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The purpose of this study was to investigate some social psychological factors related to consumer behavior. Attitudes toward the purchase of small cars and foreign cars were studied as a function of self-percept. Some of the correlates of self-percept were investigated.

To measure an aspect of self-percept, a 16 item Likerttype scale was developed. Scores were used as a basis for classifying each respondent in one of three categories:

1) "cautious-conservative"
2) "middle-of-the-roader"
3) "confident-explorer"

As possible correlates of self-percept the following characteristics were measured: age, sex, income, education, and previous car ownership.

Evidence was found to support the following conclusions:

1) Self-percept--the "cautious-conservative" person expresses preference for a smaller type of car, an American made compact car, and a small car as a second car choice.
2) Age--the age group 20-29 prefers foreign cars; the 30-39 age group is divided in its preference; the 40-49 age group prefers a larger car; and those 50 and over are favorable towards a smaller car.
3) Sex--women have more favorable attitudes toward small model cars than men, and express a decided preference for an American made car. Women are more likely to see themselves as being "cautious-conservative."
4) Income--respondents in the higher income brackets are more likely to prefer a big car. If they do express preference for a small car it is often for a foreign make.
5) Education--although respondents at all educational levels express preference for small cars there is a slight tendency for men who have completed high school but do not have any additional education to prefer large cars.
6) Previous car ownership--among men, previous car ownership plays an important role in attitudes toward cars. Those who have had the same car for five years or more are reluctant to change to a different manufacturer and are hesitant to accept a small car. Women do not demonstrate this "brand loyalty" trait.
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## INTRODUCTION

"The wanton consumption of horsepower in propelling heavy motor vehicles portends disaster. Investigations have shown that the average automobile carries, on its everyday travels, the equivalent of only one and onehalf persons. The streets of our large cities are absurdly congested with these great empty vehicles. The wise automobile manufacturer reads, along the road of progress, signs that point the way to a smaller, lighter, less expensive car" (19). Kettering made this statement in 1924, and although his prediction has only recently been corroborated, it nonetheless shows that during the early stages of the automotive industry, the compact car received consideration. During the late 1930's American Motors sensed the forthcoming demand for small cars and, as a result, initiated a study of "personal transportation" (11). This study was designed to develop a new idea of automotive functionalism--an attempt to satisfy the demands of American car buyers while simultaneously trying to adapt cars to the growing traffic congestion, suburban developments, and crowded parking facilities, In September, 1950, Kaiser-Fraser, with the introduction of the Henry $J$,
brought the small car to the attention of the general public. There were a number of attempts to introduce a small American car, but it was not until the impact of the small European car was felt that the American compact was produced on a large scale and accepted.

During the 1940 's, particularly after the war, most carowning families used their automobiles for pleasure trips, for a day's driving or, less often, for extended vacations. By the 1950's highways had become more crowded while the cost of living reached new heights. The car now faced new competition--airlines attracted many passengers for vacation and business flights. In addition, the motor vehicle was, to a noticeable extent, being replaced as a symbol of social status (ll). Resort vacations and private swimming pools were becoming new symbols of affluence, and parents were becoming more concerned with providing their children with higher education.

The automobile market during the 1950's showed a rapid rise in sales of foreign cars. The graph on page 3 shows the tremendous upsurge of imports compared with the decline of exports during the same period of time.


A report presented at the Society of Automotive Engineers meeting held January 11-15, 1960 revealed that approximately $10 \%$ of the total domestic market, or 500,000 cars, were imported in 1959--a figure ten times greater than the number imported in 1955, only four years earlier. In marked contrast, exports of American built passenger cars declined from 210,000 units in 1955 to 110,000 units in 1959 (24).

The boom in small car sales was not restricted to foreign imports. Here in the United States, American manufacturers produced their compacts. The revolutionary trend in the automobile market, having been initiated by the increase in foreign imports, was thus given further impetus. It moved with such speed and suddenness that the preference for new compacts exceeded original expectations and took the automobile industry by surprise. The new American-built compact cars have become the sensation of the current market. During the first four weeks of 1960 , sales of United States-produced compacts accounted for about 1 out of 5 new cars sold (24), surpassing earlier predictions of a $10 \%$ market. Some car manufacturers believe that within three to five years, half of all the new cars made in the United States will be compacts.

This brief review of some trends in the automotive industry suggests the subject of this inquiry; what are some factors related to consumer interest in small cars? Economic considerations suggest themselves as the primary motivation. The American public, having for years demanded bigger and more expensive cars, has now turned to the smaller counterparts that are less expensive to operate. The American public seems to be interested primarily in buying basic transportation. Size, engine power, and to a certain extent, prestige value seem no longer the decisive factors in car buying. Rather, the consuming public now seems to put less emphasis on style and instead asks for economy of operation and low initial cost, coupled with compactness, ease of handling, and use of parking. These seem to represent the major factors in the current success of the compacs and imports.

## The Research Problem

The problem of this study was to examine the factors directly related to indicated preference for an American vs. a foreign car and for a large vs. a small compact car. More specifically, the aim was to investigate additional factors related to choice of cars.

To provide some information related to this problem, a questionnaire study was conducted in which it was planned that material would be gathered to give insight into some aspects of consumer behavior relevant to car buying. The setting of the study was Woodside, Long Island--a convenient location because it was near the author's home and was assumed to be representative of middle class neighborhoods in the New York area. The number of interviews (250) was specified in advance, as being an appropriate number for the data analysis planned. All interviews were taken by the author in a manner to be described later.

The general finding of this study is that there is a relation between self-concept and types of cars preferred. It was found that those classified as "cautious conservatives" (see page 21 for explanation of this term) are more apt to express a preference for a small, American made compact car.

It was also shown that there is a difference between the sexes as to types of cars preferred. Women, considering themselves more conservative, express greater approval of small cars than do men. They overwhelmingly favor an American made compact car--much more than men do. Relationships were also found between types of cars preferred
and age, income, education, and previous car ownership. The following chapters include discussions of the sample, the technique used in interviewing, the data processing, and the findings of the study.

## Some Theory Concerning Consumer Behavior

Contrary to the assumption of many unobservant and unthinking consumers, the problems involved in buying are many. It goes without saying that spending depends both on ability to buy and on willingness to buy. Even further, the consumer is faced with the problems of l) where to buy, 2) when to buy, 3) when to pay for the goods. When buying a car the possible purchaser must further overcome some self-posed problems such as: l) Is it a good time to buy now or should I wait? 2) Might it not be better to buy other needed consumer goods?

Hayes (9) differentiates the psychological approach of studying behavior from the economic or the statistical approach. The important differences of the psychological approach are:

1) Data are sought concerning the behavior of the individual.
2) Data are sought by going DIRECTLY to the individual and not on relying on statistical records.
3) ALL kinds of habits, attitudes, and motivations are considered, not simply profit-seeking.
4) Consideration is given to the ways in which attitudes and motivations CHANGE, and the techniques that might be useful in changing them.

The methodology of this study coincides with the approach described above and uses these four factors as a basis for explaining car buying behavior.

Hayes goes on to say that the investigation of economic behavior must include the discoveries of:

1) What persons are active and influential in making significant economic decisions? What kinds of interaction are involved in the processes of decision-making?
2) What attitudes, beliefs, expectations, habits, knowledge, and motives are important, and how influential are they in each decision-making situation? Both of these points are essential to the theme of this project.

There are few clear and direct relationships between the immediate circumstances of a purchase and the purchase itself. Intervening variables mediate between the offer to sell and the purchase. As a result of past experience, motives, attitudes, and habits intervene and help the consumer evaluate the circumstances and shape his reactions
to them. Behavior is often multimotivated. When we make a decision it may be due to the interaction among, and influence of, several motivational forces.

Motives, or incentives to action, arise from desires. This desire implies that something is lacking, and a mental image of the substance that will ultimately fulfill this desire emerges. With these mental pictures we imagine the pleasures and satisfactions we would derive from the possible possession of whatever the desired product may be. Each individual has many desires which vary in number, character, and strength from time to time and under different circumstances. When a person is confronted with equal desires at the same time he faces the problems mentioned previously, and must resolve the problem in some manner. The decisions of buyers vary from individual to individual. In the course of development, each individual comes more and more to be characterized by his inherent preferences. He gradually exerts his preference toward people and things in ways that are to hold greater significance for himself and others. The important fact to note is that he has basic propensities that become stronger in some directions than in others.

From this follows the statement by Ferber and Wales: "It is apparent that any buying process is an interaction between the personality of the individual and the so-called personality of the product itself" (6). These authors say that a car, or any product, has to accomplish certain purposes--but how each individual decides which particular auto can best fulfill the job becomes a personal expression of the individual. Therefore, the chosen brand is an expression of what one thinks he is--or wants to be. Here, as before, a simple relationship between kinds of buyers and kinds of cars is denied and it is stated that "any human is a complex of many motives--his practical aims, economic limitations, personal characteristics, and his social pressures. All of the motives should be seen as patterns with predominant and subsidiary meaning which may vary in countless combinations" (6). Katona (13) further substantiates the importance of multiple motivation by offering figures to show that income, in itself, plays a small role in the kind of car bought.

The problem of this study is to analyze and identify some of the complex interrelated factors that may influence this important purchase decision. To do this it is not only necessary to test such independent variables as sex,
age, income, and education, but it is vital to determine a person's self-concept--where self-concept is taken to mean "the fullest description of himself of which a person is capable at any given time" (5). A person's self-concept is developed as a result of the interplay between the endowments of the individual and the environment in which he lives. A person usually derives satisfaction from identification with some group, by which he attains status. If his abilities permit this identification is strengthened, but if obstacles are encountered identification may be interfered with, the self-concept may be changed, a new group identification may take place, and a new pattern of interests may evolve. It is these patterns of events about which this project focused much of its attention. The study is designed to bring out the subjects' self-concepts and relate these concepts to the type of automobile preferred.

## HOW THE STUDY WAS DONE

## The Population Studied

The population consists of adults in a middle class Long Island residential community. It was chosen because it was readily available to the author of the study, who knew the characteristics of the neighborhood and had reason to believe he could conduct the study successfully in the area.

The choice behavior to be examined, deciding between an American or foreign car, or between a large or small car, was a realistic problem for an adult middle class group in this neighborhood, and the kind of population chosen is representative, in a common sense use of the term, of a relatively large segment of the potential car buying public in metropolitan areas of the United States.

## How the Sample Was Selected

The sample interviewed was randomly selected among residents of Woodside, New York. A complete street guide to Long Island City, listing all street and house numbers, was used. From this, an area on the map was marked off that included Woodside, Long Island, and within this area an arbitrary and impartial block was chosen as the starting
point. From this point every sixth dwelling unit was selected.

All "adult" members of each household were inter-viewed--the adult members being defined as those 21 years of age or older. Interviewing continued until 250 persons were reached, a number determined in advance as sufficient for the kind of analysis required in this study and for providing trustworthy evidence regarding the population.

## How Interviewing Was Done

Prior to conducting this study the questionnaire was pretested on middle class adults and students in the Lansing area. The 250 interviews for the study were then completed by the author during the period from June 23 to September 9, 1960. All the interviews were made during the evenings and on weekends. This enabled the interviewer to arrive at the selected house at an appropriate time for the male head of the family to be found at home, and at a time when the female is less occupied with her household duties.

The average number of interviews per household was 2.27. All adults, those 21 years of age or older, were interviewed--each separately and each without the other
member, or members, being present in the same room at the same time. Table 1 presents an analysis of the household size of the sample. If more than two persons of interviewing age were in a household, the person interviewed first was asked not to discuss the topic with those not yet questioned. Time was allotted so that no interviewing session would last too late and thereby necessitate its termination. Instead, time was apportioned so that there was no rush, and so that, if at home, all members of each household were interviewed on the same day. Tables 2, 3, and 4 present distributions of age, education, and income of the sample. In most cases those selected to be interviewed were at home. If not, however, a record was kept and these subjects were returned to at a later date, so that the outlined procedure was adhered to as strictly as possible. The refusal rate was rather small--only six different dwelling units-and this was handled by going to the sixth succeeding unit in each case. A total of 116 households were visited to provide data for the study.

Total time for each interview approximated 40 minutes. All questions were posed exactly as worded, in the order presented, with no attempt at explanation, and without elaboration of the wording. A copy of the questionnaire is found in the Appendix.

## Table 1

Household Size of Sample

| Size of household <br> (over 21) | Number of <br> households | Number of <br> persons | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 in family | 1 | 5 | $0.9 \%$ |
| 4 | 11 | 44 | 10.0 |
| 3 | 15 | 45 | 13.6 |
| 2 | 73 | 146 | 66.3 |
| 1 | 10 | 10 | 9.1 |

An average of 2.27 interviews per household

Table 2

Age of Sample

| Age | Male |  | Female |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| 20-24 | 15 | 11.5\% | 6 | 5.0\% | 21 | 8.4\% |
| 25-29 | 16 | 12.3 | 17 | 14.1 | 33 | 13.2 |
| 30-34 | 15 | 11.5 | 10 | 8.3 | 25 | 10.0 |
| 35-39 | 9 | 6.9 | 14 | 11.6 | 23 | 9.2 |
| 40-44 | 15 | 11.5 | 19 | 15.8 | 34 | 13.6 |
| 45-49 | 29 | 22.3 | 30 | 25.0 | 59 | 23.6 |
| 50-54 | 20 | 15.3 | 13 | 10.8 | 33 | 13.2 |
| 55-59 | 7 | 5.3 | 6 | 5.0 | 13 | 5.2 |
| 60 \& over | 4 | 3.0 | 5 | 4.1 | 9 | 3.6 |
| Total | 130 | 100\% | 120 | 100\% | 250 | 100\% |
| Mean | 40.53 |  | 41.23 |  | 40.85 |  |

Table 3
Education of Sample

|  | Male |  | Female |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| 1) Completed college | 54 | 41.5\% | 27 | 22.5\% | 81 | 32.4\% |
| 2) Some college | 22 | 16.9 | 12 | 10.0 | 34 | 13.6 |
| 3) Completed high school and no more | 44 | 33.8 | 58 | 48.3 | 102 | 40.8 |
| 4) Some high school, didn't finish | 9 | 6.9 | 23 | 19.1 | 32 | 12.8 |
| 5) Grade school | 1 | . 8 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.4 |
| Total | 130 | 100\% | 120 | 100\% | 250 | 100\% |
| Mean | 2.1 |  | 2.64 |  | 2.36 |  |
| Standard deviation | 1.04 |  | 1.03 |  | 1.12 |  |

## Table 4

Income of Sample

|  | Male |  | Female |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| 0) Didn't work | 0 | . $0 \%$ | 79 | 65.8\% | 79 | 31.6\% |
| 1) Under \$1,000 | 2 | 1.5 | 11 | 9.1 | 13 | 5.2 |
| 2) $\$ 1,000-1,999$ | 5 | 3.8 | 8 | 6.6 | 13 | 5.2 |
| 3) $\$ 2,000-2,999$ | 2 | 1.5 | 10 | 8.3 | 12 | 4.8 |
| 4) $\$ 3,000-3,999$ | 3 | 2.3 | 0 | . 0 | 3 | 1.2 |
| 5) $\$ 4,000-4,999$ | 7 | 5.3 | 6 | 5.0 | 13 | 5.2 |
| 6) $\$ 5,000-7,499$ | 56 | 43.0 | 3 | 2.5 | 59 | 23.6 |
| 7) $\$ 7,500-9,999$ | 29 | 22.3 | 0 | . 0 | 29 | 11.6 |
| 8) $\$ 10,000 \&$ over | 26 | 20.0 | 3 | 2.5 | 29 | 11.6 |
| Total | 130 | 100\% | 120 | 100\% | 250 | 100\% |
| Mean | 6.24 |  | 1.07 |  | 3.76 |  |
| Standard deviation | 1.50 |  | 1.93 |  | 3.16 |  |

## How the Data Were Processed

As was seen previously the method used for obtaining the necessary data was a guided personal interview. As a part of the interview, the respondent filled out a questionnaire form.

The interview guide (see appendix) consisted of four major divisions. The first section consisted of 16 Likert type items and was developed by the author and Dr. Eugene Jacobson. The 16 items were designed to produce evidence about the respondent's self-percept in four areas:

1) conservatism or openhandedness in the use of money
2) acceptance of new ideas
3) mastery of the contemporary world
4) identification with youth

The second and third sections of the interview dealt with the history of car buying and attitudes toward cars.

The final section requested personal background information about the subject's age, education, and income.

In the first part of the interview, the respondents were handed the questionnaire and asked to indicate their preference among the five alternatives in the 16 item selfpercept scale. Upon completion of this section the
questionnaire was returned to the interviewer who asked all the remaining questions. A complete record was kept for all interviews with notes taken during the interview and, if necessary, expanded immediately after the interviewing session. Codes were developed to categorize responses to open-ended questions.

The study made use of a self-percept measure--and measured one aspect of self-percept. This 16 item selfpercept scale was designed in such a way that on an a priori basis it could be assumed that responses would be indicative of relative degree of perception of one's self as an open, adventurous, confident, ready to take a chance kind of person. On the same basis the opposite kind of response could be taken as an indication that the person conceived himself as cautious, unwilling to take risks, conservative, and somewhat apprehensive about his ability to control his environment.

This study does not concern itself with the validity of these constructs. We have addressed ourselves to the question of the reliability of the measure and the extent to which scores on the scale are related to our other variables. Further investigation is necessary to support the labels we have assigned to responses to the scale.

The 16 items in the self-percept measure each have five possible alternatives, providing a possible range of scores from 16-80. Cut-off scores were established at three points to allow the respondents to be categorized as:
"cautious-conservatives" (up to a total score of 44)
"middle-of-the-roaders" (45-54)
"confident-explorers" (55-79)

Table 5 provides a distribution of scores with the cutoff points as indicated above. These cut-off points were selected to allow the extreme categories (the "cautiousconservatives" and "confident-explorers") to have approximately the same range within each category. Use was made of the above terms, instead of "conservative" or "liberal," to avoid political connotations.

A split-half reliability coefficient between the odd and even numbered items of this 16 item scale yielded a . 916 correlation when corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula.

As was noted before, the 16 item scale was intended to produce data about four aspects of self-concept. Intercorrelations among the four sub-sets of items show that the strongest relationship is between identification with youth and openhandedness in the use of money. Table 6 presents the sub-set intercorrelations.

Table 5

Self-percept Scores

|  | Score | Number |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Cautious-conservatives | $20-44$ | 86 |
| Middle-of-the-roaders | $45-54$ | 71 |
| Confident-explorers | $55-79$ | 93 |
| Total |  | 250 |

Table 6

Relationships Among Sub-sets of Items in
Self-percept Scale
Pearson-Product Moment N

|  | Identifi- <br> cation with <br> youth | Acceptance <br> of new <br> ideas | Liberal in <br> use of <br> money | Mastery of <br> contemporary <br> world |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New <br> ideas | .640 |  |  |  |
| Money <br> Contem- <br> porary <br> world | .686 | .635 |  |  |

The average intercorrelation among the subscales was . 565. Correcting this figure for the number of items by the Spearman-Brown formula, an estimate of the internal consistency of the 16 -item scale of .84 was obtained.

As mentioned earlier, the study was designed to investigate some factors affecting preference for a large car vs. a small compact car. The following variables were studied:

Dependent variable--attitudes toward cars
Independent variables-- 1) self-percept
2) age
3) sex
4) income
5) education
6) previous car ownership

It was hypothesized that each of these factors would play a role in the ultimate decision of the consumer.

A basic factor in expenditures is the distribution of disposable income within the family. However, there are great differences between individuals that cannot be explained by their economic circumstances. People have different standards of living, and different patterns of needs. Some save much out of low incomes while others save nothing out of large incomes.

Younger people, according to Morgan (17), have some major reasons why they might wish to keep some of each year's income for future use:

1) because income and needs are both unpredictable, you might want some reserve for emergencies;
2) there are forseeable needs for large expenditures: rearing and education of children, accumulation of household equipment, purchase of a car, housing expenses, vacations, and other necessities and luxuries for which you must save;
3) you may want to accumulate some estate to hand on to your children.

These reasons are important considerations in the possible purchase of a car. This purchase involves a large expenditure, concentrated in time, and is particularly heavy for young families that have other financial pressures and an income that may not be more than adequate.

Besides the factor of whether or not a person can afford a car, it is important to know if a person wants to spend the money if he does have it. The amount of money spent on a certain type of car is very likely to give some indication of a person's attitudes towards money. That is, a person who has been conservative with monetary matters throughout his life is very unlikely to become extravagant and purchase the most expensive model car. Instead, a person is more apt to continue to follow his
usual pattern of behavior regarding money. What one spends depends a great deal on what a person thinks he is and on what he wants others to think he is. So, if a person thinks himself a "conservative," he will, most probably, try to save on a purchase. In a car, therefore, the "conservative" person will plan to buy a cheaper brand and one that may be less expensive to operate.

The first factor taken into consideration, therefore, is the variable of self-percept, the attitudes a person has about himself. A quotation by Ferber and Wales has already been cited showing that there is "interaction between the personality of the individual and the so-called personality of the product itself." To obtain information about each person's attitudes towards himself, use was made of the 16 item self-percept scale which allowed us to distinguish between those who could be classified as "cautious conservatives," "middle-of-the-roaders," and "confident explorers."

Popular discussions of car buying suggest that one attribute of compact car owners is that they are conser-vative--with conservative according to dictionary (7) definition meaning "preservative." The first hypothesis formulated, then, was:

PERSONS WHO CONSIDER THEMSELVES CONSERVATIVE ARE MORE APT TO EXPRESS A PREFERENCE FOR A SMALL CAR.

Continuing along the same line it is hypothesized that:

A CONSERVATIVE SELF-PERCEPT LEADS TOWARD A MORE
FAVORABLE VIEW OF AN AMERICAN MADE COMPACT CAR RATHER THAN A FOREIGN MADE.

The reasoning behind this was that an American car is popularly regarded as being more conservative than a foreign car. The impression is that an American compact car has a more "reserved" appearance whereas some foreign cars are considered to be more "conspicuous." It is important to note that when speaking of a small car and a foreign make car we are not talking about the same thing. The small car is taken to mean an "American compact" type and is thought of as lending a more "conservative" appearance than do the foreign models. By foreign model, is meant the more common types as the Volkswagon and Renault rather than the sports car models and the more expensive brands.

Although these foreign models are often equivalent in price to the American compacts they still are the more conspicuous and generally demand more attention.

To test the first hypothesis (conservatives prefer a smaller type car) we used the self-percept scale and the question:
"Are your feelings concerning small cars:

```
Very favorable
Somewhat favorable
Neutral
Somewhat unfavorable
Very unfavorable
```

Table 7 shows that the data support the hypothesis. Percentages favoring smaller cars decrease in the predicted order, with the highest percentage (favoring a small car) among the "cautious conservative" group. This relationship is seen to hold true for men, women and total group (see Tables 7, 8, and 9). For the total group 79\% of the "cautious conservatives" express favorable feelings towards a smaller type car as compared with $49 \%$ of the "confident explorers." Results are significant at the .Ol level indicating that conservatives are, in fact, more apt to express preference for a smaller car.

The hypothesis that conservatives prefer an American made car was tested by relating self-percept to the question:
"If you bought a small car would you be more apt to purchase an:

American brand Foreign brand Don't know

Table 10 includes all 250 interviews and illustrates that those classified as "cautious conservatives" express preference for an American rather than a foreign car--whereas

Table 7
Self-Percept and Attitudes Towards
Small Cars (Total) N=250

|  | Cautious conservative |  | Middle-of-the-roader |  | Confidentexplorer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N |
| Favorable | 79.0\% | 68 | 57. $7 \%$ | 41 | 49.4\% | 46 |
| Neutral | 10.4 | 9 | 8.4 | 6 | 8.6 | 8 |
| Unfavorable | 10.4 | 9 | 33.8 | 24 | 41.9 | 39 |
| Total | 100\% | 86 | 100\% | 71 | 100\% | 93 |

$$
x^{2}=22.51, \quad P<.01
$$

Table 8

Self-percept and Attitudes Toward
Small Cars (Men) N=130

|  | Cautious conservative <br> \% <br> N |  | Middle-of-the-roader |  | Confidentexplorer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Favorable | 70.6\% | 24 | 44.1\% | 15 | 38.7\% | 24 |
| Neutral | 5.8 | 2 | 8.8 | 3 | 9.6 | 6 |
| Unfavorable | 23.5 | 8 | 47.0 | 16 | 51.5 | 32 |
| Total | 100\% | 34 | 100\% | 34 | 100\% | 62 |

$x^{2}=8.7, P<.01$.

Table 9
Self-percept and Attitudes Toward

$$
\text { Small Cars (Women) } N=120
$$

|  | Cautious conservative |  | Middle-of-the-roader |  | Confidentexplorer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | N | \% |  | \% | N |
| Favorable | 84.6\% | 44 | 70.2\% | 26 | 70.9\% | 22 |
| Neutral | 13.4 | 7 | 8.1 | 3 | 6.4 | 2 |
| Unfavorable | 1.9 | 1 | 21.6 | 8 | 22.6 | 7 |
| Total | 100\% | 52 | 100\% | 37 | 100\% | 31 |

$$
x^{2}=10.20, P<.01
$$

the "confident explorer" is more likely to approve of a foreign car. Again, there is a breakdown of the sexes so as to get a more comprehensive view of the results. Since only four women expressed any preference for a foreign car (see Table ll) there is little room for discussion here, except to say that among women there is an overall positive feeling toward an American brand car. It is interesting, however, that all four women who expressed preferences for a foreign make fell in the "confident explorer" category. The men's results (see Table 12) show that $40 \%$ of the men classified as "cautious conservatives" express preference for an American made car while $23 \%$ of the "confident explorers" reply in the same manner.

Conversely, $83 \%$ of the men classified as "confident explorers" indicate their preference for a foreign make as contrasted to only $6 \%$ of the "cautious conservatives."

Analyzing our results further than just the examination of the hypotheses, another relationship, falling along the same lines of these previous two, was discovered to further characterize the people within these three designated groups. This was (see Table 13) that the "cautious conservative" group voices stronger support for a smaller car as a second car choice (this was shown for men, women, and total

Table 10

Self-percept and preference for an American or Foreign Type Small Car (Total)

|  | Cautiousconservative |  | Middle-of-the-roader |  | Confidentexplorer |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | N | \% |  |  |  | \% | N |
| American | 41.9\% | 59 | 34.2\% | 49 | 24.4\% | 35 | 100\% | 143 |
| Foreign | 5.8 | 3 | 9.8 | 5 | 84.3 | 43 | 100 | 51 |
| Don't know | 41.0 | 23 | 28.5 | 16 | 30.3 | 17 | 100 | 56 |

$$
\mathrm{N}=250
$$

$$
x^{2}=31.0, P<.01
$$

Table 11
Self-percept and Preference for an American or Foreign Type Small Car (Women)

|  | Cautiousconservative |  | Middle-of-the-roader |  | Confidentexplorer |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% |  |  |  | \% | N | \% | N |
| American | 41.6\% |  | 33.3\% | 32 | 25\% | 24 | 100\% | 94 |
| Foreign | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 4 | 100 | 4 |
| Don't <br> know | 50 | 10 | 25 | 5 | 25 | 5 | 100 | 20 |
| $N=120$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 12

Self-percept and Preference for an American or Foreign Type Small Car (Men)

|  | Cautiousconservative <br> \% <br> N |  | Middle-of-the-roader <br> \% <br> N |  | Confidentexplorer <br> \% <br> N |  | Tota |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| American | 40.4\% |  | 36.1\% | 17 | 23.4\% | 11 | 100\% | 47 |
| Foreign | 6.4 | 3 | 10.6 | 5 | 82.9 | 39 | 100 | 47 |
| Don't know | 36.1 |  | 30.5 |  | 33.3 | 12 | 100 | 36 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 130 |
| $x^{2}=37.8, P<.01$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 13

Self-percept and Second Car Choice (Total)

|  | Cautiousconservative <br> \% <br> N |  | Middle-of-the-roader \% N |  | Confidentexplorer <br> \% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Small | 86\% | 74 | 66.2\% | 47 | 53.7\% | 50 |
| Big | 14 | 12 | 33.8 | 24 | 46.3 | 43 |
| Total | 100\% | 86 | 100\% | 71 | 100\% | 93 |

$\mathrm{N}=250$
$x^{2}=21.74, \quad P<.01$

Table 13A
Self-percept and Second Car Choice (Men)

|  | Cautiousconservative <br> \% <br> N |  | Middle-of-the-roader |  | Confidentexplorer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Small | 70.58\% | 24 | 55.88\% |  | 45.16\% | 28 |
| Big | 29.42 | 10 | 44.12 | 15 | 54.84 | 34 |
| Total | 100\% | 34 | 100\% | 34 | 100\% | 62 |

$$
N=130
$$

$$
x^{2}=8.99, \quad P<.02
$$

Table 13B

Self-percept and Second Car Choice (Women)

|  | Cautiousconservative <br> \% <br> N |  | Middle-of-the-roader |  | Confidentexplorer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Small | 96.15\% | 50 | 75.4 | 28 | 70.96\% | 22 |
| Big | 3.85 | 2 | 24.6 | 9 | 29.04 | 9 |
| Total | 100\% | 52 | 100\% | 37 | 100\% | 31 |

$$
N=120
$$

$x^{2}=10.9, P<.01$
with the total group recording an $86 \%-54 \%$ favoring of a smaller car as the second car choice).

The "cautious conservative," then, is characterized by the preference for:

1) a smaller model rather than a big car
2) an American brand compact car
3) a small car as a second car choice.

To fully understand a person's self-percept, however, we must look at the other variables, as there is little doubt that self-concept is related to age, sex, income, and education.

A most interesting finding of this study was the large difference between the sexes on attitudes toward cars in general-and smaller type cars in particular. It is readily seen in Table 14 that women have a more positive attitude towards small cars, when asked:
"Are your feelings concerning small cars:"
Very favorable Somewhat favorable Neutral
Somewhat unfavorable Very unfavorable

Seventy-seven per cent of the women express some form of favorable feeling toward a small car in general--a far greater percentage than that of the men (48\%).

Table 14

Sex and Attitudes Toward Small Cars

|  | Favorable |  | Neutral |  | Unfavorable |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N |
| Men | 48\% | 63 | 8\% | 11 | 43\% | 56 | 100\% | 130 |
| Women | 77\% | 92 | 10\% | 12 | 13.5\% | 16 | 100\% | 120 |
| $x^{2}=27.08, \mathrm{P}$ (.01 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 15

Sex and Type of Small Car If Bought $\mathrm{N}=250$

|  | American |  | Foreign |  | Don't know |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N |
| Men | * $50 \%$ | 47 | 50\% | 47 | - | 36 |
| Women | * $96 \%$ | 96 | 4 | 4 | - | 20 |
| Total |  | 143 |  | 51 |  | 56 |

*Percentage of those who expressed a preference. $x^{2}=52.9, \quad \mathrm{P}<.01$

Table 16

Sex and Second Car Choice

|  | Small |  | Big |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | N | \% | N |  |
| Men | 55\% | 71 | 45\% | 59 | 100\% |
| Women | 83\% | 100 | 17\% | 20 | 100\% |
| Total |  | 171 |  | 79 | $\mathrm{N}=250$ |
| $x^{2}=23.8, \quad p<.01$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Another result illustrating the large difference between the sexes is shown in the responses to the question:
"If you bought a small car would you be more apt to purchase an:"

American brand Foreign brand Don't know

Table 15 shows that whereas $96 \%$ of the women expressing a preference desire an American brand, only $50 \%$ of the men do.

A third large difference between the sexes is shown in Table 16 (see discussion of economic variable later on for a more detailed discussion of this hypothesis) where data are presented which support the hypothesis that:

A SMALLER CAR IS PREFERRED TO A BIG CAR AS A SECOND FAMILY CAR BY BOTH SEXES.

These data indicate that $83 \%$ of the women as against $55 \%$ of the men prefer the smaller type car.

We have found, in summary, that women:

1) have far greater preferences for small model cars than do men;
2) prefer an American brand car to a foreign make;
3) would rather have a small car as a second car choice.

The relationships between car preference and sex, and car preferences and self-percept scores, suggest that women's

## Table 17

Sex and Self-percept

| Cautious- <br> conservative <br> $\%$ | Midale-of- <br> the-roader | Confident- <br> explorer | Total |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Men | $26.1 \%$ | 34 | $26.1 \%$ | 34 | 47.67 | 62 | $100 \%$ |

self-percept is more likely to be "cautious conservative" as compared to men. This is confirmed by Table 17.

Purdy reports that "women dislike big cars on the ground they are hard to park, awkward to drive, and outrageously uneconomic. And nearly all women prefer automatic transmission, power brakes, and power steering" (19). Recorded results of both the direct and open-ended questions in the questionnaire substantiate this observation and give further information on the relationship found above that women tend toward the "cautious conservative" group. Economy is seen as the main reason for women's (and men's) positive feelings toward a small car.

Over $20 \%$ of the women list automatic transmission as one of the main reasons for preferring an American brand. Women generally use a car for shopping and driving children to school--processes which mean driving in traffic. Automatic transmission makes this type of driving easier.

Familiarity with American brand names (19.1\%) is also an important factor for women, as is the idea that it is easier to get repairs for an American brand. The latter idea is prevalent in the thinking of many men (23.3\%) and women (19.1\%). Another very significant reason given, especially by women, is that "they have more confidence in

American products and that we should buy American." This reason was given by $32.5 \%$ of the women.

For both sexes the main reason for a favorable attitude toward a small car is economy. Ninety-seven per cent of the women expressing either a somewhat favorable or very favorable feeling toward a small car mentioned economy as one of the main reasons. Ninety per cent of the men used the same reason. So, although a decidedly larger percentage of women than men favor a smaller car, the major reason is the same for both men and women.

Parking is also mentioned often (39.6\% for men and $47.8 \%$ for women) by both sexes as is the reason that a smaller car is good for neighborhood use $(34.9 \%$ of the men and 43.4\% of the women). Here, however, many of the men mentioning it use it in reference to a small car being a good type of car for their wives to have. The vast difference as to indicated choice between an American or foreign brand between the sexes is fairly readily explained.

## Women:

1) being more "conservative" lend their taste to the more conservative appearing American brand;
2) find automatic transmission more convenient;
3) have more faith in an "American product."

As far as age is concerned Table 18 shows that more of the youthful age groups--those in their 20's and 30's-have self-percept scores placing them in the category of "confident explorers." The subject's age is therefore seen to be another important factor in car attitudes. The data drawn from question \#l7 (feelings concerning small cars) shows that women, regardless of age, express a favorable attitude toward smaller cars and a decided preference for an American made car (see Table 19). The proportions in all age groups are high enough so that it can safely be said that the general overall view of the women is positively oriented in favor of a small American made car. The case for men is hardly as clear-cut in this respect. Men in the age groups of 20-29 and 50 and over generally express a positive feeling toward a smaller car, but the other groups give a dissenting picture. This is especially evident in the 40-49 year range where there is a rather common approval of a big car. The 50 and above group indicates a change in preference from the big car desired by those in the 40-49 age group.

The above results are again confirmed in responses to question \#23 (If he had the opportunity to buy a second car
Table 18


|  | 20-29 |  | 30-39 |  | 40-49 |  | 50-over |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N |
| Cautious-conservative | 4.6\% | 4 | 3.4\% | 3 | 53.5\% | 46 | 38.3\% | 33 | 100\% | 86 |
| Middle-of-the-road | 19.7 | 14 | 28.1 | 20 | 29.6 | 21 | 22.5 | 16 | 100 | 71 |
| Confident-explorer | 38.7 | 36 | 26.8 | 25 | 27.9 | 26 | 6.4 | 6 | 100 | 93 |

$N=250$
Table 18A
Self-percept as Related to Age (Men)

|  | 20-29 |  | 30-39 |  | 40-49 |  | 50-over |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N |
| Cautious-conservative | 2. $9 \%$ | 1 | 2. $9 \%$ | 1 | 47\% | 16 | 47\% | 16 | 100\% | 34 |
| Middle-of-the-road | 26.4 | 9 | 17.6 | 6 | 26.4 | 9 | 29.3 | 10 | 100 | 34 |
| Confident-explorer | 33.8 | 21 | 27.4 | 17 | 30.6 | 19 | 8.0 | 5 | 100 | 62 |

$N=120$

|  | 20-29 |  | 30-39 |  | 40-49 |  | 50-over |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N |
| Cautious-conservative | 5.7\% | 3 | 3.8\% | 2 | 57.7\% | 30 | 32.7\% | 17 | 100\% | 52 |
| Middle-of-the-road | 13.5 | 5 | 37.8 | 14 | 32.4 | 12 | 16.2 | 6 | 100\% | 37 |
| Confident-explorer | 48.4 | 15 | 25.8 | 8 | 22.5 | 7 | 3.2 | 1 | 100\% | 31 |

Table 19A
Age vs. Attitudes Towards Cars (Women) N=120
AGE

|  |  | 20-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-over |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Question \#25: If you bought a small car would you be more apt to buy: | American | 86.9\% | 79.1\% | 81.6\% | 83.3\% |
|  | Foreign | 43 | 4.1 | 2.0 | 0 |
|  | Don't know | 8.7 | 16.6 | 16.3 | 16.6 |
| Question \#25. Second car choice. | Small | 82.6\% | 87.5\% | 81.6\% | 87.5\% |
|  | Big | 17.3 | 12.5 | 18.3 | 12.5 |
| Question \$17. Feelings toward small cars: | Favorable | 82.6\% | 83.3\% | 69.3\% | 83.3\% |
|  | Neutral | 4.3 | 8.3 | 12.2 | 8.3 |
|  | Unfavorable | 13.0 | 8.3 | 18.3 | 8.3 |
|  | Total \% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  | $\mathrm{N}=$ | 23 | 24 | 49 | $24 \mathrm{~N}=120$ |


|  |  | $20-29$ | $30-39$ | $40-59$ | $50-$ over |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Question \#l5. If you bought a small <br> car would you be more apt to buy: | American | $25.8 \%$ | $37.4 \%$ | $31.8 \%$ | $51.6 \%$ |
|  | Foreign | 67.7 | 45.8 | 25 | 12.9 |
| Question \#25. Second car choice: | Don't know | 6.4 | 16.6 | 43.1 | 35.4 |

would it be big or small?) in which men and women follow the same pattern as above (see Table 12).

It has been shown above that the age group of 20-29 expresses positive approval of a small model car. On the surface this would seemingly indicate a conservative group. This is partially the case--but with good reason. A check of self-percept scores with open-end responses reveals the following to be the case; the 20-29 age group can be classified as a large proportion of the "confident explorers." However, as the quote from Morgan has already illustrated, these men are forced, by the necessity of providing for a young and growing family, to try to save money wherever they find it possible. Because of this we find the approval of a small--but foreign make--car.

As age advances, the emergence of a favorable attitude for the American brand is noted. An interesting thing to observe is the wide expression of approval given a big car by the 40-49 age group. This seems to indicate a person secure in vocation, leading a family life and facing the necessities (the need of extra space for the children) of some extra comfort within the car.

A person's education is another variable that was examined in relation to attitudes toward cars. Here we
again see that women of all educational levels are more favorable toward a small, American car (see Table 20).

The pattern among men is not as consistent, and the above discussion of male age and indicated preference is important here. We note that men having completed college or with some college background express slight approval of a foreign car, whereas those with only high school experience have mixed preferences, but tend to prefer the American made model.

An important item to observe here is the 19 listed "don't knows" for those men having completed only high school. Many of these responses were that they "wouldn't buy another brand." This shows leanings toward their present American made model. An important thing to remember is that those having completed college comprise the more youthful group in this sample--and although they "favor" a smaller type of car they nonetheless perceive themselves in such a manner as to be classified as "confident explorers"--and thus the positive expression for a foreign model.

The relationship between income and attitudes toward cars is seen in Table 21. Most of the women fall in the "don't work" category and, as is seen throughout this study,
Table 20A
Education vs. Attitudes Toward Small Cars (Total)

|  |  | Favorable | Neutral | Unfavorable | N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Completed college | Men | 53.7\% | 3.7\% | 42.6\% | 54 |
|  | Women | 85.1 | 3.7 | 11.1 | 27 |
|  | Total | 64.2 | 3.7 | 32.0 | 81 |
| Some college | Men | 50\% | 13.6\% | 36.3\% | 22 |
|  | Women | 50 | 8.3 | 41.6 | 12 |
|  | Total | 50 | 11.7 | 38.2 | 34 |
| Completed high school | Men | 43.1\% | 9.0\% | 47.7\% | 44 |
|  | Women | 72.4 | 15.5 | 12.0 | 58 |
|  | Total | 59.7 | 12.7 | 27.4 | 102 |
| Some high school | Men | 44.4\% | 22.2\% | 33.3\% | 9 |
|  | Women | 91.3 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 23 |
|  | Total | 78.1 | 19.3 | 12.5 | 32 |
| All else | Men | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 1 |
|  | Women | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total | 0 | 0 | 100 | 1 |
|  | Total | 155 | 23 | 72 | 250 |

## Table 20B

Education vs. Second Car Choice

|  | Small | Big | N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Completed college: |  |  |  |
| Men | 57.4\% | 42.6\% | 54 |
| Women | 88.8 | 11.2 | 27 |
| Total | 67.9 | 32.1 | 81 |
| Some college: |  |  |  |
| Men | 59.0\% | 41.0\% | 22 |
| Women | 66.6 | 33.3 | 12 |
| Total | 61.7 | 38.3 | 34 |
| Completed high school: |  |  |  |
| Men | 47.7\% | 52.3\% | 44 |
| Women | 81.0 | 19.0 | 58 |
| Total | 66.6 | 33.3 | 102 |
| Some high school: |  |  |  |
| Men | 55.5 | 44.5 | 9 |
| Women | 91.3 | 8.7 | 23 |
| Total | 81.2 | 18.8 | 32 |
| All else: |  |  |  |
| Men | 100\% | 0\% | 1 |
| Women | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 100 | 0 | 1 |
| Total $\mathrm{N}=$ | 171 | 79 | $\mathrm{N}=250$ |

Table 20C
Education vs. Small Car Purchase

|  |  | American | Foreign | Don't know | N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Completed college | Men | 37.0\% | 51.8\% | 11.1\% | 54 |
|  | Women | 74 | 11.1 | 14.8 | 27 |
|  | Total | 49.3 | 38.2 | 12.3 | 81 |
| Some college | Men | 36.3\% | 36.3\% | 27.3\% | 22 |
|  | Women | 75 | 0 | 25 | 12 |
|  | Total | 50 | 47 | 53 | 34 |
| Completed high school | Men | 34\% | 22.7\% | 43.1\% | 44 |
|  | Women | 84.4 | 1.7 | 13.8 | 58 |
|  | Total | 62.7 | 10.8 | 26.4 | 102 |
| Some high school | Men | 44.4\% | 11.1\% | 44.4 \% | 9 |
|  | Women | 78.2 | 0 | 21.7 | 23 |
|  | Total | 68.7 | 3.1 | 28.1 | 32 |
| All else | Men | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 1 |
|  | Women | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total | 0 | 0 | 100 | 1 |
|  | Total | 143 | 51 | 56 | 250 |

overwhelmingly favor a small, American car. For men, it is seen that among upper income bracket respondents a more favorable position is taken toward big cars. Foreign cars also receive a more positive preference among the higher income brackets. The large number of "don't knows" for the question: "If you bought a small car would you be more apt to purchase an American brand, foreign brand, or don't know" among the higher income groups is easily explained by examination of the open-ended questions. These are the people who have demonstrated "brand loyalty" and those who "would not buy small cars." These, therefore, are those who have the available means and favor big cars. Smaller cars are the predominant choice among those making less than $\$ 5,000$ per year. These are people forced by necessities to save if at all possible. The group that emerges in the $\$ 5,000-\$ 7,499$ category is comprised of the most members and leans toward a smaller model car. However, this group contains many of the younger college people, who, as explained before, have their personal reasons for wanting a small model car.

The possibility of a second car for a family was considered quite realistic for this day and age and therefore investigated. For a second car it was felt that economic
Table 21A
Income vs. Attitudes Toward Cars ( $\mathrm{N}=250$ )

|  |  |  | Favorable | Neutral | Unfavorable | N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0) | Didn't work | Men | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0 |
|  |  | Women | 74.6 | 12.6 | 12.6 | 79 |
|  |  | Total | 74.6 | 12.6 | 12.6 | 79 |
| 1) | Under \$1,000 | Men | 50\% | 50\% | 0\% | 2 |
|  |  | Women | 81.8 | 0 | 18.1 | 11 |
|  |  | Total | 76.9 | 7.6 | 15.3 | 13 |
| 2) | \$1,000-\$1,999 | Men | 60\% | 0\% | 40\% | 5 |
|  |  | Women | 87.5 | 0 | 12.5 | 8 |
|  |  | Total | 76.9 | 0 | 23.0 | 13 |
| 3) | \$2,000-\$2,999 | Men | 50\% | 0\% | 50\% | 2 |
|  |  | Women | 80 | 0 | 20 | 10 |
|  |  | Total | 75 | 0 | 25 | 12 |
| 4) | \$3,000-\$3,999 | Men | 66.6\% | 33.3\% | 0\% | 3 |
|  |  | Women | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 61.6 | 33.3 | 0 | 3 |

Table 21A (Continued)

|  |  |  | Favorable | Neutral | Unfavorable | N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5) | \$4,000-\$4,999 | Men | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% | 7 |
|  |  | Women | 100 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
|  |  | Total | 100 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| 6) | \$5,000-\$7,499 | Men | 57.1\% | 5.3\% | 37.5\% | 56 |
|  |  | Women | 66.6 | 0 | 33.3 | 3 |
|  |  | Total | 57.6 | 5.0 | 37.3 | 59 |
| 7) | \$7,500-\$9,999 | Men | 44.8\% | 10.3\% | 44.8\% | 29 |
|  |  | Women | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 44.8 | 10.3 | 44.8 | 29 |
| 8) | \$10,000 and over | Men | 15.3\% | 11.5\% | 73.0\% | 26 |
|  |  | Women | 33.3 | 0 | 66.3 | 3 |
|  |  | Total | 17.2 | 10.3 | 72.4 | 29 |
|  |  | Total | 155 | 21 | 74 | 250 |

Table 21B
Income vs. Second Car Choice ( $\mathrm{N}=250$ )

|  |  |  | Small | Big | N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0) | Didn't work | Men | 0\% | 0\% | 0 |
|  |  | Women | 82.2 | 17.8 | 79 |
|  |  | Total | 82.2 | 17.8 | 79 |
| 1) | Under \$1,000 | Men | 100\% | 0\% | 2 |
|  |  | Women | 81.8 | 18.2 | 11 |
|  |  | Total | 84.6 | 15.4 | 13 |
| 2) | \$1,000-\$1,999 | Men | 80\% | 20\% | 5 |
|  |  | Women | 87.5 | 12.5 | 8 |
|  |  | Total | 84.6 | 15.4 | 13 |
| 3) | \$2,000-\$2,999 | Men | 50\% | 50\% | 2 |
|  |  | Women | 90 | 10 | 10 |
|  |  | Total | 83.3 | 16.6 | 12 |
| 4) | \$3,000-\$3,999 | Men | 100\% | 0\% | 3 |
|  |  | Women | 100\% | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 100 | 0 | 3 |
| 5) | \$4,000-\$4,999 | Men | 100\% | 0\% | 7 |
|  |  | Women | 100 | 0 | 6 |
|  |  | Total | 100 | 0 | 13 |
| 6) | \$5,000-\$7,499 | Men | 62.5\% | 37.5\% | 56 |
|  |  | Women | 100 | 0 | 3 |
|  |  | Total | 64.4 | 35.6 | 59 |
| 7) | \$7,500-\$7,999 | Men | 44.8\% | 51.2\% | 29 |
|  |  | Women | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 44.8 | 51.2\% | 29 |
| 8) | \$10,000 and over | Men | 23.0\% | 77\% | 26 |
|  |  | Women | 33.3 | 66.6 | 3 |
|  |  | Total | 24.1 | 75.9 | 29 |

Table 21 C
Income vs. Small Car Purchase ( $\mathrm{N}=250$ )

|  |  |  | American | Foreign | Don't know | N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0) | Didn't work | Men | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0 |
|  |  | Women | 83.5 | 2.5 | 13.9 | 79 |
|  |  | Total | 83.5 | 2.5 | 13.9 | 79 |
| 1) | Under \$ 1,000 | Men | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 2 |
|  |  | Women | 81.8 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 11 |
|  |  | Total | 69.2 | 23.0 | 7.7 | 13 |
| 2) | \$1,000-\$1,999 | New | 20\% | 80\% | 0\% | 5 |
|  |  | Women | 62.5 | 0 | 37.5 | 8 |
|  |  | Total | 46.1 | 30.7 | 23.1 | 13 |
| 3) | \$2,000-\$2,999 | Men | 50\% | 50\% | 0\% | 2 |
|  |  | Women | 80 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
|  |  | Total | 75 | 16.6 | 8.3 | 12 |
| 4) | \$3,000-\$3,999 | Men | 33.3\% | 0\% | 66.6\% | 3 |
|  |  | Women | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 33.3 | 0 | 66.6 | 3 |

Table 21C (Continued)

|  |  |  | American | Foreign | Don't know | N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5) | \$4,000-\$4,999 | Men | 42.8\% | 42.8\% | 14.2\% | 7 |
|  |  | Women | 83.3 | 0 | 16.6 | 6 |
|  |  | Total | 61.5 | 23 | 15.3 | 13 |
| 6) | \$4,000-\$7,499 | Men | 42.8\% | 32.1\% | 25\% | 56 |
|  |  | Women | 66.6 | 0 | 33.3 | 3 |
|  |  | Total | 44 | 30.5 | 25.4 | 59 |
| 7) | \$7,500-\$7,999 | Men | 31\% | 44.8\% | 24.1\% | 29 |
|  |  | Women | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 31\% | 44.8 | 24.1 | 29 |
| 8) | \$10,000 and over | New | 30.7\% | 23\% | 46.1\% | 26 |
|  |  | Women | 33.3 | 0 | 66.6 | 3 |
|  |  | Total | 31 | 20.7 | 48.2 | 29 |
|  |  | Total | 143 | 51 | 56 | 250 |

reasons would be of prime importance. Second cars are used mainly for short trips--to school and for neighborhood shopping--and this being the case it would seem that economy and convenience (parking, etc.) would play the most important roles in choice of a second car. Consequently, it was predicted that:

A SMALL CAR IS PREFERRED TO A BIG CAR AS A SECOND FAMILY CAR BY BOTH SEXES.

This was tested by making direct use of question \#23: "If you already owned a large car and had the opportunity to buy a second car would you buy a big or small car?" Fifty-five per cent of the men (see Table 16) prefer a smaller car as a second choice whereas $83 \%$ of the women express this same choice. These results lend support to the data acquired by Katona showing that the desire of keeping up with the Joneses is less important in the selection of a second car. Instead, economy seems to be the major underlying reason for this choice.

Another variable considered necessary to investigate was the effect of previous car ownership upon attitudes toward cars. Psychological experiments have shown that the strength of a habit depends upon the frequency of its repetition, its recency, and on the degree of resultant
success or satisfaction. It was felt that this would probably hold true for cars also and that car preference would be related to previous car ownership. An individual satisfied to the extent of purchasing the same brand car for a number of years (five years here is the operational definition of "brand loyalty") with supposed success, would be expected to be more reluctant to switch car types. Therefore, it was predicted that:

THOSE RESPONDENTS WHO HAVE DEMONSTRATED "BRAND LOYALTY" WILL BE LESS LIKELY TO EXPRESS POSITIVE FEELINGS TOWARD A SMALL CAR.

It is necessary to point out that this "brand loyalty" test was felt "safe" because it is obvious that smaller model cars have not been available for a long enough period to permit a "brand loyalty" to this type of car. Therefore, if there is any demonstration of "brand loyalty" it will be towards an American brand--as the prediction assumes. This brand loyalty was tested by the following sequence of questions:

Do you own a car?
Do you own more than one car?
What year and make is it?
When did you buy it (year) ?
What model car did you have before your present brand car?

How long did you have it? What model before that and how long?

Table 22

Length of Owning a Car vs. Brand Loyalty

## MEN

|  | Positive <br> attitudes <br> toward <br> small car | NeutralNegative <br> attitide <br> toward <br> small car |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Different car within <br> last 5 years <br> Same car less than <br> 5 years <br> Same car more than <br> 5 years | $* 29$ | 3 | 26 |

* $50 \%$ of those who have had a different car in the last 5 years
** $28.5 \%$ of those who have had the same car more than 5 years

WOMEN

|  | Positive <br> attitude <br> toward <br> small car | NeutralNegative <br> attitude <br> toward <br> small car |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Different car within <br> last 5 years <br> Same car less than 5 <br> years <br> Same car more than 5 <br> years | $* 9$ | 2 | 7 |

* $50 \%$ of those who have had a different car in the last 5 years
** $85.7 \%$ of those who have had the same car more than 5 years.

As can be seen in Table 22 only 28.5 of those having had their present model five years or more express a preference for a small car. In contrast to this there is a favorable expression toward small cars by $50 \%$ of those having different model cars within the last five years, and by 75\% of those having had the same brand for less than five years. This, therefore, indicates a popular acceptance of smaller cars among those car owners who have not become set in their ways toward one certain brand car. For women the results do not hold true in the manner prescribed by the hypothesis. This is due to two possible factors:

1) the total pattern of the women's acceptance of a small car; almost all of them preferring a small American car.
2) the small number of women that own a car.

Summarizing the results we find the following relationships to exist among the examined variables:
A) Self-percept

The "cautious-conservative" prefers:

1) a small car
2) an American brand compact car
3) a small car as a second car choice
B) Sex

## Women:

1) express more favorable feelings toward small cars than do men
2) prefer an American brand compact car
3) prefer a small car as a second car choice
C) Age
4) the younger age group (29-29) expresses a preference for a foreign make car
5) the 30-39 age group provides no decisive results
6) the 40-49 age group favors a big car
7) those 50 and over prefer a small car
D) Education

There is an overall favorable attitude toward small cars in the entire sample, and in all education levels. However, among men who have completed high school but do not have any additional education, there is a slight preference for larger cars.
E) Income

Those in the upper income brackets favor a big car-or a foreign car if a smaller car is preferred.
F) Previous car ownership

Men were shown to have demonstrated "brand loyalty"but women (possibly due to the reasons offered on page 66) do not react in a similar manner.
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## APPENDIX A

I usually know where to go to find out about important things.

1. agree very much
2. agree somewhat
3. neutral
4. disagree somewhat
5. disagree very much

Unless there is a good reason for changing, I think we should continue to do things the way they are being done now.

1. agree very much
2. agree somewhat
3. neutral
4. disagree somewhat
5. disagree very much

Youth is usually too impatient and too much in a hurry.

1. agree very much
2. agree somewhat
3. neutral
4. disagree somewhat
5. disagree very much

When new ideas are going around, I am usually among the first to accept them.

1. agree very much
2. agree somewhat
3. neutral
4. disagree somewhat
5. disagree very much

I watch my expenses very carefully and know where my money goes.

1. agree very much
2. agree somewhat
3. neutral
4. disagree somewhat
5. disagree very much

It is not particularly important to me to know all the answers to things people are talking about.

1. agree very much
2. agree somewhat
3. neutral
4. disagree somewhat
5. disagree very much

A penny saved is a penny earned.

1. agree very much
2. agree somewhat
3. neutral
4. disagree somewhat
5. disagree very much

Among my friends, people usually take me to be younger than I am.

1. agree very much
2. agree somewhat
3. neutral
4. disagree somewhat
5. disagree very much

I am a little bit suspicious about people who always want to have the latest in everything.

1. agree very much
2. agree somewhat
3. neutral
4. disagree somewhat
5. disagree very much

Among my friends I am considered to be a free spender and liberal in the use of money.

1. agree very much
2. agree somewhat
3. neutral
4. disagree somewhat
5. disagree very much

The enthusiasms of younger people are hard for me to understand.

1. agree very much
2. agree somewhat
3. neutral
4. disagree somewhat
5. disagree very much

Others seem to be better than $I$ am at knowing about everyday affairs.

1. agree very much
2. agree somewhat
3. neutral
4. disagree somewhat
5. disagree very much

In general, modern ways of living are much superior to older ways.

1. agree very much
2. agree somewhat
3. neutral
4. disagree somewhat
5. disagree very much

My interests seem to be more with those of people younger than I am than with older people.

1. agree very much
2. agree somewhat
3. neutral
4. disagree somewhat
5. disagree very much

I seem to understand about the way in which the world is developing better than many people.

1. agree very much
2. agree somewhat
3. neutral
4. disagree somewhat
5. disagree very much

Money is made to be spent.

1. agree very much
2. agree somewhat
3. neutral
4. disagree somewhat
5. disagree very much
6. Do you own a car? YES
7. If YES, Do you own more than 1 car? NO TWO 3 OR MORE
8. What year and make is it? $\qquad$
IF OWNS
9. When did you buy it? (year)
10. Do you expect to buy a car within the next year?

YES
NO
6. Will it be a brand new car or a used car?

IF YES, DEPENDS
NEW USED
DON'T KNOW
7. Have you given any thought to buying a small car? YES NO

IF NO
8. When do you think you will buy a car, if ever? $\qquad$
9. What model car did you have before your present brand car?
10. How long did you have it? $\qquad$
11. What model before that and how long? $\qquad$
12. Rank in order of preference the qualities you desire in a car: ECONOMY

LUXURY

STYLE

OPERATING CHARACTERISTICS (Speed, Power, etc.)

```
13. Do you own--or have you ever owned--a small car?
14. What make is it?

IF YES
15. What year model is it?

IF NO
16. Have you ever driven a small car?
17. Are your feelings concerning small cars (Circle)
very favorable
somewhat favorable
neutral
somewhat unfavorable
very unfavorable
18. Why do you hold such a view?
19. IF FAVORABLE, can you give any DISADVAN-
TAGES OF SMALL CARS?
20. IF UNFAVORABLE, can you give and ADVANTAGES OF SMALL CARS?
21. IF NEUTRAL, can you give some ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF SMALL CARS?
22. What factors (speed, power, etc。) do you consider necessary for the small car to have?
23. If you already owned a large car and had the opportunity to buy a second car would you buy a big or small car?
24. Why?
25. If you bought a small car would you be more apt to purchase
```

AMERICAN BRAND

```

FOREIGN BRAND
DON'T KNOW
26. Why?

INFORMATION ABOUT SUBJECT INTERVIEWED
Interviewer \(\qquad\) Interview No. \(\qquad\) Date \(\qquad\)
Town or city \(\qquad\) State \(\qquad\)
Address of dwelling \(\qquad\)
Sex of interviewee: ( ) Male
( ) Female
Age \(\qquad\)

Could you give me some idea of what your 1959 income was? Was it Under \$1,000 \$1,000-\$1,999 \$2,000-\$2,999 \$3,000-\$3,999 \(\$ 4,000-4,999 \quad \$ 5,000-\$ 7,499 \quad \$ 7,500-\$ 9,999 \quad \$ 10,000 \&\) over

What was the last grade (or year) you completed in school?
1. Completed college \(\qquad\)
2. Some college (years and kind of school if not regular college)
3. Completed high school and no more \(\qquad\)
4. Some high school (didn't finish)
5. All else \(\qquad\)

\section*{APPENDIX B}
(Code)

Code 18--ATTITUDES TOWARD SMALL CARS--Based on the following questions:

Are your feelings concerning small cars:
Very favorable Somewhat favorable Neutral
Somewhat unfavorable Very unfavorable

Why do you hold such a view?
Code:

Category
FAVORABLE RESPONSES:

Economy
Maneuverability
Parking 25
25
44
69
Neighborhood use
22
8
40
6
62
Easier to maneuver
Quality
Better performance
Good as second car
Safety
Holds road better
Other
Personality 1
\(1 \quad 0\)
0
Good for young family 2
NEUTRAL RESPONSES:
Doesn't know
No thought
\(1 \quad 3\)
Doesn't drive 11
Depends on wants
10
0
Category Frequency of mention
UNFAVORABLE RESPONSES: Men Women Total
Safety
General ..... 30 ..... 10 ..... 40
In case of accident ..... 16 ..... 2 ..... 18
Power
Poor pick-up ..... 4
Not enough power ..... 1ComfortGeneral 3838
Poorer on trips ..... 8
Poor family car ..... 19Inadequate luggage room 11
12 ..... 50
0 ..... 1919
3 ..... 4
Quality
Less impressive ..... 9312
Poorer styling ..... 6
3 ..... 9
Brand preference
Satisfied with present brand ll ..... 0 ..... 11
Other
Poorer business car ..... 6
0 ..... 6
Heresay ..... 1 ..... 2 ..... 3
Big car has more ofeverything 1\(1 \quad 0\)1

Code 19--DISADVANTAGES OF SMALL CARS (More than one response per person possible). Based on the following sequence of questions:
17. Are your feelings concerning small cars:

Very favorable
Somewhat favorable Neutral
Somewhat unfavorable
Very unfavorable
18. Why do you hold such a view?
19. If FAVORABLE can you give any DISADVANTAGES OF SMALL CARS?

Code:

Category

Comfort
Too small for long distance driving \(18 \quad 12 \quad 30\)
Too small for families 19
Too small--general 15
46 65 26 41

Power
\begin{tabular}{llrr} 
Not enough pickup & 4 & 2 & 6 \\
Not enough power & 7 & 5 & 12
\end{tabular}
Quality--durability ..... 2 ..... 2 ..... 4
SafetyLess protection in event ofaccident 96615
Maintenance--parts inaccessible \(\quad 1\) ..... 1 ..... 2
Appearance--not impressive ..... 1\(1 \quad 0\)1
No answer ..... 11

\[
10
\] ..... 21
Men Women Total

Code 20--ADVANTAGES OF SMALL CARS (More than one response per person possible). Based on the following sequence of questions:
17. Are your feelings concerning small cars:

> Very favorable
> Somewhat favorable
> Neutral
> Somewhat unfavorable
> Very unfavorable
18. Why do you hold such a view?
19. If FAVORABLE can you give any DISADVANTAGES OF SMALL CARS?
20. If UNFAVORABLE, can you give any ADVANTAGES OF SMALL CARS?

Code:

Category Frequency of mention Men Women Total

Economy \(42 \quad 14\)
Economy \(42 \quad 14\)
Maneuverability Parking 12
Neighborhood use 1
Don't know \(0 \quad 1\)

No answer
1
3
16
0 1

1 1

0
0
0

Code 2l--ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF SMALL CARS (More than one response per person possible). Based on the following sequence of questions:
17. Are your feelings concerning small cars:

Very favorable
Somewhat favorable
Neutral
Somewhat unfavorable
Very unfavorable
18. Why do you hold such a view?
19. If favorable can you give any disadvantages of small cars?
20. If unfavorable can you give any advantages of small cars?
21. If NEUTRAL can you give some ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF SMALL CARS?

Code:
\begin{tabular}{lccr} 
Category & Frequency of mention \\
ADVANTAGES OF SMALL CARS: & Men & Women & Total \\
Economy & 12 & 13 & 25 \\
Maneuverability & & & \\
\(\quad\) Parking & 5 & 4 & 9 \\
\(\quad\) Easier to maneuver & 1 & 1 & 2 \\
\(\quad\) Neighborhood use & 0 & 2 & 2 \\
Other--for a young person & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
DISADVANTAGES of SMALL CARS: & & & \\
Comfort & & & \\
\(\quad\) Not as comfortable & 6 & 6 & 12 \\
Not as much luggage space & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
Poorer for long trips & 2 & 1 & 3 \\
Poorer for large family & 2 & 4 & 6 \\
Safety & & & \\
Not as safe & 2 & 3 & 5 \\
Not built as well & 2 & 1 & 3 \\
Less pick-up and power & 2 & 0 & 2 \\
Quality--less impressive & 2 & 0 & 2
\end{tabular}

Code 22--Based on questions: WHAT FACTORS (SPEED, POWER, ETC.) DO YOU CONSIDER NECESSARY FOR THE SMALL CAR TO HAVE? (More than one response per person possible)

Code :
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Category} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Frequency of mention} \\
\hline & Men & Women & Total \\
\hline Economy & 27 & 49 & 76 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Power} \\
\hline Pickup & 23 & 3 & 26 \\
\hline Passing speed & 49 & 11 & 60 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Comfort} \\
\hline Enough room & 14 & 9 & 23 \\
\hline Smooth riding & 2 & 1 & 3 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Quality} \\
\hline Construction-durability & 15 & 7 & 22 \\
\hline Styling & 7 & 6 & 13 \\
\hline Design & 2 & 2 & 4 \\
\hline Maneuverability & 2 & 2 & 4 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Safety} \\
\hline General & 16 & 9 & 25 \\
\hline Visibility (field of vision) & 2 & 0 & 2 \\
\hline Road holding & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
\hline Weight & 2 & 0 & 2 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Other} \\
\hline Luxury & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
\hline Automatic transmission & 3 & 6 & 9 \\
\hline Don't know & 0 & 6 & 6 \\
\hline No answer & 19 & 26 & 45 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Code 24--Based on question: IF YOU ALREADY OWNED A LARGE CAR AND HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO BUY A SECOND CAR WOULD YOU BUY A BIG OR SMALL CAR? WHY? (More than one response per person possible).

Code:

Category
REASONS FOR PREFERRING SMALL CAR:

\section*{Economy}

Maneuverability
\begin{tabular}{lrrr} 
Parking & 9 & 7 & 16 \\
Neighborhood use & 15 & 12 & 27
\end{tabular}
\(\begin{array}{llll}\text { Other } & 1 & 0 & 1\end{array}\)
REASONS FOR PREFERRING LARGE CAR:

Comfort
General \(16 \quad 11 \quad 27\)
Size 3
Smooth riding 4
Quality
General \(9 \quad 2 \quad 11\)
\(\begin{array}{llll}\text { More reliable--durability } & 12 & 0 & 12\end{array}\) Styling 3

25
\(\begin{array}{llll}\text { Safety--general } & 16 & 17\end{array}\)
Brand preference
Used to big car \(17 \quad 0 \quad 17\)
\(\begin{array}{cllll}\text { Other--personality preference } & 2 & 1 & 3\end{array}\)
Don't know 00
No answer \(\quad 0 \quad 0\)

Code 26--Based on answers to question: IF YOU BOUGHT A SMALL CAR WOULD YOU BE MORE APT TO PURCHASE AN

American brand Foreign brand
Don't know
Why? (More than one response per person possible.)

Code:
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Category & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Frequency of mention \\
Men
\end{tabular} \\
REASONS FOR PREFERRING & Women Total \\
AMERICAN: &
\end{tabular}

Quality
\(\begin{array}{llll}\text { Are better products } & 30 & 6 & 36\end{array}\)
\begin{tabular}{llll} 
Styling & 3 & 1
\end{tabular}

More confidence in
\(\begin{array}{llll}\text { American brands } & 98\end{array}\)
Brand preference
More familiar with brand names 42327
Comfort
More room in American types \(2 \quad 5\)
Other
\(\begin{array}{lllll}\text { Automatic transmission } & 11 & 27\end{array}\)
Give our people employment \(0 \quad 1\)
Better trade-in value l
0
1
Maintenance
Easier to get repairs 292352
REASONS FOR PREFERRING FOREIGN:
\(\begin{array}{llll}\text { Economy } & 8 & 2 & 10\end{array}\)
Quality
Design, styling \(16 \quad 2 \quad 18\)

More impressive \(12 \quad 0 \quad 12\)
\(\begin{array}{llll}\text { More power } & 1 & 0 & 1\end{array}\)
\(\begin{array}{lllll}\text { Other--personality preferences } & 6 & 0 & 6\end{array}\)
Don't know
Not sure which is better \(14 \quad 18 \quad 32\)
Wouldn't buy small car 21 l 22
\(\begin{array}{llll}\text { Likes present brand } & 4 & 0 & 4\end{array}\)

```
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