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1. Purpose

Words matter—we all know it. They indicate descriptors and elaborate. They paint pictures and tell stories. They represent cultures and classes and education and wisdom and so much more. Specific words can allude to specific personalities and how an individual may think or behave. So too, when organizations are discussed, the words associated with their everyday information and communication can be indicative of a specific brand personality.

The purpose of this project is to determine if an organization could use small changes to its everyday language in order to create better relationships with its publics. Organizations may not be people, but they do have brand personalities, and by leveraging those, a positive organization-public relationship can be had.

This study is designed to determine if brand personalities impact the strength of an organization-public relationship (OPR). With the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) being a commonly used measurement for human temperament differences, it is believed that organizations can choose to present general communication in one of these temperament styles for positive impact. By tapping into these personality aspects, organizations and publics can have a better understanding of each other and can see even stronger relationships develop because of them.

Developing a brand personality can prove to be a simple yet important factor into developing powerful relationships between organizations and their publics.
2. Review of Literature

2.1 Organization-public relationships

Ever since Ledingham and Bruning presented their theory of organization-public relationships for public relations (1998), the social science field has embraced the concept and devoted plenty more research into solidifying many of the themes. According to Bruning and Ledingham, “the relationships management perspective has the potential to serve as a platform to guide theoretical inquiry and professional practice, and to provide a method of evaluation that is consistent with the management approach” (p. 158). Prior to the strong call for organization-public relationships as a management process, some scholars expressed concern that there was less attention paid to organization-public relationships than there should have been, and many researchers were missing out on defining them (Broom, Casey, & Ritchey, 1997). However, since Ledingham and Bruning’s public stance on the theory, organization-public relationships have been assessed and reviewed many times over, with many more results growing from the theory.

“Relationship-building became a central issue, and various scholars have developed theories, models, and measurement scales to analyze and define organization-public relationships” (Avidar, 2013, p. 440). Public relations is a management perspective that focuses on organizations and how relationships can be managed with their publics (Heath, 2013).

Organization-public relationships has now been a subject researched in a bevy of fields, strengthening its claim as a solid public relations theory and showcasing successful research supporting Ledingham and Bruning’s initial claims. The assortment of research on
organization-public relationships and how it intersects with countless walks of life includes—but is not limited to—the following: between a city and its housing residents (Bruning, Langenhop, & Green, 2004); between a European football club, its ownership, and the community where it is located (Coombs & Osborne, 2012); and practical uses of OPR in the military (Plowman, 2013). Waymer discussed how relationships could be measured in a government setting, emphasizing on OPR being not just theoretical, but practical (2013). It has even been used in art! “Only by letting publics speak in their own terms can we begin to understand their concerns and issues, not just their responses to our concerns and agendas” (Forernan-Wernet & Dervin, 2006, p. 293).

Using arts in experimentation methods with OPR, excellent two-way symmetrical communication was found, and user perceptions changed in other instances (Banning & Schoen, 2007). Basically, there are instances where one can find studies of OPR everywhere. “Organization-public relationships have been extensively examined in various contexts, including corporate, nonprofit, government, global, and online settings” (Men, 2014, p. 261).

Organization-public relationships go beyond just studies, though. The theory has been tied to a myriad of other public relations aspects, such as crisis responding like when Brown and White wrote, “Maintaining positive relationships with stakeholders is more important than any individual crisis response strategy” (2010, p. 88). It is also regularly linked to corporate social responsibility and engagement (Devin & Lane, 2014) and even online user interfaces and experiences (Vorvoreanu, 2006). Ivanov, Sims, and Parker argue that OPR should be considered in full integrated marketing communications strategies, bleeding beyond just pure public relations (2013).
2.2 Two-way dialogic communications

OPR ties in, as well, to symmetrical communication (Bruning and Ledingham, 2000; Shen and Kim, 2012). Not everything should be one-sided. Lee and Park explain why interactivity is so important (2013), Kent and Taylor stress dialogue (2002), and two-way dialogic interactions are studied extensively (Avidar, et al., 2015). “Because the ultimate goal of a public relations program should be to build a mutually beneficial relationship with key public members, it is important that public relations practitioners manage organization-public relationships by using a two-way symmetrical model” (Bruning & Ledingham, 1999, p. 91).

Engaging in two-way communication is so much more important than just emphasizing the organization’s needs—it shows a mutual understanding (Taylor & Kent, 2014). Sometimes there are unique ways to approach dialogic aspects of communication (Foreman-Wernet & Dervin, 2006), while Twitter is becoming the staple of two-way communication (Sweetser, English, & Fernandes, 2015) that can provide the biggest impact toward OPR dimensions. “Social media channels… with two-way, interactive/dialogical, communal, and relational features should be harnessed to promote employee participation, engagement, and community building” (Men, 2014, p. 274-275). Grunig may not have had Twitter when he was developing breakthrough public relations ideas two decades ago, but he did have the foresight to put so much emphasis on two-way symmetrical communication and how successful relationships involve mutual benefit for both the organization and the public (1993).
2.3 Dimensions of organization-public relationships

What aspects make up OPRs and dialogic communication, though? How can it be measured? Hon and Grunig developed dimensions for OPR that included trust, control mutuality, satisfaction, and commitment (1999). Further research into dimensions has proposed other potential dimensions—Kim initially looked at 10 in 2001: trust, mutuality, commitment, satisfaction, communal relationship, openness, community involvement, affective intimacy, relationship termination cost, and reputation. Most, however, have helped solidify the four primary dimensions—for instance two studies by Huang that reinforced the said dimensions (2001a, 2001b).

Bruning and Ledingham lamented for better way to measure OPR. “Because relationships can be difficult to measure, public relations practitioners often have struggled to demonstrate the influence that public relations activities have on consumer perceptions, evaluations, and behaviors” (2000, p. 85). Six years later, and there were still those calling for better measurements. “Although many scholars and practitioners understand that mutual benefit is an important part of public relations research and practice, measurement systems for determining the advantages of obtaining mutual benefit have not emerged” (Bruning, DeMiglio, & Embry, 2006, p. 33). Thankfully, Ki and Hon provided plenty of research to help solidify dimensions on which to follow (2007; 2009). In addition to their great contributions, Auger helped show the incredible connection between the dimension of trust and transparency (2014), Ki showed positive correlations of the dimensions in the banking industry (2013), and Moon and Rhee emphasized the negative aspects that can be associated with dimensions (2013). “When both
parties to an organization-public relationship are able to influence the other, an equal partnership can develop” (Bruning, Dials, and Shirka, 2008, p. 29).

Ultimately, these dimensions help showcase the strengths of the OPR. They give it more substance and areas on which to focus. These dimensions also show there can be different types of relationships, dependent on other factors. “Organizations, like people, form different types of relationships with different actors” (Yang & Taylor, 2015, p. 103).
3. Hypotheses

After considering the potential for how brand personality types might impact the dimensions of organization-public relationships, the following hypotheses seem reasonable.

1. “Intuitive-Feeling” (NF) organization will be more associated with commitment than the other types.

2. Organizations with “intuition” (N) will have higher associations with commitment than types with “sensing” (S).

3. “Intuitive-Thinking” (NT) organization will be more associated with control mutuality than the other types.

4. Organizations with “thinking” (T) will have higher associations with control mutuality than types with “feeling” (F).

5. “Sensing-Feeling” (SF) organization will be more associated with satisfaction than the other types.

6. Organizations with “feeling” (F) will have higher associations with satisfaction than types with “thinking” (T).

7. “Sensing-Thinking” (ST) organization will be more associated with trust than the other types.

8. Organizations with “sensing” (S) will have higher associations with trust than types with “intuition” (N).
4. Method

This study is designed to determine if brand personalities impact the strength of an organization-public relationship (OPR). With the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) being a commonly used measurement for human temperament differences, it is believed that organizations can choose to present general communication in one of these “brand personality” styles for positive impact. Using dimensions of OPR—trust, satisfaction, control mutuality, and commitment, as discussed by Hon and Grunig (1999)—as indicators of positive or negative relationships, it should be determined if there is any impact based on emulating four specific personality types through basic organization communication.

4.1 Definitions and scales

Dimensions of OPR are chosen as representations of solid indicators for positive or negative connections. In addition, the dimensions of trust, satisfaction, control mutuality, and commitment will provide a solid example of scale when determining what type of connections are prevalent amongst the personality types.

Trust relates to the confidence someone has in another. Three dimensions include integrity, “the belief that an organization is fair and just;” dependability, “the belief that an organization will do what it says it will do;” and competence, “the belief that an organization has the ability to do what it says it will do” (Hon and Grunig, 1999). To measure trust, modified questions originally posited by Hon and Grunig (1999) were used to determine how trustworthy survey recipients
found a mock company. The following questions were asked to measure trust for a given brand personality.

1. This organization can be relied on to keep its promises.
2. I believe this organization would take opinions of people like me into account when making decisions.
3. I feel very confident about this organization’s skills.
4. This organization does not mislead people like me.
5. I think it is important to watch this organization closely so that it does not take advantage of people like me. *(Reversed)*

Satisfaction deals with parties feeling positive toward one another because of reinforced favorable expectations. To measure satisfaction, updated questions originally constructed by Hon and Grunig (1999) were used to figure out how satisfactory survey recipients found a mock company. The following questions were asked to measure satisfaction for a given brand personality.

1. I am happy with this organization.
2. Most people like me would be happy in their interactions with this organization.
3. I feel people like me are important to this organization.
4. Both the organization and people like me benefit from the relationship.
5. The organization fails to satisfy the needs of people like me. *(Reversed)*
Control mutuality revolves around how much each party can influence one another and the agreement on that. To measure control mutuality, questions originally developed by Hon and Grunig (1999) were modified and used to determine the level of control mutuality survey recipients found in a mock company. The following questions were asked to measure control mutuality for a given brand personality.

1. This organization believes the opinions of people like me are legitimate.
2. I believe people like me have influence on the decision-makers of this organization.
3. This organization and people like me are attentive to what each other say.
4. When I would have an opportunity to interact with this organization, I feel that I would have some sense of control over the situation.
5. This organization won’t cooperate with people like me. *(Reversed)*

The main aspects of commitment are each party wanting to produce effort to maintain the relationship. Hon and Grunig (1999) created questions to measure commitment that were modified and used to discover levels of commitment survey recipients found within a mock company. The following questions were asked to measure commitment for a given brand personality.

1. I can see that this organization wants to maintain a relationship with people like me.
2. I would rather work together with this organization than not.
3. There is a long-lasting bond between this organization and people like me.
4. Compared to other organizations, I would value my relationship with this organization more.
5. I have no desire to have a relationship with this organization. *(Reversed)*

### 4.2 Temperament theory and type indicators

Within the realm of temperament theory, sensing and intuition typically focus around how people gather information but can also project how parties prefer to produce final details. Based opposite of each other, sensing is much more concrete and literal, playing around the five senses—sight, sound, touch, taste, and smell—while intuition is much more abstract and possibility-based, placing emphasis on “what if’s” more than the here and now (Jung, 1971; Keirsey, 1984).

Thinking and feeling are used more for making decisions. When parties make certain choices, some focus more on logic and reason—placing them into the thinking spectrum. As for feeling, choices are made more on value systems and beliefs in what is right or wrong. These also fall diametrically opposed to each other, with personalities leaning one way or another (Jung, 1971; Keirsey, 1984).

The pairs of thinking/feeling and intuition/sensing were chosen for use over the other primary type indicator preferences (introversion/extraversion and judging/perceiving) for multiple reasons. First off, these four preferences are brought up in studies about type regularly and have been included in personality type research since Carl Jung (1971) used elements in his archetype research. Describing them as basic functions of the psyche, these were the bases on which his other type research revolved. Keirsey continued with Jung’s propositions, creating the
groundwork for many of the type indicators and temperament sorters used in abundance today (1984). In addition to the core functional reasons, the pair of extraversion/introversion was also left out of this study because of the need for larger swaths of communication points to accurately denote obvious differences. As for the judging/perceiving duo, many of those temperament preferences are based on time-sensitive aspects, creating a difficult environment to gather the requisite responses. If hypotheses for this study are supported, both other pairs could be considered in future research.

4.3 Subjects

Subjects were predominantly recruited from classes within Ball State University’s Department of Journalism. Assisting faculty offered five points of extra credit in exchange for subjects participating in the study. Students were informed of the opportunity by the principal investigator via email, with a link to the Qualtrics survey provided as well as brief information about the investigation. Subjects then took the survey online through Qualtrics wherever was convenient for them. All subjects were 18 years of age or older and willing participants. Participants were able to withdraw from the survey with no consequences. In order to maximize responses, partially finished surveys were accepted, with answered questions being included in data. Coercion did not take place within the survey, and no potential risks were perceived.

4.4 Pre-test

For the initial pre-test, four fictitious organizations (brands) were created—each representing different personality types from the MBTI spectrum, including intuitive-feeling (NF),
intuitive-thinking (NT), sensing-feeling (SF), and sensing-thinking (ST). These brands were created to closely align the communication with four MBTI types that were presented in a brief biography and several posts on Twitter (tweets). To assure the organizations represented specific types through their general communication, a panel of experts analyzed and confirmed the content to accurately reflect the four temperaments.

For the pre-test, subjects reviewed the material from the four brands through a survey and responded using a seven-point Likert scale to discover how individual brands rated amongst dimensions of OPR. The test did not make mention of MBTI to subjects so as not to illicit potential bias from those familiar with the type indicator. This allowed for chances to learn of technical and comprehension difficulties to ensure the main surveys were administered successfully.

![Intuitive-thinking tweet example.](image)

*Figure 1.* Intuitive-thinking tweet example. This figure showcased one of the tweets used in the survey representing metaphorical, yet data-driven Xentropy Motors brand.

### 4.5 Procedure

With the four brands securely in place and the online aspects confirmed after the pretest, the survey moved on to the majority of respondents. After filling out a consent page and reading
about the aspects of the survey—including that each company has been created solely for the purpose of the survey—students moved onto the main portions. This online Qualtrics survey consisted of sections grouped by each of the four mock brands. After reviewing the materials for an organization, respondents then answered the questions relating to OPR dimensions (trust, satisfaction, etc.) listed in “Definitions and Scales” above. Each question had a seven-point Likert scale response option, ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree,” with a neutral response in the center. A total of 20 questions were asked for each organization. To ensure no response-bias, the four organizations were randomized for each individual, and the questions relating to each organization were randomized as well. More than 80 students participated in this survey, many of which opted to receive extra credit as an incentive.

Figure 2. Intuitive-feeling tweet example. This figure showcased one of the tweets used in the survey representing metaphorical, yet emotion-based Finn Motor Company brand.

4.6 Analysis

Once the responses were completely gathered, a data reduction was run in order to prepare the figures for the best analysis. A factor analysis was addressed to determine that all the figures were meaningful and reliable in comparison to the rest of the data. The hypotheses were measured using multiple tests to determine if they were supported. A one-way analysis of
variance was used in order to determine if there was any gap of significance between the means of the groups since there were both independent and dependent variables. Tukey’s honest significance difference test was used in the post hoc test to determine where the differences appeared amongst the brand personality type groups. Since using post hoc tests necessitates multiple groups, it was not used to compare just thinking to feeling or sensing to intuition. However, simple means ANOVA were still run on the pairs.
5. Results

Ultimately, there were mixed results as to what was expected initially compared to what was found after the surveys. While it was expected to have a range of brand personalities having favorable aspects in different areas, there instead seemed to be clear strong types and weak types.

5.1 Data reduction and reliability analysis

The survey data was run through a data reduction, creating scales for trust, control mutuality, satisfaction, and commitment. This was done in order to compare the four dimensions of OPR for each brand personality type against each other. As the figures were run through a reliability analysis, an overall Cronbach’s Alpha of .906 came back, indicating very legitimate data. Quality survey results were further strengthened when looking to see how figures would work if answers were deleted. Questions relating to “trust” ranged from .900 to .911 Cronbach’s Alpha, while “control mutuality” survey questions gave the highest figure of the bunch, ranging from a .899 to .906.
The questions that reflected “satisfaction” had a range of .899 to .903, and questions for “commitment” ranged from .898 to .902. Even with the lowest question having a floor of .898 Cronbach’s Alpha, all the questions came back incredibly reliable and relevant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question Asked</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha if Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This organization believes the opinions of people like me are legitimate.</td>
<td>.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe people like me have influence on the decision-makers of this organization.</td>
<td>.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization and people like me would be attentive to what each other say.</td>
<td>.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I had an opportunity to interact with this organization, I feel that I would have some sense of control over the situation.</td>
<td>.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization won’t cooperate with people like me. (Reversed)</td>
<td>.906</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4. Reliability of control mutuality questions. This figure shows the importance of each question for control mutuality and how much it could change data if a question were deleted.*
5.2 One-way ANOVA and post hoc tests

A one-way analysis of variance was used next. Between the groups of the dimensions, all four were determined to be significant. Satisfaction showed a significance value of .001, while trust, control mutuality, and commitment each had values of significance of .000, respectively.
**ANOVA for Intuitive-Thinking, Intuitive-Feeling, Sensing-Feeling, & Sensing-Thinking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Factor Score</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>9.296</td>
<td>Between: 3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within: 260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Mutuality</td>
<td>6.158</td>
<td>Between: 3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within: 260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.669</td>
<td>Between: 3</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within: 259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>13.587</td>
<td>Between: 3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within: 256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 7.* ANOVA chart for all four temperament types. This figure showcased core values and significance for the one-way analysis of variance amongst the temperaments NT, NF, SF, and ST.

When comparing just intuition to sensing, significance was also shown across the board, with values of .000 for trust and commitment and values of .001 for control mutuality and satisfaction. Meanwhile, between thinking and feeling, only one dimension showed significance—commitment, with a value of .044. The non-significant values were as follows: .539 for trust, .373 for control mutuality, and .229 for satisfaction.

**5.3 Hypothesis 1**

Original hypothesis: “Intuitive-Feeling” (NF) organization will be more associated with *commitment* than the other types.
To test this hypothesis, a one-way analysis of variance was used, creating $F = 13.587$, $df = 259$, $Sig. = .000$. Since a significant figure was produced using the ANOVA, a post hoc test was run, using Tukey’s model for multiple comparisons significance. NF produced significant p values of .002 over NT and .000 over both SF and ST. When comparing regression factor score means, NF had the highest of .617. NT had .012, ST had -.262, and SF had -.340.

**Table 1.** Post Hoc Test with Tukey HSD for Commitment Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intuitive-Feeling compared to</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive-Thinking</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing-Feeling</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing-Thinking</td>
<td>.879</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 8.* Significant p values for commitment with Tukey HSD. This figure shows mean difference and the significance between NF and NT, NF and SF, and NF and ST.

Result: *This is supported.* Intuitive-feeling proved to be the strongest of the four types used—not just in this category, but in all. It was significant with commitment in the ANOVA, and it had significant comparisons to the other three types as well as the regression factor score mean.

### 5.4 Hypothesis 2

Original hypothesis: Organizations with “intuition” (N) will have higher associations with *commitment* than types with “sensing” (S).
To test this hypothesis, a one-way analysis of variance was used, creating $F = 13.587$, $df = 259$, $\text{Sig.} = .000$. A significant figure was produced using the ANOVA, but a post hoc test could not be run, as there were only two groups in intuition and sensing. However, when comparing regression factor scores for commitment, N had a mean of .301, while S had a mean of -.301.

**Figure 9.** ANOVA comparing intuitive companies to sensing companies. This figure shows the significance between intuition and sensing for commitment.

Result: *This is supported.* Intuition seemed to have connotations ranging from neutral to very positive for every dimension, but this original hypothesis stands true. A significance was apparent in the ANOVA, and the regression factor score mean for intuition was higher than that of sensing.

### 5.5 Hypothesis 3

Original hypothesis: “Intuitive-Thinking”(NT) organization will be more associated with control *mutuality* than the other types.
Figure 10. Significant p values for control mutuality with Tukey HSD. This figure shows mean difference and the significance between NT and NF, NT and SF, and NT and ST.

To test this hypothesis, a one-way analysis of variance was used, creating $F = 6.158$, $df = 263$, Sig. = .000. Since a significant figure was produced using the ANOVA, a post hoc test was run, using Tukey’s model for multiple comparisons significance. NT did not produce any significant numbers (compared to NF $p = .052$, to SF $p = .046$, to ST $p = .742$). When comparing regression factor score means for control mutuality, NT had .004. NF had the highest, with .414, ST had -.114, and SF had the lowest, with -292.

Result: *This is unsupported.* While intuitive thinking brand seemed better than sensing-thinking and sensing-feeling according to means, it was more a beneficiary of the other two being so negative while it maintained primarily a neutral impact. It also had no significant showing at all.
5.6 Hypothesis 4

Original hypothesis: Organizations with “thinking” (T) will have higher associations with control mutuality than types with “feeling” (F).

To test this hypothesis, a one-way analysis of variance was used, creating $F = .796$, df = 263, Sig. = .373. No significant figure was produced using the ANOVA, and a post hoc test could not be run anyways, as there were only two groups in thinking and feeling. Also, when comparing regression factor scores for control mutuality, T had a mean of -.054, and F had a mean of .056.

Result: This is unsupported. The only dimension that even did seem to have significance between thinking and feeling was in commitment, and even then, feeling surpassed thinking anyways. Thinking was not higher rated, and no significance was found.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Mutuality</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>Between: 1</td>
<td>.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within: 262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11. ANOVA comparing thinking companies to feeling companies. This figure shows the significance between thinking and feeling for control mutuality.
5.7 Hypothesis 5

Original hypothesis: “Sensing-Feeling” (SF) organization will be more associated with satisfaction than the other types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensing-Feeling compared to</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive-Thinking</td>
<td>-.258</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive-Feeling</td>
<td>-.653</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing-Thinking</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.951</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 12. Significant p values for satisfaction with Tukey HSD. This figure shows mean difference and the significance between SF and NT, SF and NF, and SF and ST.*

To test this hypothesis, a one-way analysis of variance was used, creating $F = 5.669$, df = 262, Sig. = .001. Since a significant figure was produced using the ANOVA, a post hoc test was run, using Tukey’s model for multiple comparisons significance. SF did not produce a significant p value for NT (.423) or ST (.951), but it did with NF at .001. However, when comparing regression factor score means, SF had a -.248. NF had the highest at .405, NT had -.010, and ST had -.158.
Result: While it is very associated with satisfaction and shows significance, it is a completely negative association according to the means. Intuitive feeling had the most positive connection in this instance. *This is unsupported.*

### 5.8 Hypothesis 6

Original hypothesis: Organizations with “feeling” (F) will have higher associations with *satisfaction* than types with “thinking” (T).

To test this hypothesis, a one-way analysis of variance was used, creating $F = 1.453$, $df = 262$, Sig. = .229. No significant figure was produced using the ANOVA, and a post hoc test could not be run, as there were only two groups in thinking and feeling. Also, when comparing regression factor scores for control mutuality, T had a mean of -.073, and F had a mean of .076.

![ANOVA for Thinking vs Feeling](image)

*Figure 13.* ANOVA comparing thinking companies to feeling companies. This figure shows the significance between thinking and feeling for satisfaction.

Result: While feeling does rate higher than thinking for satisfaction, it is by incredibly small amounts and is deemed insignificant. *This is unsupported.*
5.9 Hypothesis 7

Original hypothesis: “Sensing-Thinking” (ST) organization will be more associated with trust than the other types.

To test this hypothesis, a one-way analysis of variance was used, creating $F = 9.296$, $df = 263$, $Sig = .000$. Since a significant figure was produced using the ANOVA, a post hoc test was run, using Tukey’s model for multiple comparisons significance. ST produced a significant figure of $p = .003$ to NF, but non-significant figures to NT and SF of $p = .742$ and $p = .390$, respectively. When comparing regression factor score means, ST had -.123. NF was highest with .471, while NT had .045, and SF had the lowest, with -.388.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensing-Thinking compared to</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive-Thinking</td>
<td>-.168</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive-Feeling</td>
<td>-.594</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing-Feeling</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14. Significant p values for trust with Tukey HSD. This figure shows mean difference and the significance between ST and NT, ST and NF, and ST and SF.
Result: *This is unsupported.* No dimension rated highest—or even second-highest—with sensing thinking. It was consistently negative in every category, and the significance that was present was more indicative of the strong NF.

5.10 Hypothesis 8

Original hypothesis: Organizations with “sensing” (S) will have higher associations with *trust* than types with “intuition” (N).

To test this hypothesis, a one-way analysis of variance was used, creating $F = 18.267$, df = 263, Sig. = .000. A significant figure was produced using the ANOVA, but a post hoc test could not be run, as there were only two groups in intuition and sensing. However, when comparing regression factor scores for commitment, N had a mean of .253, while S had a mean of -.257.

Result: *This is unsupported.* Sensing figures were consistently low across the board—if anything, using sensing language can only hurt. Negative figures abound, and the only significance is that it is so opposite of NF.
Figure 15. ANOVA comparing intuitive companies to sensing companies. This figure shows the significance between intuition and sensing for trust.
6. Discussion

6.1 What does it mean?

The results in this study were impressive. The sheer scale of the chasm between positive-leaning language and negatively impactful verbiage was impressive. Language matters in a phenomenally huge way—both positively and negatively. Within the world of sales and marketing, language is known to matter, but this impresses just how much it matters in the most seemingly mundane of items.

It was expected for some brand personalities to better correlate with dimensions of OPR, but intuitive-feeling was clearly leaps and bounds better than the rest. Not only that, but everything in the sensing realm—all the straightforward language about seeing, hearing, tangible things—eschewed incredibly low for each and every dimension of OPR, especially for sensing-feeling. Intuitive-thinking, meanwhile, stayed neutral almost across the board.

The implications for this on public relations as a whole are significant—practitioners need not focus just on press releases, “official” statements, and the like, but instead they need to be putting thought into general content in everyday conversation, especially in social media.
Figure 16. Plot of the regression factor scores of four temperaments. This figure depicts the differences in the NT, NF, SF, and ST temperaments and shows how similar the dimensions are to each.
6.2 Implications

This matters because language plays a much larger role in regular aspects. Copywriters may create great ad campaigns, and content producers may produce plenty of clicks, but the generic everyday aspects are just as important. One, organization decision-makers should be meeting with communications practitioners to develop a brand personality and all the “brand speak” (Wheeler, 2009) that goes along with it. That includes deciding what tone to take in conversations and general pieces. In what way do you tell directions? How do you mention the founder of an organization? What generic aspects are on the horizon? All of those previously overlooked areas should now be able to fit with the language indicative of the brand personality.

Brand personality has been covered much in the advertising world, be it on the link with campaigns like Dove with “actual self” models being featured (Malär, Krohmer, Hoyer, & Nyffenegger, 2011), the visual appeal for personality (Branaghan & Hildebrand, 2011), because of performance (Malär, Nyffenegger, Krohmer, & Hoyer, 2011), or clever gimmicks that make up the persona (Heath & Heath, 2007). Now, however, the basic language matters so much more—organizations should be creating a brand personality that is consistent across all areas. Language that may have been handled half-heartedly because it just needed to fill a place should be thought out and stay consistent with the overall theme of the organization’s brand personality.
Figure 17. Plot of the regression factor scores of related to dimensions. This figure depicts the how dimensions are similar and different for each of the four temperaments surveyed.

6.3 Specific vernacular

Intuitive-feeling, represented by fictitious brand Finn Motor Company, was far and away the strongest performing brand personality type tested. It emphasized the theoretical and
possibility-laden side of the organizations. It didn’t focus on the here and now or the sights and sounds—instead it made references. The product did not matter, and the subjects appreciated that en masse. In addition, the brand personality type of Finn Motor Company approached the sensitive side of language. The biography and tweets talked more about hard-working (feeling) instead of horsepower (thinking). It brought up subjects like Thanksgiving. Basically, it almost went out of its way to not directly talk about the brand or its product. This is what should be done. Metaphor and hyperbole, emotions and connections—welcome to the new brand economy.

6.4 Tweet game should be strong

Twitter is a strong medium on its own, but using it the right way—using the best language—will be an important aspect of every practitioner going forward. Knowing how to speak for a company’s brand should be in each practitioner’s toolbox. Basically, no language gets a day off—it all has to be crafted specifically to maximize the relationships between the organizations and their publics. This is should put more emphasis on organizations crafting specific communications guidelines and determining how to “speak” in general senses all the time. By focusing on how to craft language, it will allow more emphasis to be put elsewhere, creating positive impact for trust, control mutuality, satisfaction, and commitment without having to invest too much time or resources. Mention an upcoming holiday, quote a song, use an emoji—these are ok things to do, and an organization’s publics will appreciate it for being relatable.
6.5 Limitations and Future Research

While this investigation proved to have great results, it could definitely use more studies going forward. For one, the sample was limited to millennials at a Midwestern university. The sample size could be expanded to be more thorough and to also see if there are any impacts based on age or region. Furthermore, it would be interesting to discover the personality types indicators of subjects while doing the research to see if there are any connections. Students that are interested in journalism and communications majors are more likely to be of one type than others (but are not necessarily). With that in mind, further research could shed light on if there is any connections between a subject’s type and the types that create the most positive or negative impact.

In addition to strengthening the sample size and discovering personality types of subjects, it could also help to create a wider variety of brand examples. Current brands were avoided in this study to avoid any types of biases, but with a large enough sample size, most biases could most likely be avoided, providing similar positive and negative press coverage leading up to surveys.
7. Conclusions

It sounds cliché, but words matter. Not only do words matter, but words can make or break a relationship between an organization and a public before anything substantial is even started. Before an ad actually gets a chance to pitch a product, before a spokesperson can regale a group of investors of an organization’s merits, and before a campaign has a chance to even begin molding perception for an issue, the most basic of semantics are of great importance.

Ultimately, many of the original hypotheses were shot down in this research. However, in learning what was incorrect, there was a great breakthrough in what did and did not work. Sensing-feeling absolutely tanked. Subjects wholly rejected the tangible qualities of organizations and their products being discussed and how they related to emotions. Subjects did not want to equate looks and status or newness with a particular smell—they instead decidedly backed intuitive-feeling. Metaphors and hypotheticals and how they could benefit a subject’s emotions won the day in this study. Overwhelmingly so, tying the company and product to things that had nothing to do with its product was the way to go. Couple that with playing up how those elements impacted emotions made intuitive-feeling the clear-cut leader in ways every organization should have its staff writing about it in everyday speech.

Etymologists of the world will hopefully be offering their services, as plenty of organizations could benefit from having some logophiles on retainer. The great thing is that anyone can do this, though, so holster your thesaurus and prep your emojis—it’s about to get wordy up in here.
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Appendix A

Intuitive-Thinking Company

Xentro Motors

Biography:

Founded in 2001, Xentro Motors was created by a collection of scientists and engineers that had one desire—to create one-of-a-kind vehicles with peak performance, low costs, and sustainability. Xentro’s team of inventors and innovators build engines that surpass the standard—the Model X accelerates from 0 to 60 mph in 3.6 seconds, the Model Y achieves a remarkable 85 miles per gallon, and the Model Z has more than 1,000 different customizable combinations. At Xentra, a premium is placed on using vehicles in new and different ways while still performing at the highest end of any competition.
Our top-safety rated #ModelY has received a ★★★★★ safety rating and will be prepared for all of life’s events.

Appreciate the 52 cubic feet of cargo space in our #ModelZ for those spur of the moment weekend trips.

To answer your question, our vehicles should have a higher-than-average re-sale value. #EveryoneWantsXentro


Who wants to #roadtrip? So many possibilities to visit & our #ModelY can get you to all of them.
Appendix B

Intuitive-Feeling Company

Finn Motor Company

Biography:

Finn Motor Company is an American automaker based out of historic Detroit. Founded in the 1930’s, we are proud of our heritage, and it shows in our automobiles. We are committed to producing great products for many types of people, and we always strive to be a part of something better. Whether you are looking for a family road trip or just something safe to grow old with, we make the vehicle for you. With the best car portfolio on this side of the pond, our commitment to improving our vehicles and our drivers’ lives is always at the forefront of our minds.
Twitter:

@FMC

Finn Motor Company @FMC • 1h
What is a car? It’s a story. It takes you through life…

Finn Motor Company @FMC • 5h
Our cars: built for you by people like you.

Finn Motor Company @FMC • Dec 1
Embrace the historic #Detroit tradition, and be a part of something better.

Finn Motor Company @FMC • Dec 1
Hello, it’s Finn. We were wondering if after all these yrs you’d like to drive “@Carquestioner: I miss my old Finn! Favorite car growing up”

Finn Motor Company @FMC • Nov 26
We’re #thankful for our Finn Motor Company family and wish you all the best on this holiday.
Sensing-Feeling Company

Saef

Biography:
It is a most perfect history. Sati’s emblem is known worldwide and symbolizes performance, power, and prestige. We have been around for ages, and everyone recognizes the specific Saef bold design. Listen to the story of Saef, the auto company that grew from humble beginnings as a sprocket company in the early 1900’s through tough times that forced the company to become stronger through a depression until the founder created the signature look of what came to be known as Saef. Feel the nostalgia, embrace the car’s contours, and see the boldness of colors. Hearing “Saef” will produce excitement, and we want you to be a part of that when you purchase your own.
Whether you want a vehicle built tough or built for style, we have you covered.

Nothing says #status like the signature look of Saef.

Today is #blackfriday & that means new car smell is in your new future at our lots.

Smell the stuffing & taste the turkey. Then feel the breeze through your Saef sunroof as you cruise later.

@Carquestioner You asked about test-driving. Our stores are open six days a week so our customers can get those happy samplings regularly.
Appendix D

Sensing-Thinking Company

Tossi of America

Biography:

Created in 1950, Tossi was the result of two European inventors who wanted to create a solid machine for transport. Blood, sweat, and tears were thrown into the mix, and the original Tossi Sidewinder Car was born. It was loud, but it was efficient. Over the years, our company has expanded to Asia, Africa, and North America and created many more cars along the way. They may not all be as loud as the first Sidewinder, but they are still pushing forward in efficiency. Tossi is a car that you can feel the 1.5-ton heft of the steel frame that you know will keep you safe, while allowing for acceleration that beats all others. Tossi is affordable and outperforms: if you don’t believe us, come see for yourself.
Tossi of America @Tossi-US • Dec 1
Who else offers 5.1 Dolby surround sound in a car? #Music

Tossi of America @Tossi-US • Nov 29
Hear the roar of the powerful eight cylinders in our latest Model Truck C. #Torque

Tossi of America @Tossi-US • Nov 27
See savings when you purchase a new Tossi today, and see savings at the pump year-round. #BlackFriday

Tossi of America @Tossi-US • Nov 25
We can’t wait to show you our new models! #SotiNewcomer
“@Carquestioner: “All I want for Christmas is my first Tossi”

Tossi of America @Tossi-US • Nov 23
Be safe on the roads this winter with Tossi’s protection plan. #WinterWeather
Appendix E

Survey questions asked regarding each company (organized by OPR dimension)

Trust

1. This organization can be relied on to keep its promises.

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Strongly disagree} & \text{Neutral} & \text{Strongly Agree} \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\end{array} \]

2. I feel very confident about this organization’s skills.

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Strongly disagree} & \text{Neutral} & \text{Strongly Agree} \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\end{array} \]

3. I believe that this organization takes the opinions of people like me into account when making decisions.

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Strongly disagree} & \text{Neutral} & \text{Strongly Agree} \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\end{array} \]

4. This organization does not mislead people like me.

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Strongly disagree} & \text{Neutral} & \text{Strongly Agree} \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\end{array} \]

5. I think it is important to watch this organization closely so that it does not take advantage of people like me. (Reversed)

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Strongly disagree} & \text{Neutral} & \text{Strongly Agree} \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\end{array} \]
Control mutuality

6. This organization believes the opinions of people like me are legitimate.
   
   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
   | Strongly disagree | Neutral | Strongly Agree

7. This organization won’t cooperate with people like me. *(Reversed)*
   
   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
   | Strongly disagree | Neutral | Strongly Agree

8. I believe people like me have influence on the decision-makers of this organization.

   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
   | Strongly disagree | Neutral | Strongly Agree

9. This organization and people like me are attentive to what each other say.

   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
   | Strongly disagree | Neutral | Strongly Agree

10. When I would have an opportunity to interact with this organization, I would feel that I have some sense of control over the situation.

    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
    | Strongly disagree | Neutral | Strongly Agree
Commitment

11. I can see that this organization wants to maintain a relationship with people like me.

• • • • • • • •

Strongly disagree  Neutral  Strongly Agree

12. I would rather work together with this organization than not.

• • • • • • • •

Strongly disagree  Neutral  Strongly Agree

13. I have no desire to have a relationship with this organization. (Reversed)

• • • • • • • •

Strongly disagree  Neutral  Strongly Agree

14. There is a long-lasting bond between this organization and people like me.

• • • • • • • •

Strongly disagree  Neutral  Strongly Agree

15. Compared to other organizations, I would value my relationship with this organization more.

• • • • • • • •

Strongly disagree  Neutral  Strongly Agree
Satisfaction

16. I am happy with this organization.

• • • • • • • • •

Strongly disagree  Neutral  Strongly Agree

17. Most people like me are happy in their interactions with this organization.

• • • • • • • • •

Strongly disagree  Neutral  Strongly Agree

18. I feel people like me are important to this organization.

• • • • • • • • •

Strongly disagree  Neutral  Strongly Agree

19. Both the organization and people like me benefit from the relationship.

• • • • • • • • •

Strongly disagree  Neutral  Strongly Agree

20. The organization fails to satisfy the needs of people like me. [Reversed]

• • • • • • • • •

Strongly disagree  Neutral  Strongly Agree