbitrarily selected) fifth feature
6
7 participants had listed (wave 1) or their “level of hunger,” (wave 2), to account for potential
8
9 differences in the general tendency to report more or fewer causal links among the features of the
10
11 self-concept. Participants completed two trials for each of the target features: one that measured
12
13 the number of other features causing the target feature (i.e., the feature’s causes) and another that
14
15 measured the number of other features caused by the target feature (i.e., the feature’s effects).
16
17

18
19 For example, a participant who reported being a Carolina Panthers fan would first be asked
20
21 which other aspects of her self-concept *caused her* to be a fan of the Carolina Panthers. She
22
23 would then be asked which other aspects of her self-concept were *caused by* her being a fan of
24
25 the Carolina Panthers. The causal centrality of being a Carolina Panthers was calculated by
26
27 summing the number of features selected across the two trials.
28
29

30
31 Participants were asked how much they would be willing to pay for a ticket to see their
32
33 team play in the Super Bowl if their team made it the following year. Participants then reported
34
35 measures of sports involvement: whether they knew who had won the Super Bowl (wave 1),
36
37 whether they had watched the Super Bowl (wave 1) or how likely it was that they would watch
38
39 the Super Bowl (wave 2), their interest in football, and how many hours per week they spent on
40
41 sports (including participating, watching, playing sports video games, etc).
42
43

44
45 In wave 2, after reporting that they were an NFL fan but before the “listing causal
46
47 relationships” task, participants completed the identity importance scale (Reed II 2004, see web
48
49 appendix C). The importance scale asked how much participants feel that being a fan of a team
50
51 describes who they are, how much they identify with that group, and how much they admire the
52
53 group. Although our focus is on identity importance, because previous literature had also found
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 greater identity congruency effects among those with high identity esteem (Reed II, Shang, and
4 Croson 2008), we also had participants complete the identity esteem scale which measures
5
6 perceived standing in a social group (see web appendix C).
7
8
9

10 Results

11
12 *Relationship Between Causal Centrality and Willingness to Pay.* As the WTP data were
13 positively skewed, we report analyses using the natural log of WTP + 1. We regressed log-WTP
14 on the casual centrality of being a fan, controlling for the causal centrality of the control feature.
15 As predicted, football fans who perceived their fan identity as more causally central were willing
16 to pay significantly more than those who perceived being a fan as more causally peripheral ($B =$
17 $.14$, $SE = .03$, $p < .001$). The relationship between the causal centrality of the football fan identity
18 and log-WTP remained highly significant when controlling for income ($B = .13$, $SE = .03$, $p <$
19 $.001$, table 6 web appendix A).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 While our focus is on identity-consistent behaviors, exploratory analysis revealed that
32 causal centrality also predicted interest in football (controlling for number of total links
33 reported), suggesting that causal centrality may predict degree of involvement with the social
34 identity. According to our account, football fans whose fandom is more causally central will be
35 more willing to pay to see their team in the Super Bowl, because they perceive acting in identity-
36 consistent ways as more congruent with who they are than those who perceive fandom as
37 causally peripheral. However, it is also possible that the causal centrality measure is merely
38 capturing differences in involvement with football. To examine this, we ran another linear
39 regression, predicting log-WTP with football fan causal centrality and the control links,
40 controlling for interest in football. The relationship between fan causal centrality and log-WTP
41 remained significant ($B = .09$, $SE = .03$, $p = .002$), suggesting that interest in football does not
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 explain the relationship between causal centrality and log-WTP.
4

5 To further examine whether involvement could explain the relationship between causal
6 centrality and log-WTP, we added additional proxies for involvement to the above regression:
7 amount of the Super Bowl watched (wave 1, which took place after the Super Bowl) or
8 likelihood of watching the Super Bowl (wave 2, which took place before the Super Bowl), and
9 the number of hours spent on sports per week. Even after adding these additional controls, causal
10 centrality was a highly significant predictor of log-WTP ($B = .09$, $SE = .03$, $p = .004$).
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 *Identity Importance as a Mediator.* We conducted a mediation analysis with the wave 2
20 data (in which we measured identity importance) to test whether causally central identities feel
21 more important than causally peripheral ones and whether the relationship between causal
22 centrality and valuation operates via football fan identity importance, controlling for the control
23 feature links. We found that those who perceived the football fan identity as more causally
24 central reported that that identity was more important ($B = .12$, $SE = .03$, $p < .001$). Furthermore,
25 there was a significant indirect effect of causal centrality on log-WTP via fan identity importance
26 ($B = .03$, $SE = .01$, 95% Bootstrapped CI = [.00, .06], figure 1 web appendix A). Importance
27 mediated approximately 50% of the effect of causal centrality on log-WTP (total effect of causal
28 centrality on log-WTP: $B = .06$, $p = .108$). Causal centrality did not significantly predict log-
29 WTP when controlling for importance ($B = .03$, $SE = .04$, $p = .413$). Identity esteem was strongly
30 correlated with importance ($r = .47$, $p < .001$) and also mediated the effect (figure 2 web
31 appendix A). However, the two scales (identity importance and esteem) were not disassociable in
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 a factor analysis, suggesting that both scales may measure the same construct (table 7 web
4
5
6
7 appendix A).

8 9 10 Discussion

11
12 Consistent with the findings in study 1, the results of study 2 suggest that football fans who
13
14 believe being a fan is causally central are more willing to spend in identity-consistent ways.
15
16 Further, the relationship between causal centrality and log-WTP remained when controlling for
17
18 whether participants watched or planned to watch the Super Bowl, and the amount of time spent
19
20 on sports, suggesting that causal centrality is not simply a measure of involvement with identity-
21
22 related activities.
23
24

25
26 In wave 2, we found that causally central identities are perceived as more important than
27
28 causally peripheral ones and that identity importance mediated the relationship between causal
29
30 centrality and log-WTP, replicating study 1B. Complementing previous findings that identity
31
32 importance predicts attitudes towards identity-relevant products (Reed II 2004), these results
33
34 suggest that identity importance predicts identity-consistent behavior even when identity salience
35
36 is high and are consistent with our hypothesis that causal centrality underlies identity importance.
37
38 We further test our claim that causal centrality underlies identity importance in study 3.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 49 **STUDY 3: MANIPULATING CAUSAL CENTRALITY**

50
51
52
53 The previous studies provide strong correlational evidence for the relationship between an
54
55 identity's causal centrality and its perceived importance (studies 1A, 1B, and study 2, wave 2),
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and for the relationship between an identity's causal centrality and identity-consistent behaviors
4
5 (studies 1A, 1B, and 2). Thus far, we have studied causal centrality of an identity as a relatively
6
7 stable individual difference, much like identity importance (Forehand et al. 2002; Reed II 2004).
8
9 However, given that causal centrality is based on a subjective perception, even if deeply held, it
10
11 may be possible to experimentally manipulate the causal centrality of a given social identity in
12
13 the moment, specifically by prompting participants to either focus on causal connections to that
14
15 social identity (more central) or to focus on how that social identity is independent from other
16
17 aspects of the self-concept (less central). Further, based on our theorizing, if causal centrality
18
19 underlies identity importance, successfully manipulating causal centrality should influence
20
21 identity importance and, as a result, should also influence identity-consistent choices.
22
23
24
25

26 In study 3, we experimentally manipulate causal centrality by having football fans either
27
28 write about how their football fan identity is causally connected to other aspects of their self-
29
30 concepts (high centrality condition) or write about how their football fan identity was causally
31
32 independent from other aspects of their self-concept (low centrality condition). We test whether
33
34 this makes the social identity seem more important and increases the likelihood of identity-
35
36 consistent behaviour (as measured by WTP for seeing one's team in the Superbowl).
37
38
39

40 Based on our theory and the results of study 2, we predicted that prompting participants to
41
42 think about their football fan identity's causal relationships with other features of the self-
43
44 concept would increase both perceived identity importance and WTP. However, the alternative
45
46 possibility is that thinking of a social identity as more causally independent of other features of
47
48 the self-concept could be interpreted as the identity revealing one's true, deeper self. That is,
49
50 contrary to our causal centrality hypothesis, someone who believes that she would have been a
51
52 football fan regardless of the relationships she had with other people, what cities she lived in,
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 what her profession was, etc. could feel that being a fan is an integral part of who she is. In this
4
5 alternative account, prompting consideration of causal connections could make the identity seem
6
7 to be a product of or the cause of more surface-level features.
8

9 10 Method

11
12 *Participants.* We collected a total of 904 valid surveys from football fans on Amazon
13
14 Mechanical Turk, after pre-registered exclusions for duplicate IP addresses, failed attention
15
16 check, outlier log-WTP values (± 2 SD from the mean), and non-valid answers to the open-ended
17
18 questions.
19

20
21 *Procedure.* Participants first completed a screener in which they answered eight questions
22
23 about specific identities, including if they were an NFL fan and seven distractor questions.
24
25 Participants who passed the screener reported which team they were a fan of. The main study
26
27 consisted of three tasks in which participants first wrote about their football fan identity (the
28
29 causal centrality manipulation), and then reported their WTP and completed the identity
30
31 importance scale (Reed II 2004, used in study 2, wave 2), with the order of reporting WTP and
32
33 the scale counter-balanced. Our findings were not moderated by task order so, in our analyses,
34
35 we collapse across the two different task orders.
36
37

38
39 To manipulate the causal centrality of the football fan identity, participants were randomly
40
41 assigned to either the high or low centrality condition. Participants in the high centrality
42
43 condition wrote about how their football fan identity had influenced or been influenced by
44
45 whichever other aspects of their self-concept they considered causally related to their football fan
46
47 identity. Participants in the low centrality condition wrote about how their football fan identity
48
49 was independent from (i.e., was not influenced by and had not influenced) whichever other
50
51 aspects of their self-concept they considered separate from their football fan identity. (See web
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 appendix C for exact wording for both conditions).
4

5
6 Importantly, having participants in both conditions write about their football fan identity
7
8 equalized the salience of the identity across the conditions. After reading the instructions to the
9
10 writing task, participants answered a comprehension question. Participants who answered
11
12 correctly were informed that they had selected the correct answer and completed the writing task.
13
14 Participants who answered incorrectly were informed that they had selected the wrong answer
15
16 and were asked to carefully read instructions again prior to completing the writing task.
17
18


19 Results

20
21 *Effect of the Causal Centrality Manipulation on Importance.* Consistent with our
22
23 prediction, participants in the high centrality condition reported significantly higher football fan
24
25 identity importance than those in the low centrality condition ($M_{\text{HighCentrality}} = 4.72$, $M_{\text{LowCentrality}} =$
26
27 3.86 , $t(902) = 7.86$, $p < .001$, $d = .52$, 95% CI of the difference [.64, 1.07]).
28
29

30
31 *Effect of the Causal Centrality Manipulation on WTP.* Participants in the high centrality
32
33 condition reported a higher log-WTP to see their team in the Super Bowl than those in the low
34
35 centrality condition ($M_{\text{HighCentrality}} = 5.76$, $M_{\text{LowCentrality}} = 5.60$, $t(902) = 2.30$, $p = .022$, $d = .15$,
36
37 95% CI of the difference [.02, .30]). Results were similar when using raw WTP (table 8 web
38
39 appendix A). A linear regression predicting log-WTP by condition (high vs. low centrality),
40
41 controlling for income, confirmed that those in the high centrality condition were willing to pay
42
43 more to see their team play in the Super Bowl ($B = .17$, $SE = .07$, $p = .016$, table 9 web appendix
44
45 A).
46
47
48

49 FIGURE 3

50
51 STUDY 3: IDENTITY IMPORTANCE MEDIATES THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE
52
53 CAUSAL CENTRALITY MANIPULATION AND LN(WTP+1)
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



NOTE.—Centrality manipulation was coded as follows: low centrality = 1, high centrality = 2. Mediation analysis performed using the PROCESS bootstrapping macro (model 4) with 5,000 resamples. A 95% confidence interval was computed to test the indirect effect (95% CI of the indirect effect = [.11, .22]).

Mediation Analysis. We conducted a mediation analysis to test whether the effect of the causal centrality manipulation influenced log-WTP via importance. There was a significant indirect effect of the causal centrality manipulation on log-WTP via fan identity importance ($B = .16, 95\%$ Bootstrapped CI = [.11, .22]). Importance mediated almost all of the effect of causal centrality on log-WTP (total effect of causal centrality on log-WTP: $B = .16, p = .022$). The relationship between the causal centrality manipulation and log-WTP was no longer significant when controlling for importance ($B = .002, SE = .07, p = .980$, see figure 3).

Discussion

The results of study 3 provide causal evidence for our account, using an experimental manipulation of causal centrality. After writing about their football fan identity's causal connections with other aspects of the self-concept (vs. about the identity's independence from other aspects of the self-concept), consumers perceived the football fan identity as more important and were willing to pay more for an identity-relevant experience.

Additionally, replicating the results of study 1B and wave 2 of study 2, identity importance mediated the influence of causal centrality on WTP. This provides further support for our theorizing that causal centrality of an identity underlies identity importance and impacts identity-consistent behaviors, in part, by making that identity subjectively more important. In a second

1
2
3 study using the same design, (study A1, reported in web appendix B, n=384), we confirm the
4
5 robustness of the positive effect of the causal centrality manipulation on willingness to pay as
6
7 well as the mediation via increased identity importance.
8
9

10 Finally, our successful manipulation of causal centrality highlights the usefulness of
11
12 understanding how social identities fit into the broader self-concept in influencing both identity
13
14 importance and identity-based consumer behaviors. By identifying causal centrality as a
15
16 determinant of identity importance, we were able to design a manipulation that influenced
17
18 identity importance which has primarily been studied as a stable individual difference (e.g.,
19
20 Dalton and Huang 2014; Forehand et al. 2002; LeBoeuf et al. 2010; Mazodier et al. 2018). Reed
21
22 II (2004) also manipulated importance of family identity, using an emotion-based manipulation
23
24 that prompted participants to consider either their role in or their independence from their family.
25
26 This can be interpreted in terms of the causal centrality account, as a manipulation prompting
27
28 more vs. less consideration of connections within the self-concept. The finding that our theory-
29
30 based manipulation also influenced identity-consistent behaviors suggests that such
31
32 manipulations could prove useful in promoting a wide range of consumer behaviors.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **STUDY 4: IDENTITY SALIENCE AND CAUSAL CENTRALITY**

41
42
43
44 In study 4, we generalize our findings by testing a completely different consumer identity,
45
46 being an environmentalist. We measured the causal centrality of the environmentalist identity
47
48 among self-identified environmentally-friendly consumers and had these consumers make a
49
50 series of hypothetical purchase decisions between a more expensive environmentally-friendly
51
52 product and a cheaper conventional product.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Furthermore, we contrast the causal centrality of an identity with identity salience. Prior
4 research has found that the salience of an environmentalist identity impacts consumer choice and
5 judgments (Bolton and Reed II 2004; Coleman and Williams 2013). In this view, salience of the
6 identity makes the norms and/or emotional profiles associated with that identity salient,
7 influencing behavior. By contrast, we have posited that the causal centrality of a social identity
8 guides behavior because consumers generally value their own behavior more when it is
9 consistent with more subjectively important social identities, rather than because of identity
10 salience temporarily activating norms. Consistent with this view, studies 2 and 3 documented the
11 effect of causal centrality when the relevant consumer identity (football fandom) was highly
12 salient (on Super Bowl Sunday in study 2, after writing about the identity as both conditions did
13 in study 3). While in study 3, we found that making *specifically* the causal connections to an
14 identity more salient increased identity importance, and in turn, influenced behavior, we have not
15 directly tested for a potential role of more general identity salience in the effects of causal
16 centrality.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 In order to examine whether identity salience drives the relationship between causal
36 centrality and purchase decisions, in part 1 of study 4, we manipulated the salience of the
37 environmentalist identity, using a task from the prior literature intended to specifically impact
38 salience of the identity but which does not highlight causal relationships (unlike the causal
39 centrality manipulation used in study 3). If identity salience is responsible for the relationship
40 between causal centrality and purchase decisions, we would expect the salience manipulation to
41 increase both causal centrality of the environmentalist identity and identity-consistent
42 consumption. If, instead, identity salience and causal centrality are separable, we would expect
43 each construct to independently predict choice of environmentally-friendly products.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

To further test a prediction of our causal centrality account of identity-based consumption, we investigated not only immediate effects, but also the longer-term relationship. If causal centrality underlies identity importance, a relatively stable association between a consumer's sense of self and an identity, causal centrality could also be relatively stable over time and the causal centrality of a social identity (unlike momentary salience) should predict choices made substantially later in time. To test this, we re-recruited participants approximately 11 months after part 1 for a second unanticipated survey (part 2) in which they made the same product choices that they had in part 1. We predicted that the reported causal centrality of the environmentalist identity previously measured in part 1 would predict choices in part 2 but that the identity salience condition (from part 1) would not.

Method

Participants. A power analysis from a pilot study (study A3 in web appendix B), in which the effect of the salience manipulation was marginally significant, suggested that detecting an effect of salience on causal centrality with 95% power in this context might require approximately 200 participants per condition.

As pre-registered,⁴ we recruited a total of 450 US participants from Prolific Academic, who had previously reported caring about environmental issues (answering a 4 or 5 on a 1-to-5 scale to the question, "How concerned are you about environmental issues?" in the Prolific panel questions). The survey yielded a total of 411 valid participants after exclusions for a failed attention check or reporting that they did not intend to have an environmentally-friendly identity in the main survey. Recruiting for part 2 occurred approximately 11 months after part 1. We invited all the participants who had participated in part 1 and were still active on Prolific,

⁴ Part 2 of study 4 was not part of the original experimental design and was not included in the pre-registration.

yielding 177 participants with valid responses.







Procedure. At the beginning of part 1 of the study, participants reported whether they agreed with an initial set of social identity related statements, including one about the target social identity: “I want to be an environmentally-friendly person”. Five other questions served to disguise the criteria for inclusion in the study.

The rest of part 1 of the study consisted of three tasks: 1) a writing task (the salience manipulation), 2) the “listing causal relationships” task to measure causal centrality and, 3) the environmental-products choice task. The salience manipulation was adapted from Coleman and Williams (2013). Participants were randomly assigned to either write about their environmentalist identity (environmentalist-salient condition) or to write about what they had done the previous day (control condition, see web appendix C for wording.)

Prior to completing the “listing causal relationships” task, participants reported the features that they felt were most important to the person who they are, in six categories found to be important to the self-concept in previous research (Chen et al. 2016, Strohinger and Nichols 2014): memories, preferences, moral qualities, personality traits, goals/desires, and other (in which participants could describe anything important to their self-concept that they had not yet listed). Participants then completed the full “listing causal relationships” task from study 1 with twelve features of the self-concept, including their environmental identity, the six features they had just described, and the features they had reported in five questions from the initial set of identity questions. The presentation order of these features was randomized across participants.

FIGURE 4

STUDIES 4 AND 5: CHOICE SETS, ENVIRONMENTAL-PRODUCTS CHOICE TASK

	<p>GE 60-watt, 4-pack A19 light bulbs for \$4</p>
<p>OR</p>	
	<p>GE LED 4-pack replacement 60-watt light bulbs for \$19.99</p>
<p>OR</p>	
	<p>Single-use plastic bag for \$0.10</p>
<p>OR</p>	
	<p>Re-useable canvas bag for \$3.99</p>
<p>OR</p>	
	<p>Energizer 4-pack of AA alkaline batteries for \$4.99</p>
<p>OR</p>	
	<p>Energizer 4-pack of AA rechargeable batteries for \$13.99</p>

In the choice task, participants made three hypothetical purchasing decisions between an environmentally-friendly version and a cheaper conventional version of the same product type. To ensure their choices were not based on brand loyalty instead of a greater willingness to pay for environmentally-friendly products, the conventional and environmentally-friendly products were either from the same brand or were unbranded (see figure 4). The placement of the choice options (environmentally-friendly vs. conventional) on the screen was randomized. After choosing, participants rated which product in each choice set they thought was better for the environment on a five-point scale. In all studies using environmentally-friendly vs. conventional product choice sets, participants consistently rated environmentally-friendly products as better for the environment than the conventional products (all $ps < .001$, see web appendix A).

Eleven months after part 1, all participants who were still active on Prolific were invited to do an unexpected follow-up study (part 2). Participants completed the choice task from part 1 (with the same choice sets) and rated the environmental-friendliness of the products.

Results

Effect of the Salience Manipulation on Causal Centrality. The salience manipulation did not have a significant effect on the causal centrality of the environmentalist identity ($M_{\text{env}} = 3.45$ vs $M_{\text{control}} = 3.10$, $t(409) = 1.15$, $p = .249$, $d = .11$, 95% CI of the difference = $[-.24, .94]$). A linear regression predicting causal centrality by condition, controlling for total number of links, also confirmed that the salience manipulation had no significant effect on causal centrality ($B = .16$, $SE = .18$, $p = .370$). Despite high statistical power (80% power to detect $d = .28$), we find no evidence that manipulating the salience of the environmentalist identity affects its causal centrality, although we cannot rule out a small positive or negative effect.

In an additional pre-registered study using the abbreviated listing causal relationships task from study 2 (study A4 in web appendix B) instead of the full task, to reduce the time between the measurement of the causal centrality and the target identity and maximize the possible influence of salience on causal centrality, we likewise found no effect of salience on either causal centrality ($n = 432$, $M_{\text{env}} = 5.27$, $M_{\text{control}} = 4.91$, $t(432) = 1.04$, $p = .300$, $d = .10$, 95% CI of the difference = $[-.32, 1.04]$) or on identity importance ($M_{\text{env}} = 5.29$, $M_{\text{control}} = 5.34$, $t(432) = .50$, $p = .616$, $d = -.05$, 95% CI of the difference = $[-.24, .14]$). These results are consistent with the conceptualization of identity importance as an enduring trait that is not influenced by general identity salience (Forehand et al. 2002), but which is instead based on causal centrality, which can be affected by the salience of specifically the causal connections to an identity (which we successfully manipulated in study 3).

Effect of the Salience Manipulation on Product Choices. Consistent with prior research, participants chose more environmentally-friendly products in the environmentalist-salient condition ($M = 2.11$), than in the control condition ($M = 1.96$, $t(409) = 1.83$, $p = .068$, $d = .18$,

95% CI of the difference = [-.01, .32]), a marginally significant difference.

Relationship Between Causal Centrality and Product Choices. A linear regression confirmed that participants who saw their environmental identity as more (vs. less) causally central chose more environmentally friendly products ($B = .10$, $SE = .02$, $p < .001$), controlling for total number of links. This result was replicated in two additional studies (studies A2 and A3, reported in web appendix B) that used the same choice task as study 4 (study A2: $n = 96$, $B = .13$, $SE = .05$, $p = .014$; study A3: $n = 292$, $B = .09$, $SE = .03$, $p = .004$). The relationship between the causal centrality of the environmentalist identity and choice remained when controlling for income ($B = .09$, $SE = .03$, $p = .005$, table 10 web appendix A). Further, the relationship between causal centrality and choice holds both in the environmentalist-salient condition ($B = .10$, $SE = .03$, $p = .004$) and in the control condition ($B = .10$, $SE = .03$, $p = .001$).

Relationship Between Causal Centrality, Salience, and Product Choice. A linear regression found that the causal centrality of the environmentalist identity significantly predicted environmentally-friendly choices ($B = .10$, $SE = .02$, $p < .001$), controlling for a directional non-significant effect of salience condition ($B = .13$, $SE = .08$, $p = .102$), and total number of causal links. To test whether the relationship between causal centrality and choice was moderated by salience, we re-ran the regression, adding salience condition x causal centrality and salience x total links interaction terms. The near-zero salience x causal centrality interaction ($B = .00$, $SE = .04$, $p = .928$), suggests that causal centrality of a social identity predicts identity-relevant choices similarly regardless of whether the identity salience has been manipulated to be high or not.

Relationship Between Causal Centrality and Product Choice Over Time. To examine long-term effects, we ran a linear regression predicting part 2 choices by the measured causal centrality of the environmentalist identity and identity salience condition (both from part 1),

controlling for total links. Causal centrality of the environmentalist identity, measured 11 months earlier, significantly predicted choice ($B = .12$, $SE = .04$, $p = .001$), while the identity salience condition did not ($B = -.17$, $SE = .14$, $p = .229$).

Discussion

Study 4, as well as studies A2 and A3, replicated the findings of the previous studies with a different consumer-relevant social identity. Consumers who perceived the environmentalist identity as more causally central were more likely to make identity-consistent choices, both immediately and after a long delay, than those who perceived this identity as more causally peripheral, regardless of whether the identity was first made salient or not. The results of the environmentalist-salient condition show that even when a social identity is experimentally manipulated to be salient, centrality still predicts purchase decisions—consistent with our study 2 finding that centrality of the football fan identity predicted willingness to pay, even when a real-world event made the identity highly salient.

The results of study 4 suggest that causal centrality and salience of an identity are dissociable and have separate influences on identity-consistent behavior. The salience manipulation had no effect on causal centrality. Further, while the results of study 4 (and study A3 in web appendix B) were consistent with prior findings that experimentally manipulating an identity to be more salient increases consumers' identity-consistent choices (pooled $B = .18$, $p = .007$, see web appendix B), we found no evidence that the influence of the salience manipulation on choice differs depending on the causal centrality of the environmental identity. The lack of an interaction between salience and causal centrality suggests that the salience manipulation is equally effective among consumers who see the identity as central and peripheral. Finally, the lack of an interaction also rules out an alternative explanation of our earlier findings, that higher

1
2
3 causal centrality of an identity motivates identity-relevant choices by making that identity more
4
5 chronically salient.
6

7
8 The part 2 results revealed that the causal centrality of the environmentalist identity
9
10 predicts choices made nearly a year after measuring centrality. This is consistent with our
11
12 proposal that causal centrality underlies a relatively stable construct, identity importance, in the
13
14 absence of specific factors that change perceptions of causal relationships among aspects of
15
16 identity (as our manipulation of causal centrality did in study 3).
17

18 19 20 21 **STUDY 5: THE STABILITY OF CAUSAL CENTRALITY IN PREDICTING CHOICES** 22

23
24
25
26 Study 5 addresses a potential confound, self-generated validity (Feldman and Lynch 1988).
27
28 In the previous studies, participants made their choices and reported causal centrality in the same
29
30 session. This raises the possibility that participants' decisions and causal centrality ratings may
31
32 have been influenced by a desire to keep responses consistent across tasks (although the belief
33
34 that more connections to an identity is consistent with maintaining identity norms could also
35
36 reflect our framework).
37

38
39
40 Study 4 partially addressed this concern, because participants also made choices 11 months
41
42 after they had reported causal centrality in part 1. However, participants had made the same
43
44 choices directly after reporting causal centrality in part 1 and could have recalled their previous
45
46 choices when participating in part 2. Furthermore, measurement of centrality after the salience
47
48 manipulation could have reduced the potential effect of the salience manipulation on choices by
49
50 making the environmental identity salient even in the control condition or by distracting
51
52 participants. To address these potential limitations, in part 1 of study 5, we measured causal
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 centrality with no reference to product choices. Then, one week later, in part 2, we manipulated
4 the salience of the environmentalist identity and participants made choices between more
5
6 expensive environmentally-friendly products and cheaper conventional products (as in study 4).
7

8 9 10 Method

11
12 *Participants.* We collected valid surveys from 877 Amazon Mechanical Turk participants,
13
14 after pre-registered exclusions for duplicate IP addresses or worker IDs, providing nonsense
15
16 answers to open-ended questions, or failing the attention check.
17

18
19 *Design.* The experiment consisted of two parts that were one week apart. The tasks used in
20
21 study 5 were the same as those used in study 4 but presented in a different order and with the
22
23 addition of the identity importance scale used in studies 2 and 3.
24

25
26 *Part 1.* As in study 4, participants first reported whether they agreed with a series of six
27
28 identity-related statements, including one that related to the target identity: “I want to be an
29
30 environmentally-friendly person.” Only participants who answered “yes” to this question were
31
32 invited to complete the study. The other five questions were unrelated to the target identity and
33
34 served to mask the survey’s intention so that participants could not strategically answer to
35
36 qualify for the survey. Participants then reported the features that were most important to the
37
38 person who they are, from each of six categories (memories, preferences, moral qualities,
39
40 personality traits, goals/desires, and other) and completed the “listing causal relationships” task.
41
42
43

44
45 After the “listing causal relationships” task, participants completed the identity importance
46
47 scale used in studies 2 and 3, modified to ask about the environmentalist identity. Finally,
48
49 participants were told that they would be invited back the following week for part 2 of the study,
50
51 but were not told what would be asked.
52

53
54 *Part 2.* As in study 4, participants were randomly assigned to either write about their
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 environmentalist identity (environmentalist-salient condition) or to write about what they had
4 done the previous day (control condition, see web appendix C). Directly after the writing task,
5
6 participants made the same three hypothetical purchasing decisions as in study 4 (see figure 4)
7
8 and then rated which product in each choice set they thought was more environmentally-friendly.
9

12 Results

13
14
15 *Effect of Identity Salience on Product Choice.* Consistent with study 4 and conceptually
16 replicating prior research, participants in the environmentalist-salient condition chose more
17 environmentally-friendly products than in the control condition ($M_{\text{env}} = 2.19$, $M_{\text{control}} = 1.65$;
18
19 $t(875) = 8.44$, $p < .001$, $d = .57$, 95% CI of the difference = [.42, .67]).
20
21
22

23
24 *Relationship Between Environmentalist Causal Centrality and Choice.* We fit a linear
25 regression predicting the total number of environmentally-friendly choices based on identity-
26 salience condition (environmental vs. control) and measured causal centrality of the
27 environmental identity, controlling for the total number of links. Consumers who saw their
28 environmental identity as more central chose significantly more environmentally-friendly
29 products ($B = .07$, $SE = .02$, $p < .001$). This analysis also confirmed the main effect of the
30 salience-manipulation condition ($B = .27$, $SE = .03$, $p < .001$). The relationship between the
31 causal centrality of the environmentalist identity and choice remained significant when
32 controlling for income ($B = .07$, $SE = .02$, $p < .001$, table 11 web appendix A).
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44
45 In a follow-up regression, we included a condition x causal centrality interaction term,
46 which was not significant ($B = -.01$, $SE = .01$, $p = .471$). This suggests that the effect of the
47 salience manipulation on choices did not depend on the causal centrality of the environmentalist
48 identity, and that the relationship between choices and subsequently measured causal centrality
49 was robust to the salience of the environmentalist identity at the time of choice (i.e., a similar
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 relationship between causal centrality and choice was found in the environmentalist-salient and
4
5 control conditions).

6
7
8 *Mediation Analysis.* We conducted a mediation analysis to test whether the relationship
9
10 between causal centrality and choice operates via identity importance, controlling for the total
11
12 links reported. We found that those who perceived their environmentalist identity as more
13
14 causally central also reported that the identity was more important ($B = .21$, $SE = .02$, $p < .001$).

15
16
17
18 There was a significant indirect effect of causal centrality on choice via environmentalist identity
19
20 importance ($B = .06$, 95% Bootstrapped CI = [.04, .07]). Importance mediated the majority of the
21
22 relationship between causal centrality on choice and the relationship between causal centrality
23
24 and choice was no longer significant when controlling for importance ($B = .02$, $SE = .02$, $p =$
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
.358, figure 3 web appendix A).

Discussion

Study 5 finds that causal centrality of the environmentalist identity predicts choices of more expensive but environmentally friendly products, even when choices are measured at a different time. This suggests that the relationship between causal centrality and choice is unlikely to be explained by self-generated validity and provides additional evidence that causal centrality, a relatively stable individual difference, underlies identity importance. Further, replicating the results of studies 1B, 2 (wave 2) and 3, in study 5, consumers who perceived their environmentalist identity as more causally central also perceived it as more important and identity importance mediated the relationship between causal centrality and choice.

The effect of centrality on later choices was also tested in three additional two-part (one week apart) pre-registered studies. The effect was replicated in one study that used the same

1
2
3 design as study 5 (study A5: $n = 585$, $B = .04$, $SE = .02$, $p = .059$) and another study in which
4
5 participants completed the choice and centrality task in the opposite order (i.e., choice in the first
6
7 session, centrality in the second session; study A6: $n = 208$, $B = .08$, $SE = .04$, $p = .041$), but not
8
9 in a third study. In a meta-analysis ($n = 2152$) of the four studies (5, A5, A6, and A7, reported in
10
11 web appendix B) in which choice and causal centrality were measured at different times, the
12
13 relationship between causal centrality and choice was significant ($B = .04$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$).
14
15
16

17 The results of study 5 provide further confirmation that salience and causal centrality of
18
19 identity represent distinct psychological processes. Replicating study 4, the effect of identity
20
21 salience was distinct from causal centrality, significantly shifting choices whether the social
22
23 identity was causally-central or not. Furthermore, causal centrality predicted identity-relevant
24
25 product choices whether or not the social identity was manipulated to be salient at the time of
26
27 choice. The disassociation between salience and causal centrality (e.g., the lack of mediation or
28
29 interaction) was also replicated in the two additional pre-registered two-part studies described in
30
31 the previous paragraph, studies A5 and A6, testing the effects of the salience and centrality of the
32
33 environmental identity (see web appendix B).
34
35
36

37
38 Our finding that salience and causal centrality have independent non-interacting effects on
39
40 choice may seem at odds with previous findings that salience interacts with identity importance
41
42 in predicting choice (Bolton and Reed II 2004; LeBoeuf et al. 2010). Because our theory is about
43
44 the relative impact of identities that people hold on their consumption decisions, our studies only
45
46 included people who self-ascribed to an identity (e.g., screening out participants who did not
47
48 consider themselves environmentalists). The interaction between salience and importance found
49
50 in prior research occurred in general unscreened samples (e.g., Bolton and Reed II 2004), and
51
52 included consumers who did not hold the identity.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 For example, the interaction found in LeBoeuf et al. (2010, study 3) was driven by low
4 identifiers making more identity-*inconsistent* choices when the identity was salient, the opposite
5 of mid and high identifiers. This pattern of results is consistent with both our results among those
6 identifying with an identity, and with prior theorizing that consumers who don't identify with a
7 social group (low identifiers) may wish to disassociate and respond negatively to in-group
8 members (Forehand et al. 2002). Therefore, the seeming discrepancy may be explained by
9 salience increasing norm-consistent preferences and behavior, as shown in this research, only
10 among consumer who hold the identity, with low importance ratings indicating that the consumer
11 either does not hold the identity or holds a contrary identity (e.g., anti-environmentalist).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 **STUDY 6: QUALITY TRADE-OFFS**

27
28
29 Thus far, we have documented the role of causal centrality in identity-based consumption
30 for trade-offs between money and identity-relevant spending. In study 6, we test whether our
31 findings extend beyond monetary trade-offs, to trade-offs between identity-relevance and quality.
32 Participants in study 6 chose between environmentally-friendly products and conventional
33 products with either higher quality ratings or with lower prices (as in studies 4 and 5), depending
34 on the condition. As previous research has suggested that consumers are particularly unwilling to
35 trade-off quality (functional performance) for environmental-friendliness (Luchs and Kumar
36 2017), using causal centrality of the environmentalist identity to predict consumer willingness to
37 trade off quality for environmental-friendliness is a particularly strong test of the generality of
38 our theory.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 **Method**

53
54
55 *Participants.* As in study 4, we recruited U.S. participants from Prolific Academic who had
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 previously reported caring about environmental issues. The survey yielded a total of 811 valid
4
5 participants, after pre-registered exclusions for a failed attention check or for not agreeing that
6
7 they wanted to be an environmentally-friendly person in the screener.
8

9
10 *Procedure.* As in studies 4 and 5, participants were screened to ensure that they self-
11
12 ascribed to the environmentalist identity. Participants then reported the features most important
13
14 to who they are, from each of six categories (memories, preferences, moral qualities, personality
15
16 traits, goals/desires, and other) and completed the same “listing causal relationships” task.
17

18
19 Participants then made three choices between an environmentally-friendly product and a
20
21 conventional version of the same product. Two product pairs (lightbulbs and batteries) were the
22
23 same as in studies 4 and 5. Because quality ratings did not seem relevant to shopping bags, they
24
25 were replaced with Ikea food storage containers (see figure 6, web appendix C). The placement
26
27 of the choice options (environmentally-friendly vs. conventional) on the screen was randomized.
28
29

30
31 We randomly assigned participants to the price-trade-off condition (similar to studies 4 and
32
33 5) or the quality-trade-off condition. Participants in the price condition chose between more
34
35 expensive environmentally-friendly products and cheaper conventional products. Participants in
36
37 the quality condition chose between lower-rated environmentally-friendly products and higher-
38
39 rated conventional products, presented as average ratings of at least 100 independent consumers.
40
41

42
43 To ensure that the price and quality trade-offs were comparable, we first ran a separate
44
45 titration test (study A6 in web appendix B) in which participants made a series of trade-offs
46
47 between purchasing a lower quality product for the low price and a higher quality product for a
48
49 higher price (using high and low prices from studies 4 and 5, not describing any products as
50
51 environmentally-friendly). We used the quality scores from the indifference points as the ratings
52
53 for the more expensive products in the quality condition of this study (for light bulbs: 2 stars vs.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 4.5 stars, for food containers: 2 stars vs. 4.25 stars, for batteries: 2 stars vs. 4.5 stars).

4
5 All participants then made a series of three control choices which did not involve
6 environmentally-friendly products. In each of these choices, participants chose between two
7 products from the same brand: an expensive product with a higher average rating and a cheaper
8 product with a lower average rating (see figure 6 in web appendix C). These choices were
9 included to ensure that any relationship found between the causal centrality of the
10 environmentalist identity and choice was not due to those perceiving the environmentalist
11 identity as more causally central being relatively more price or quality sensitive. Finally,
12 participants rated which product in each of the environmentally-friendly choice sets they thought
13 was better for the environment.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Results

27
28 We fit a linear regression predicting the total number of environmentally-friendly choices
29 based on condition (price vs. quality) and the causal centrality of the environmentalist identity,
30 controlling for the total number of links. This analysis confirmed that consumers who saw their
31 environmentalist identity as more central chose significantly more environmentally-friendly
32 products overall ($B = .08$, $SE = .02$, $p < .001$) and revealed a main effect of the trade-off
33 condition (more environmental choices in the price-trade-off condition: $B = -.53$, $SE = .07$, p
34 $< .001$). The relationship between the causal centrality of the environmentalist identity and choice
35 remained significant when controlling for income and for the number of expensive choices in the
36 control task in the above regression ($B = .08$, $SE = .02$, $p < .001$, table 12 web appendix A). For
37 the control products, the relationship between causal centrality and choice was not significant (B
38 $= .01$, $SE = .02$, $p = .726$).
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Notably, the relationship between causal centrality and choice was significant and similar
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 in magnitude in the price ($B = .09$, $SE = .03$, $p < .001$) and the quality condition ($B = .08$, $SE =$
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

in magnitude in the price ($B = .09$, $SE = .03$, $p < .001$) and the quality condition ($B = .08$, $SE = .03$, $p = .006$), and each remained significant when controlling for income and the number of expensive choices in the control task (tables 13 and 14 in web appendix A). The non-significant interaction between trade-off condition and causal centrality ($B = .02$, $SE = .03$, $p = .437$) in a follow-up regression confirmed that we did not detect a difference in the relationship between choice and causal centrality when participants were considering price or quality trade-offs.

Discussion

The results of study 6 replicated the results of studies 4 and 5. The causal centrality of the environmentalist identity predicted choices when consumers traded off environmental-friendliness for price. Further, we found that the causal centrality of the environmentalist identity also predicted choices when consumers traded off environmental-friendliness for quality, suggesting that causal centrality predicts a wider range of consumer trade-offs. Two additional studies, studies A7 and A8 in web appendix B, also examined the role of causal centrality in quality vs. environmentally-friendliness trade-offs. A meta-analysis across all three studies (excluding the price trade-off condition from study 6) revealed that those who perceived their environmentalist identity as more causally central were more likely to trade-off product quality for environmental-friendliness (pooled $B = .03$, $p = .014$, see web appendix B).

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Our studies demonstrate that understanding social identities in terms of how they interact with each other and fit into consumers' broader self-concept provides new explanations for

1
2
3 identity importance and consumer's identity-based behaviors. We find that more causally central
4 identities are perceived as more important (studies 1A, 1B, 2, and 5) and that experimentally
5 increasing the causal centrality of a social identity increases the importance of that identity
6 (study 3). Additionally, across multiple consumer-relevant identities, we provide evidence that
7 among consumers who belong to the same social category, those who perceived that social
8 identity as more causally central (measured or manipulated) are more likely to act in identity-
9 consistent ways, compared to those who perceived the same social identity as more causally
10 peripheral. Finally, we demonstrate that the relationship between a social identity's causal
11 centrality and identity-consistent behaviors cannot be explained by non-causal associations
12 between an identity and other features of the self-concept (study 1A), involvement in identity-
13 related activities (study 2), identity salience (studies 2, 4, and 5), or general price or quality
14 sensitivity (study 6).

31 Theoretical Implications

32
33 Our novel approach to understanding identity-consistent behavior theoretically advances
34 the identity-based consumption literature in a number of ways. First, our approach reconciles
35 cognitive approaches to the self-concept, which focus on individual-level conceptualization (e.g.,
36 Blok, Newman, and Rips 2005; Nichols and Bruno 2010; Strohming and Nichols 2014, 2015),
37 and prior consumer research on identity-based consumption, which has focused on social
38 categories (e.g., Broughs et al. 2016; Reed II 2004; LeBoeuf et al. 2010). By measuring how
39 identities relate to each other within an individual's broader self-concept, our approach integrates
40 and builds on both lines of literature to provide a more complete framework for the role of
41 identity importance and identity-based norms in behavior.

42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54 Second, our approach provides a novel psychological explanation of identity importance, a
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 key determinant of an identity's influence on behavior (LeBoeuf et al. 2010; Markus and Wurf
4 1987; Reed II 2004). By understanding the consumer psychology that underlies identity
5 importance, we can explain how identities become important. Furthermore, identifying the basis
6 of identity importance enabled us to construct the theory-based manipulation of the perceived
7 causal centrality of an identity used in study 3 to influence identity importance and downstream
8 identity-consistent behaviors.
9

10
11 Further, understanding that causal centrality underlies identity importance highlights that
12 some research has defined identity importance narrowly (e.g., on scales measuring identity
13 importance) as a combination of a positive evaluation of the group and affiliation with the group
14 (e.g., measuring admiration of the group as well as reported identification with the group and that
15 group membership is a good description of who they are, Reed II 2004). There is a broader
16 construct of identity importance that is captured by causal centrality. More specifically, a social
17 identity's causal centrality is the extent that consumers perceive that social identity as having
18 influenced or been influenced by other aspects of the self (Chen et al. 2016; Chen and Urminsky
19 2019), regardless of the valence of a consumer's evaluation of the social identity.
20
21

22
23 For example, an alumna of a college could see her college social identity as causally
24 central because her undergraduate experience shaped her career, where she went to graduate
25 school, and gave her the opportunity to study abroad. If she doesn't have a positive evaluation of
26 the alumna identity (she chose to study abroad and go to graduate school at a different university
27 because she didn't like her undergraduate institution), her score on identity importance scales
28 would be low. Nevertheless, her identity as an alumna of the college would still be important as
29 it has had a large influence who she is as an individual and she would be a very different person
30 had she gone to a different college (reflected by high causal centrality of the alumna identity),
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 even though she likely does not admire or may not even strongly affiliate with the social identity
4 (reflected by low scores on an identity importance scale). This is an interesting potential
5
6 direction for future research.
7
8
9

10 Finally, we also provide independent and pre-registered replication tests of the effects of
11 identity salience on consumer choice (e.g., Coleman and Williams 2013; see Kettle 2019 for a
12 review). Across the four studies in which the salience manipulation occurred directly before the
13 choice task (studies 5 and A5, A6, and A7), we find that manipulating the salience of an
14 environmentally-conscious identity using an online writing task increased choices of
15 environmentally friendly products (total $n = 2152$, overall $d = .56$; $p < .001$; significant at $p <$
16 $.001$ in all four studies). The only time we did not replicate the effect was in Study 4, in which
17 the listing causal relationships task was conducted between the salience manipulation and choice
18 tasks. This may suggest intervening tasks as a boundary condition, but we did not test that
19 systematically. These constitute theory-test replications and contribute to our understanding of
20 the robustness and generalizability of identity salience effects (Urminsky and Dietvorst 2023).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 Our findings also challenge some assumptions about how people engage in causal
36 reasoning. While some prior research has argued that only causes matter (Ahn et al. 2000;
37 Sloman et al. 1996) for determining causal centrality, others have argued that both causes and
38 effects matter (Rehder 2003; Rehder and Hastie 2001). In a meta-analysis across all studies
39 except for study 3, we predicted choice with the number of times the target identity was a cause
40 and the number of times the target identity was an effect as separate variables, controlling for the
41 total number of links. Both the number of times the target identity was a cause ($B = .08$, $SE =$
42 $.02$, $p < .001$) and the number of times it was an effect ($B = .16$, $SE = .02$, $p < .001$; bootstrapped
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
CI of the difference = [.01 .15]) significantly predicted choice (table 17 web appendix A).

1
2
3 The finding that both causes and effects matter in the representation of the self-concept has
4 important consequences. Since causes always occur before their effects, if only being a cause
5 contributed to centrality, consumers' identities would be more defined by the events that
6 occurred or features that developed earlier in life. Because an identity is also perceived as central
7 when it is the consequence of other features of identity, what is most defining of the self can
8 change over time. Features that develop later in life (e.g., culminating identities, such as a
9 profession or becoming a parent) can become more defining of the self-concepts than their
10 causes, consistent with the self-concept being a changing and dynamic entity (Reed II and
11 Forehand 2016).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Our approach to identity-consistent behavior also has important implications for cross-
25 disciplinary research on decision making. For example, inspired by social psychology, some
26 economic models of utility incorporate identity by assuming that the utility an individual gains
27 from acting in identity-consistent ways depends on how much the person has embraced the social
28 category (e.g., Akerlof and Kranton 2000, 2010). These models do not attempt to measure or
29 define these differences in adoption of an identity. We demonstrate, consistent with the model
30 assumptions, that consumers who belong to the same category do indeed integrate the social
31 identity into their self-concepts to different degrees and that these differences have implications
32 for choice. Further, our approach to identity-based consumption provides a psychological
33 explanation for what it means to adopt a social identity (i.e., integrating the social identity into
34 the self-concept via causal connections to other features).
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Further, our results extend our understanding of consumers' causal knowledge as
50 essential to category representation and reliance on subjective categories in decision making.
51
52 While previous research has examined the role of causal centrality in categorization judgments
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

(e.g., Ahn et al. 2000; Sloman et al. 1998) and consumer perceptions of products (Gershoff and Frels 2015), we have demonstrated that differences in causal centrality can explain differences in identity-relevant consumption decisions. Our findings demonstrate the value in going beyond explorations of how the categorization of products and situations influence choice (e.g., Chen, Ross, and Murphy 2014; Moreau, Markman, Lehmann 2001) to investigate how the complex *representation* of these categories motivates behavior. For example, future research on mental accounting could go beyond how money is categorized and explore whether differences in consumers' representations of the relationships between different mental accounts motivates allocation of funds into them. Additionally, as consumers' beliefs about the causal relationships that exist between the features of a brand influence perceptions of the brand's identity and purchase intentions (Chen and Urminsky, working paper), future research could explore how causal beliefs about brands may interact with causal beliefs about the consumer's own self-concept to motivate the development of brand-consumer relationships.

Future Directions


By gaining a greater understanding of the psychological basis of identity importance, we were able to develop a manipulation of causal centrality that increased identity importance and identity-based consumption (study 3). These results are proof-of-concept that marketers may build consumer loyalty by prompting their consumers to think about how a brand-user or product-relevant identity is causally connected to other identities. In fact, recent requests for alumni donations from Princeton University and Dartmouth College prompt alumni to think about the causal centrality of the university identity (e.g., reminding alumni they wouldn't have the same friends and opportunities without their university identity). Further, these requests include quotes from alumni explaining why they donate to the university, some of which

1
2
3 describe the university identity as causally connected to other aspects of the self-concept,
4 suggesting that seeing the university identity as causally central may motivate some to donate
5 (figure 5). Conversely, marketers targeting conversions could prompt competitors' customers to
6 think about how the brand-user identity is independent of other identities—e.g., if Adidas is
7 trying to convert Nike customers, they could remind customers that they would still have been
8 athletes even if they had never been a Nike-user.
9

10
11 Additionally, understanding that causal centrality underlies identity importance provides
12 specific strategic insights for how to tailor marketing appeals to target segments of consumers.
13 For example, the understanding that both causes and effects determine causal centrality and
14 identity importance provides insight on how to customize the requests donations in figure 5 for
15 alumni at different life stages. As the consequences of a social identity must develop after the
16 identity is acquired, appeals that highlight the effects of the university alumni identity (like those
17 in figure 5A, e.g., lifelong friends, skills for a successful career) may be better suited for older
18 alumni for whom the effects have had more time to develop. For younger alumni (and
19 potentially, current students), it may be more effective to use appeals that highlight the aspects
20 that caused the university identity (e.g., intelligence, hard work, talent).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **FIGURE 5: EXAMPLES OF CAUSAL CENTRALITY IN DONATION CONTEXTS**

41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



A

“
 What Dartmouth gave me—the friends, the experiences, the education, the relationships with professors—shaped my life so much for the good. Dartmouth provided access to a path which would not have been possible without her. For this I am and have been extremely grateful. It is the most natural thing to give in response to gratitude and appreciation.

Beth Johnston Stephenson

B

NOTE.—A) Mailing from Princeton University. B) A donor explaining why they gave to Dartmouth College, from the Dartmouth College fundraising website (<https://calltolead.dartmouth.edu/your-impact/donors?page=1>, accessed June 12, 2023).

Furthermore, as the self-concept is a dynamic concept that can change over time, marketers can increase motivation to use their products by fostering connections to multiple identities. For example, to make a brand-user identity more important, brands may invest in becoming integrated with other aspects of the self-concept—e.g., sponsoring a local kids' sports team. Thus, over time, the brand-user identity may become connected to a consumer's identity as a parent and thus, more causally central and important. In fact, contrary to a common view of sponsorship as merely a vehicle for attention and brand recall, our findings suggest that sponsorships related to events that are relevant to causal identity links may be more valuable.

To further develop these implications for marketers, additional research is needed to identify the most effective strategies and possible boundary conditions. For example, having consumers think about what other aspects of the self-concept an identity is causally connected to (as we did in study 3) may have no effect (or even potentially backfire) among consumers who

1
2
3 hold a social identity but fail to identify what it is causally connected to (possibly making the
4 identity seem *less* important). We speculate that this may be more likely to occur for social
5 identities that consumers do not self-select into (e.g., gender or age) than for those that
6 consumers self-select into (those studied in this paper). For social identities that consumers do
7 not choose, some consumers who hold the identities (because they are members of the social
8 category) may nevertheless not think that the identity is representative of who they are.

9
10 Further, while many approaches to understanding differences in consumer's identity-based
11 behavior have utilized individual difference scales (e.g., identity importance, identity esteem,
12 self-brand connection), our approach to understanding identity-based consumptions has been
13 based on a more basic psychological process. As demonstrated in our exploration of identity
14 importance and identity esteem in study 2, it can be difficult to differentiate some of these scales.
15 The scales measure the attitudinal consequences of identity importance, whereas we argue that
16 causal centrality measures the basis of identity importance. Further, it may be that different items
17 in a single scale may, while generally correlated with one another and an effective proxy for
18 measuring differences in identity importance, may not be influenced by the same underlying
19 psychology. As discussed, earlier, it may be that the admiration question may not be based on
20 causal centrality the same way the identification and reflection questions are (and in fact, this
21 item is not included in all identity importance scales, e.g., LeBoeuf et al. 2010).

22
23 Additionally, future research could further explore the relationship between causal
24 centrality and identity salience effects on identity-based behaviors. As salience highlights the
25 norms of a focal identity, it may also highlight the norms of identities that are strongly causally
26 connected to the focal identity, which may result in different effects on different consumers,
27 depending on which identities a focal identity is connected to. For example, the impact of a
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 making football fan identity salient may differ depending on the norms associated with the other
4 identities (e.g., family vs professional) causally connected to the focal identity.
5
6

7
8 Our investigation of identity-based consumption has focused on choices between options
9 that clearly relate to strong identity-relevant norms. However, some behaviors that are *associated*
10 with identities may not represent norms and may therefore not be predicted by the causal
11 centrality of the identity even when causal centrality makes an identity important to a consumer.
12 For example, while many environmentalists likely drive Priuses, it is not clear that there is a
13 norm for them to drive Priuses (certainly not descriptively, but perhaps not even prescriptively).
14 In more extreme cases—when consumers' beliefs about what behaviors are identity-consistent
15 conflict with behaviors that are associated with the identity (via marketing efforts or
16 otherwise)—causal centrality may even predict the opposite behavior. For example, when
17 marketers attempt to position visiting Times Square as the prototypical New York experience to
18 tourists, instead of building an identity-related norm, that marketing may decrease the
19 willingness of consumers with a more causally central New Yorker identity from going there.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 Similarly, some attempts to market products to women have famously backfired (Grose
36 2013)—e.g., the Bic Pen for Her (pink and pastel pens) or the Della computer for women
37 (marketed by emphasizing its ability to aid with stereotypically female activities like cooking). In
38 fact, it may be that to the extent that female consumers see their gender identity as including
39 more progressive values, a more causally central female identity might be related to a higher
40 likelihood of rejecting such unnecessarily gendered products, as violating one's personal gender
41 norms. Consistent with the idea that consumer beliefs about norms influence the relationship
42 between causal centrality and choice, in studies A6 and A11 (see web appendix B), we found
43 preliminary evidence that greater causal centrality of an identity that has weak norms, frugality,
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 may not predict choices. Thus, future research should examine how consumers' views regarding
4 the relationships between behaviors and an identity may moderate the effects of causal centrality
5 of the identity, particularly in the absence of a consensus norm.
6
7

8
9
10 While we have focused our exploration on consumers who share a social identity, our
11 approach to identity-based behavior also has implications for understanding how the multiple
12 social identities within a single consumer interact and relate to behavior. As consumers have
13 multiple social identities with potentially conflicting norms (LeBoeuf et al., 2010; Markus and
14 Wurf, 1987; Oyserman, 2009; Reed II et al., 2012), it would be useful to explore *which* of a
15 consumer's social identities is most likely to influence her behavior. Our approach would predict
16 that in cases where a consumer's social identities have conflicting and equally strong norms
17 about behavior, a social identity would be more likely to influence a consumer's behavior the
18 more central it is relative to the other competing social identities, either overall or within the
19 relevant decision context. More generally, providing a cognitive foundation for identity
20 importance as arising from the perceived causal relationships between specific features of
21 identity can help clarify and explain prior research findings, identify important relationships
22 between identity and consumer decision-making and point the way to promising new research
23 directions.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

DATA COLLECTION STATEMENT

The second and third authors managed data collection for study 1A in the fall of 2019. The first and third authors jointly analyzed these data. The first and second authors managed data collection for study 1B by a research assistant in the spring of 2023. The first author analyzed the data. The second author managed data collection by an online commercial marketing-research panel (Research Now) for study 2, wave 1 in the winter of 2016. These data were analyzed by the first author. The first and second authors supervised data collection for study 2, wave 2 by a research assistant in the winter of 2017. These data were analyzed by the first author. The first author managed data collection for study 3 in the spring of 2021 and analyzed the data. The first author supervised data collection for part 1 of study 4 by a research assistant in the spring of 2020 and analyzed the data. The first author managed data collection for part 2 of study 4 in the spring of 2021 and analyzed the data. The first and second authors managed data collection for study 5 by a research assistant in the summer of 2023. These data were analyzed by the first author. The first author managed data collection for study 6 in the winter of 2022 and analyzed the data. For all studies, Qualtrics survey software presented the survey and recorded responses. All studies with the exception of study 2, wave 1, study 4, and study 6 were collected online using Amazon Mechanical Turk for participant recruitment. Participants in study 2, wave 1 were recruited from an online panel (Research Now). Only residents of Colorado and North Carolina were eligible for this study. Participants in studies 4 and 6 were recruited from Prolific Academic. Only participants in the United States and participants who had previously answered that they were concerned about environmental issues (reported 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale) were eligible for the studies. Data files and study materials for all studies can be found at: <https://osf.io/6zcbp/>.

REFERENCES

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 Akerlof, George A., and Rachel E. Kranton (2000), "Economics and Identity," *The Quarterly*
7
8 *Journal of Economics*, 115, 715–753.
9
10 Akerlof, George A., and Rachel E. Kranton (2010), *Identity Economics: How Our Identities*
11
12 *Shape Our Work, Wages, and Well-Being*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
13
14 Ahn, W., J. K., Marsh, C. C., Luhmann, and K. Lee (2002), "Effect of theory-based feature
15
16 correlations on typicality judgments," *Memory & Cognition*, 30(1), 107-118.
17
18 Ahn, Woo-Kyoung, Nancy S. Kim, Mary E. Lassaline, and Martin J. Dennis (2000), "Causal
19
20 Status as a Determinant of Feature Centrality," *Cognitive Psychology*, 41, 361-416.
21
22 Bartels, Daniel M., and Lance J. Rips (2010), "Psychological Connectedness and Intertemporal
23
24 Choice," *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 139, 49-69.
25
26 Bartels, Daniel M., and Oleg Urminsky (2011), "On Intertemporal Selfishness: How the
27
28 Perceived Instability of Identity Underlies Impatient Consumption," *Journal of Consumer*
29
30 *Research*, 38(1), 182-198.
31
32 Bartels, Daniel M., and Oleg Urminsky (2015), "To Know and to Care: How Awareness and
33
34 Valuation of the Future Jointly Shape Consumer Spending," *Journal of Consumer*
35
36 *Research*, 41, 1469-1485.
37
38 Belk, Russell W (1988), "Possessions and the Extended Self," *Journal of Consumer*
39
40 *Research*, 15, 139-168.
41
42 Blok, Sergey, George Newman, and Lance J. Rips (2005), "Individuals and Their Concepts," in
43
44 *Categorization Inside and Outside the Lab*, eds. Woo-Kyoung Ahn, Robert. L.
45
46 Goldstone, Brad C. Love, Arthur B. Markman, & Phillip Wolff, Washington, DC:
47
48 American Psychological Association, 127-149.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Bolton, Lisa E., and Americus Reed II (2004), "Sticky Priors: The Perseverance of Identity
4 Effects on Judgment," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 41(4), 397-410.
5
6
7
8 Brough, Aaron R., James E. B. Wilkie, Jingjing Ma, Mathew S. Isaac, David Gal (2016), "Is
9 Eco-Friendly Unmanly? The Green-Feminine Stereotype and Its Effect on Sustainable
10 Consumption," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43(4), 567-582.
11
12
13
14
15 Chen, Haipeng, Sharon Ng, and Akshay R. Rao (2005), "Cultural Differences in Consumer
16 Impatience," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 42(3), 291-301
17
18
19 Chen, Stephanie Y., Brian H. Ross, and Gregory L. Murphy (2014). "Decision Making Under
20 Uncertain Categorization," *Frontiers in Psychology: Special Issues on Common*
21 *Mechanisms in Memory, Reasoning and Categorization*, 5, article no. 991.
22
23
24
25
26 Chen, Stephanie Y., Oleg Urminsky, and Daniel M. Bartels (2016), "Beliefs About the Causal
27 Structure of the Self-Concept Determine Which Changes Disrupt Personal Identity,"
28 *Psychological Science*, 27, 1398-1406.
29
30
31
32
33 Chen, Stephanie Y. and Oleg Urminsky (2019), "The Role of Causal Beliefs in Political Identity
34 and Voting," *Cognition*, 188, 27-38.
35
36
37
38 Chen, Stephanie Y. and Oleg Urminsky (working paper), "Not All (Brand) Changes are Made
39 Equal."
40
41
42
43 Coleman, Nicole V., and Patti Williams (2013). "Feeling Like My Self: Emotion Profiles and
44 Social Identity." *Journal of Consumer Research*, 40, 203-222.
45
46
47
48
49 Cornwell, T. Bettina, Michael S. Humphreys, Angela M. Maguire, Clinton S. Weeks, and
50 Cassandra L. Tellegen (2006). "Sponsorship-Linked Marketing: The Role of Articulation
51 in Memory," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 33, 312-321.
52
53
54 Dalton, Amy N., and Li Huang (2014), "Motivated forgetting in response to social identity
55
56
57
58
59
60

- threat.” *Journal of Consumer Research* 40, 1017-1038.
- Ersner-Hershfield, Hal, M. Tess Garton, Kacey Ballard, Gregory R. Samanez-Larkin, and Brian Knutson (2009), “Don’t Stop Thinking About Tomorrow: Individual Differences in Future Self-Continuity Account for Saving,” *Judgment and Decision Making*, 4(4), 280.
- Escalas, Jennifer Edson, and James R. Bettman (2003), “You Are What They Eat: The Influence of Reference Groups on Consumers’ Connections to Brands,” *Journal of Consumer Psychology* 13, 339-348.
- _____ (2005), “Self Construal, Reference Groups, and Brand Meaning,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 32(3), 378-389.
- Feldman, Jack M., and John G. Lynch (1988), “Self-Generated Validity and Other Effects of Measurement on Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior,” *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73(3), 421-435.
- Forehand, Mark R., Rohit Deshpandé, and Americus Reed II (2002), “Identity Salience and the Influence of Activation of the Social Self-Schema on Advertising Response,” *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(6), 1086–99.
- Freeman, Linton C. (1978), “Centrality in Social Networks Conceptual Clarification,” *Social Networks*, 1, 215-239.
- Gershoff, Andrew D., and Judy K. Frels (2015), “What Makes it Green? The Role of Centrality of Green Attributes in Evaluations of the Greenness of Products,” *Journal of Marketing*, 79(1), 97-110.
- Gopnik, Alison, and Laura E. Schulz (2004), “Mechanisms of theory formation in young children,” *Trends in Cognitive Science*, 8(8), 371-377.
- Gross, Jessica (2013), “Why Do Companies Keep Making Offensive Products “For Her”?”, *Fast*

Company, retrieved from: <https://www.fastcompany.com/1682607/why-do-companies-keep-making-offensive-pink-products-for-her>.

Keil, Frank, C. (1989), *Concepts, kinds, and cognitive development*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

_____ (2006), "Explanation and Understanding," *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57, 227–254.

Kettle, Keri (2019). "Identity Salience: Understanding When Identity Affects Consumption," *Handbook of Research on Identity Theory in Marketing*, 30-43.

LeBoeuf, Robyn A., Eldar Shafir, and Julia Belyavsky Bayuk (2010), "The Conflicting Choices of Alternating Selves," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 111, 48-61.

Locke, John (1690/2009), *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. New York, NY: WLC.

Luchs, Michael G., and Minu Kumar (2017), "Yes, but this other one looks better/works better": how do consumers respond to trade-offs between sustainability and other valued attributes?." *Journal of Business Ethics*, 140(3), 567-584.

Luhtanen, Riia, and Jennifer Crocker (1992), "A Collective Self-Esteem Scale: Self-Evaluation of One's Social Identity," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18, 302-318.

Malt, B. and E. E. Smith (1984), "Correlated Properties in Natural Categories," *Journal of Natural Language and Verbal Behavior*, 23(2), 250-269.

Markus, Hazel, and Elissa Wurf (1987), "The Dynamic Self-Concept: A Social Psychological Perspective," *Annual Review of Psychology*, 38, 299–337.

Mazodier, Marc, Conor M. Henderson, and Joshua T. Beck (2018) "The long reach of sponsorship: How fan isolation and identification jointly shape sponsorship performance." *Journal of Marketing* 82, 28-48.

Medin, Douglas L., and Andrew Ortony (1989), Psychological essentialism. in *Similarity and*

- 1
2
3 *Analogical Reasoning*, S. Vosniadou & A. Ortony eds., Cambridge, MA: Cambridge
4
5 University Press, 179–196.
6
7
8 Molouki, Sarah, Stephanie Y. Chen, Oleg Urminsky, and Daniel M. Bartels (2020), “How
9
10 Personal Theories of the Self Shape Beliefs About Identity Continuity,” in *Becoming*
11
12 *Someone New: Essays on Transformative Experience, Choice, and Change*, Enoch
13
14 Lambert and John Schwenkler, eds. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 52-73.
15
16
17 Moreau, C. Page, Arthur B. Markman, and Donald R. Lehmann (2001), ““What is it?”
18
19 Categorization Flexibility and Consumers' Responses to Really New Products,” *Journal*
20
21 *of Consumer Research* 27(4), 489-498.
22
23
24 Murphy, Gregory L., and Douglas L. Medin (1985), “The Role of Theories in Conceptual
25
26 Coherence,” *Psychological Review*, 92(3), 289.
27
28
29 Nichols, Shaun and Michael Bruno (2010), “Intuitions about Personal Identity: An Empirical
30
31 Study,” *Philosophical Psychology*, 23(3), 293–312.
32
33
34 Oyserman, Daphna (2009), “Identity-Based Motivation and Consumer Behavior,” *Journal of*
35
36 *Consumer Psychology*, 19, 276-279.
37
38
39 Reed II, Americus (2004), “Activating the Self-Importance of Consumer Selves: Exploring
40
41 Identity Salience Effects on Judgments,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31(2), 286-295.
42
43
44 Reed II, Americus and Mark Forehand (2016), “The Ebb and Flow of Consumer Identities: The
45
46 Role of Memory, Emotions, and Threats,” *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 10, 94-100.
47
48
49 Reed II, Americus, Mark Forehand, Stefano Puntoni, and Luk Warlop (2012), “Identity-Based
50
51 Consumer Behavior,” *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 29(4), 310-321.
52
53
54 Rehder, Bob (2003), “A Causal-Model Theory of Conceptual Representation and
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 *Cognition*, 29(6), 1141-59.
- 4
5 Rehder, Bob and Reid Hastie (2001), "Causal Knowledge and Categories: The Effects of Causal
6
7 Beliefs on Categorization, Induction, and Similarity," *Journal of Experimental*
8
9 *Psychology: General*, 130(3), 323-360.
- 10
11 Shang, Jen, Americus Reed II, and Rachel Croson (2008), "Identity Congruency Effects on
12
13 Donations," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 45, 351-361.
- 14
15 Sloman, Steven, Bradley C. Love, and Ahn Woo-Kyoung (1998), "Feature Centrality and
16
17 Conceptual Coherence," *Cognitive Science*, 22(2), 189-228.
- 18
19 Strohminger, Nina, and Shaun Nichols (2014), "The Essential Moral Self," *Cognition* 131, 159-
20
21 171.
- 22
23 _____ (2015), "Neurodegeneration and Identity," *Psychological Science*, 26, 1469-1479.
- 24
25 Smith, Edward E., and Douglas L. Medin (1981), *Categories and Concepts*. Cambridge, MA:
26
27 Harvard University Press.
- 28
29 Turner, John C (1985), "Social Categorization and the Self-Concept: A social cognitive theory of
30
31 group behavior," in *Advances in group processes: Theory and Research (Vol 2)*, ed. E. J.
32
33 Lawler, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 77-122.
- 34
35 Tversky, Amos (1977), "Features of Similarity," *Psychological Review*, 84(4), 327-352.
- 36
37 Urminsky, Oleg (2017) "The Role of 'Psychological Connectedness to the Future Self' in
38
39 Decisions Over Time," *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 26, 34-39.
- 40
41 Urminsky, Oleg and Berkeley Dietvorst (forthcoming), "Taking the Full Measure: Integrating
42
43 Replication into Research Practice to Assess Generalizability," *Journal of Consumer*
44
45 *Research*.
- 46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

HEADINGS LIST

- 1) THEORETICAL DEVELOPMENT
- 2) Social Categories, Identity Importance, and Choice
- 2) Representation of the Self-Concept
- 2) Causally Central Aspects of the Self
- 2) The Role of Causes and Effects in Causal Conceptualization of the Self-Concept
- 2) Causal Centrality as an Explanation of Identity Importance and Identity-Consistent Behavior
- 1) STUDIES 1A AND 1B: CAUSAL CENTRALITY OF THE BRAND-USER IDENTITY
- 2) Method
- 3) *Participants*
- 3) *Screeners and Design*
- 3) *Choice Task*
- 3) *Measuring Causal Centrality*
- 3) *Measuring Non-Causal Associations (study 1A only)*
- 3) *Measuring Self-Brand Connection*
- 2) Study 1A Results
- 3) *Descriptive Statistics*
- 3) *Relationship Between Causal Centrality and Brand Choice*
- 3) *Distinguishing Causal Centrality from Non-Causal Associative Links*
- 3) *Mediation Analysis*
- 2) Study 1B Results
- 2) Discussion
- 1) STUDY 2: CAUSAL CENTRALITY AND WILLINGNESS TO PAY WHEN IDENTITY SALIENCE IS HIGH
- 2) Method
- 3) *Participants*
- 3) *Procedure*
- 2) Results
- 3) *Relationship Between Causal Centrality and Willingness to Pay*
- 3) *Identity Importance as a Mediator*
- 2) Discussion
- 1) STUDY 3: MANIPULATING CAUSAL CENTRALITY
- 2) Method
- 3) *Participants*
- 3) *Procedure*
- 2) Results
- 3) *Effect of the Causal Centrality Manipulation on Importance*
- 3) *Effect of the Causal Centrality Manipulation on WTP*
- 3) *Mediation Analysis*
- 2) Discussion
- 1) STUDY 4: IDENTITY SALIENCE AND CAUSAL CENTRALITY
- 2) Method
- 3) *Participants*
- 3) *Procedure*
- 2) Results

- 3) *Effect of the Saliency Manipulation on Causal Centrality*
- 3) *Effect of the Saliency Manipulation on Product Choices*
- 3) *Relationship Between Causal Centrality and Product Choices*
- 3) *Relationship Between Causal Centrality, Saliency, and Product Choice*
- 3) *Relationship Between Causal Centrality and Product Choice Over Time*
- 2) Discussion
- 1) STUDY 5: THE STABILITY OF CAUSAL CENTRALITY IN PREDICTING CHOICES
- 2) Method
- 3) *Participants*
- 3) *Design*
- 3) *Part 1*
- 3) *Part 2*
- 2) Results
- 3) *Effect of Identity Saliency on Product Choice*
- 3) *Relationship Between Environmentalist Causal Centrality and Choice*
- 3) *Mediation Analysis*
- 2) Discussion
- 1) STUDY 6: QUALITY TRADE-OFFS
- 2) Method
- 3) *Participants*
- 3) *Procedure*
- 2) Results
- 2) Discussion
- 1) GENERAL DISCUSSION
- 2) Theoretical Implications
- 2) Future Directions

Accepted Manuscript
(not copy edited or formatted)
Use DOI when citing or quoting