

行政院國家科學委員會專題研究計畫 成果報告

家族品牌延伸的互換性之研究 研究成果報告(精簡版)

計畫類別：個別型
計畫編號：NSC 98-2410-H-004-007-
執行期間：98年08月01日至99年12月31日
執行單位：國立政治大學企業管理學系

計畫主持人：樓永堅

報告附件：出席國際會議研究心得報告及發表論文

處理方式：本計畫涉及專利或其他智慧財產權，2年後可公開查詢

中華民國 100年04月14日

行政院國家科學委員會專題研究計畫成果報告

家族品牌延伸的互換性之研究

計畫編號：NSC 98-2410-H-004-007-

執行期限：98年8月1日至99年12月31日

主持人：樓永堅 國立政治大學企業管理學系

計畫參與人員：Joseph W. Chang Faculty of Management, Vancouver Island U.

一、中文摘要

本研究目的即運用群體層次的屬性轉化(Group-level trait transference, GLAT) 模式來探討群體成員實體性的高低，是否影響消費者對於母品牌的態度，以及對其他品牌延伸的評估。研究結果顯示，失敗的品牌延伸將對實體性高的家族品牌產生負面的影響；相反地，成功的品牌延伸將對實體性低的家族品牌產生正面的影響。

關鍵詞：實體性、家族品牌、極化

Abstract

This research examined the effects of the perceived entitativity of family brands and the accessibility of brand extension information on family brand evaluations. Similar results were identified for high and low accessibility conditions. Both high- and low-entitative family brands were enhanced and diluted by positive and negative extension information respectively. However, as perceived entitativity induced polarization effects, high- (vs. low-) entitative family brands were more significantly diluted by negative (dissimilar) extension information, whereas low- (vs. high-) entitative family brands were more significantly enhanced by positive extension information. By comparisons, highly (vs. lowly) accessible positive extension information is more diagnostic and, thus, more enhanceive on family brand evaluations, while highly and lowly accessible negative extension information yielded similar dilution effects on family brand evaluations.

Keywords: entitativity, family brands, polarization effects

二、本文

Conceptualization

Social cognition research has paid considerable attention to the influence of two characteristics of social groups on how they are perceived (e.g., Crawford, Sherman, and Hamilton 2002; Lickel, Hamilton, Wierzchowska, Lewis, Sherman and Uhles 2000), namely variability and entitativity. As the cognitive processes underlying the evaluations of objects and subjects are common (Loken 2006), it is expected that at least some influences on the perception of social groups apply also to the perception of family brands, which suggests that the feedback effects of brand extensions on high- and low-entitative family brands may also be disproportionate. However, relatively little empirical research has investigated this important issue. Therefore, in

addition to categorical similarity and perceived variability, this study moves a further step to examine how family brand entitativity mediates feedback extension effects on its subsequent family brand evaluations. Crawford and colleagues (2002) proposes the model of group-level trait transference (GLTT; Figure 1) to discuss the influence of individual members on the group and other group members. In the GLTT model, perceived entitativity serves as a pre-determinant of a three-stage information processing: trait abstraction (or trait inference), stereotyping (or group impression formation), and trait generalization (or trait transference). As with social groups, the attribute transference across brand extensions is more likely to occur for high-entitative family brands and induces asymmetric effects on family brand evaluations. Given the same quality of brand extensions, high-entitative family brands shall be more favorably evaluated than low-entitative family brands because perceivers make more extreme judgments and form more disproportional polarized impressions on high-entitative groups (Hamilton and Sherman 1996; Sherman et al. 1999). Therefore, a high- (vs. low-) entitative family brand is more favorably evaluated (Hypothesis 1). Based on the cue-diagnostics model (Skowronski and Carlston 1987), as extreme cues receive more weight on impression formation (e.g., Anderson 1981), the diagnostic cue of positive extension information is perceived as more extreme to, and will have more positive impacts on, a low-entitative family brand, which yields extremity and positivity biases (e.g., Skowronski and Carlston 1987). In contrast, the diagnostic cue of negative extension information is perceived as more extreme to, and will have more negative impacts on, a high-entitative family brand, which yields extremity and negativity biases. In other words, a low-entitative (or moderate-quality) family brand is expected to be more significantly enhanced by positive extension information, whereas a high-entitative (or high-quality) family brand is expected to be more significantly diluted by negative extension information. This result yields asymmetric (or disproportionate) impacts of positive and negative extension information on family brand evaluations, which is likely mediated by the prior perceived entitativity of family brands. Hence, low- (vs. high-) entitative family brands are more significantly enhanced by positive extension information (hypothesis 2), whereas high- (vs. low-) entitative family brands are more significantly diluted by negative extension information (hypothesis 3).

Method

Two studies were conducted to examine the hypotheses under highly and lowly accessible conditions respectively. For the first study (the high accessibility condition), following previous research (e.g., Loken and John 1993), two fictitious XXX (high-entitative) and YYY (low-entitative) family brands in Consumer Reports' format were portrayed representing high- and low-entitative family brands respectively. Anti-cavity toothpastes and pain relievers were selected as similar and dissimilar brand extensions respectively based on a pre-test which requested respondents to list possible similar and dissimilar brand extensions of the hypothesized family brands. The research design of the second study was similar to the first study, except intervening tasks were added to manipulate the low accessibility of brand

extension information. The accessibility of extension information was manipulated by varying the intervening material between the experimental treatment of extension information and family brand evaluations. The intervening materials were confusing tasks designed to decrease the accessibility of experimental treatments (e.g., Feldman and Lynch 1988) including a filler task and a confusing task.

Major findings

The study's results indicated that, when extension information was highly accessible, family brand images were enhanced and diluted by positive and negative extension information respectively, regardless of the categorical similarity of brand extension and the perceived entitativity of family brand. However, while both high- and low-entitative family brands were enhanced and diluted by positive and negative extension information respectively, the dilution and enhancement effects on high-entitative family brands were different from those on low-entitative family brands. High- (vs. low-) entitative family brands were more significantly diluted by negative extension information (H2), whereas low- (vs. high-) entitative family brands were more significantly enhanced by positive extension information (H3). The asymmetric result was caused by the polarization effect of perceived entitativity on family brand evaluations. Based on the GLTT model, attribute transference should be more significant for high-entitative family brands. The abstracted attributes of high-entitative family brands transferred across brand extensions and, eventually, associated with each individual brand extension. The strongly associated attributes across brand extensions amplified consumers' impressions about the attributes of high-entitative family brands and led to the result that high-entitative family brands were more favorably evaluated (H1). The research results of the second study paralleled the first study. However, by comparisons, highly accessible positive extension information was more diagnostic and, thus, more enhanceive than lowly accessible extension information on family brand evaluations, while highly and lowly accessible negative extension information yielded similar dilution effects on family brand evaluations. In conclusion, except the factor of categorical similarity, the determination about the dilution and enhancement of brand extension information on family brands pretty much depended on the cue-diagnosticsity of extension information, rather than the accessibility.

REFERENCES

- Ahluwalia, Rohini and Zeynep Gurhan-Canli (2000), "The Effects of Extensions on the Family Brand Name: An Accessibility-Diagnosticsity Perspective," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27 (December), 371-381.
- Anderson, N. H. (1981), *Foundations of Information Integration Theory*. New York: Academic Press.
- Brewer, M. B. (1988), "A Dual Process Model of Impression Formation," in *Advances in*

- Social Cognition*, Vol. 1, T. K. Srull and R. S. Wyer, eds. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Brewer, M. B. and A. S. Harasty (1996), "Seeing Groups as Entities: The Role of Perceiver Motivation," in *Handbook of Motivation and Cognition*, Vol. 3, E. T. Higgins and R. M. Sorrentino eds. New York: Guilford Press, 347-370.
- Campbell, D. T. (1958), "Common Fate, Similarity, and Other Indices of the Status of Aggregates of Persons as Social Entities," *Behavioral Science*, Vol. 3, 14-25.
- Crawford, M. T., S. J. Sherman, and D. L. Hamilton (2002), "Perceived Entitativity, Stereotype Formation, and the Interchangeability of Group Members," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83 (5), 1076-1094.
- Feldman, Jack M. and John G. Lynch (1988), "Self-Generated Validity and Other Effects of Measurement on Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 73 (August), 421-435.
- Fiske, S. T. and S. L. Neuberg (1990), "A Continuum of Impression Formation, from Category-Based to Individuating Processes: Influences of Information and Motivation on Attention and Interpretation," in *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 23, M. P. Zanna, ed. New York, NY: Academic Press, 1-74.
- Gaertner, L. and J. Schopler (1998), "Perceived Ingroup Entitativity and Intergroup Bias: An Interconnection of Self and Others," *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 28, 963-980.
- Gurhan-Canli Z (2003), "The effect of expected variability of product quality and attribute uniqueness on family brand evaluations," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 30, 105-114.
- Hamilton, D. L. and S. J. Sherman (1996), "Perceiving Persons and Groups," *Psychological Review*, Vol. 103, 336-355.
- Hamilton, D.L., S.J. Sherman, and J.S. Rodgers (2003), "Perceiving the groupness of groups: Entitativity, homogeneity, essentialism, and stereotypes," in Yzerbyt V, Judd CM, and O. Corneille (Eds). *The Psychology of Group Perception: Contributions to the Study of Homogeneity, Entitativity, and Essentialism*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press, 39-60.
- Lickel, B., D. L. Hamilton, G. Wierzchowska, A. C. Lewis, S. J. Sherman, and A. N. Uhles (2000), "Varieties of Groups and the Perception of Group Entitativity," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 78, 223-246.
- Loken B (2006), "Consumer psychology: Categorization, inferences, affect, and persuasion," *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57 (January), 453-485.
- Loken, Barbara and Deborah Roedder John (1993), "Diluting Brand Beliefs: When Do Brand Extensions Have a Negative Impact?" *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 57 (July), 71-84.
- Milberg, S.J. and F. Sinn (2008), "Vulnerability of global brands to negative feedback effects," *Journal of Business Research* 2008, 61(June), 684-690.
- Rosch, E. (1978), "Principles of Categorization", In *Cognition and Categorization*, E. Rosch and B. B. Lloyd, eds. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 27-48.
- Salinas, E.M. and J.M.P. Perez (2009), "Modeling the brand extensions' influence on brand image," *Journal of Business Research*, 62(January), 50-60.
- Sherman, S. J., D. L. Hamilton, and A. C. Lewis (1999), "Perceived Entitativity and the Social

Identity Value of Group Membership,” in *Social Identity and Social Cognition*, D. Abrams and M. Hogg, eds. Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 80-110.

Skowronski, John J. and Donal E. Carlston (1987), “Social Judgment and Social Memory: The Role of Cue Diagnosticity in Negativity, Positivity, and Extremity Biases,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 52(4), 689-699.

出席國際學術會議報告

2010 Association for Consumer Research Conference, Jacksonville, Florida, October 7-10.

一、參加會議經過

消費者研究學會ACR (Association for Consumer Research) 是研究消費者行為最重要的組織，每年在北美舉行的年會，皆吸引全球各地數百位學者及博士班學生前來與會發表最新研究成果。今年共吸引830篇投稿，但接受率只有48%左右，競爭相當激烈，而其出版之大會論文集 *Advances in Consumer Research*，雖然只是研討會論文輯，但其影響力很大，甚至，比一些期刊還重要，更被評為所有行銷期刊中最具影響力的第十三名。可見其水準之高，學術地位之重要性。

年會論文發表分成四大部分：一是競爭論文(competitive paper session)，是學者已完成的科研成果，二是特別議題(special session)，是集合數篇在議題取向類似，或是針對某一新興研究取向，提出一整合性探討。可能是研究成果，也可能只是概念的分享，但往往是未來許多最新研究課題的激發，三是工作論文(working paper session) 可能是尚未成為完整論文形式或是理論架構完成但還未實際測試，或是雖未達競爭論文水準，但仍有潛力，而以 poster 的方式呈現。另外，則是圓桌論壇(Roundtable)，針對某些特殊議題，由參與者進行討論。今年有八場，涵蓋社會行銷，質性研究方法，刻板印象，家庭消費，食物消費行為等。在三天的時間中，每天有四個時段，同時有八場研討會進行，共約有四百篇論文發表。

ACR 年會的另一個特色，是在正式年會的前一天，為博士班學生舉辦 Doctoral Symposium，由大會邀請在消費者研究領域中，學有專精的重量級人物或是歷任期刊 (*Journal of Consumer Research*) 主編為這些未來的研究生力軍講解如何進行研究，如何進行期刊的投稿，發表，如何與期刊主編和審稿人對話，以及學術生涯的規劃等議題進行深入分析，以便這些生力軍能及早適應未來的學術生活。自去年年會開辦以來，廣受好評，費用十美元(含晚餐)，更重要的是，沒有配額限制。只要是 ACR 的學生會員，每年皆可參加，是值得國內博士班學生考慮參與。

本人此次投稿競爭論文 (competitive paper session) 倖獲錄取，被歸在品牌與消費 (consumption and branding strategies) 之場次，論文題目是 PERCEIVED ENTITATIVITY AND ACCESSIBILITY-DIAGNOSTICITY AS MODERATORS OF RECIPROCAL EXTENSION EFFECTS，主要探討家族品牌成員實體性的高低，是否影響消費者對於母品牌的態度，以及對其他品牌延伸的評估。在會場中與許多學者充分交換意見，並得到許多寶貴的意見，對未來進一步的探討及延伸收穫良多。

二、心得與建議

ACR 年會每次皆吸引數百位學者及博士班學生與會，提供學者們一個互相交流及社

交的機會，同時也讓博士班學生能及早接觸，了解學術生涯及生態，並建立人際網路或合作研究的基礎。另外，更有許多重量級學者幾乎每次皆參與，也提供博士班學生親炙大師風采，更進而有所請益的機會。再者，藉由每年年會的機會，檢視學者們研究的進展及成果，進而發覺可能的合作機會，也就是這樣暨合作又競爭的機制，使得學術水準不斷提昇。因此，國內似應更加強相關學術社群之互動機制，以提供學者持續交流的機會，並加強博士班學生互動，以彼此激勵與學習

再者，本次大會所發表的四百多篇文章中，與品牌相關的論文似有逐年大幅增加的趨勢。其中與大陸相關的論文，更是逐年攀升，並吸引爆滿的學者與會，並且熱烈的討論，欲罷不能。大陸市場似乎不僅吸引了企業的注意，也成功的吸引學者關注。其中，更不乏許多重量級學者的投入。面對這股學術的大熱潮，我們應如何自處，如果西方學界不斷投入大陸的研究，透過快速增加的大陸留學生而建立與大陸學界的聯繫管道或直接的合作研究，則台灣將喪失原有同文同種的優勢，將更難對世界整體的知識提昇有所貢獻。因此，本人認為國內似應更積極的強化大陸消費者行為的研究，或是將本土化的消費者研究放在更大的華人文化的架構下，與國際主流接軌，方能確保立足之地。

三、攜回資料

攜回大會手冊，與會人員名單。至於大會論文集將結集出版，預計明年中可以發行。

PERCEIVED ENTITATIVITY AND ACCESSIBILITY-DIAGNOSTICITY AS MODERATORS OF RECIPROCAL EXTENSION EFFECTS

INTRODUCTION

The discussion of previous research in reciprocal extension effects has focused on the characteristics of brand extension information. The findings indicate that the effect of brand extension on family brand evaluations relies on the diagnosticity of extension information valence, which is moderated by the categorical similarity of brand extension (e.g., Ahluwalia and Gurhan-Canli 2000; Milberg and Sinn 2008; Salinas and Perez 2009). The diagnosticity of positive and negative extension information is a function of categorical similarity. When brand extensions are similar, negative extension information is more diagnostic to (or influential on) family brand evaluations. In contrast, when brand extensions are dissimilar, positive extension information is more diagnostic to (or influential on) family brand evaluations. Family brand images are more significantly weakened and enhanced by negative similar and positive dissimilar extension information respectively. In addition, the discussion has moved from the characteristics of a brand extension to the composition of a family brand (Gurhan-Canli 2003). The expected variability of individual extension quality moderates the processing of extension information and the evaluations of a family brand. On-line (vs. memory-based) integration of brand extension information and spontaneous judgments on a family brand are made when the variability of the individual extension quality of a family brand is expected to be low (vs. high). Moreover, Milberg and Sinn (2008) further examined the impacts of competitor brand familiarity and family brand breadth (a similar concept to brand variability) on family brand evaluations. Research findings indicate that negative impacts on brand extensions occur when

the extensions compete with the extensions of well-known and well-liked competing family brands, which yields more significant subsequent negative feedback effects on narrowly extended family brands.

Recently, social cognition research has paid considerable attention to the influence of two characteristics of social groups on how they are perceived (e.g., Crawford, Sherman, and Hamilton 2002; Lickel, Hamilton, Wierzchowska, Lewis, Sherman and Uhles 2000): variability and entitativity. Group *variability* reflects the extent of category similarity among group members, for example on the basis of gender or ethnic origin, whereas *entitativity* refers to the wholeness of a group defined as the degree to which a social aggregate is perceived as “having the nature of an entity” (Campbell 1958, p. 17). A high-entitative group is a collection of people who are bonded together in a coherent unit, such as task or intimacy groups (Lickel et al. 2000). Interactive coherence can be identified by the degree of *interdependence* among group members, which is a key antecedent of perceived entitativity (Gaertner and Schopler, 1998; Hamilton, Sherman, and Rodgers 2003). A social group with low variability in ages, such as the first-year college students attending the Basic Marketing course, does not suggest a high-entitative group. In comparisons, *entitativity* appears a more holistic concept than *variability* (or brand breadth) in describing the characteristics of social groups.

Moreover, the perceived entitativity of groups affects the information integration of group members and the subsequent impression formation about the groups (Crawford et al. 2002). In particular, trait transference among group members is more salient for high- (vs. low-) entitative groups, which induces the result that the traits of high- (vs. low-) entitative groups are more extremely evaluated (Hamilton and Sherman 1996; Sherman et al. 1999). As the cognitive processes underlying the evaluations of objects and subjects are common (Loken 2006), it is expected that at least some influences on the perception of social groups apply also to the perception of family brands, which suggests that the feedback effects of brand

extensions on high- and low-entitative family brands may also be disproportionate. However, relatively little empirical research has investigated this important issue. Therefore, in addition to categorical similarity and perceived variability, this study moves a further step to examine how family brand entitativity mediates feedback extension effects on its subsequent family brand evaluations.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Group-Level Trait Transference Model

Entitativity is initially defined as the degree to which a social aggregate is perceived as “being entitative” or “having the nature of an entity” (Campbell 1958, p. 17). A high-entitative group is a collection of persons perceived as being bonded together in a coherent unit.

Crawford and colleagues (2002) proposes the model of group-level trait transference (GLTT) to discuss the influence of individual members on the group and other group members. In the GLTT model, perceived entitativity serves as a pre-determinant of a three-stage information processing: trait abstraction (or trait inference), stereotyping (or group impression formation), and trait generalization (or trait transference).

At the first stage, motivated perceivers engage in on-line processing for both high- and low-entitative groups, where traits are abstracted from, and associated with, the behaviors of individual members. However, as the underlying essences of stereotype are not expected for low-entitative groups, less effort is made to further process the abstracted traits for the next step of stereotyping. The processing is more individuated or piecemeal represented (Brewer 1988; Fiske and Neuberg 1990). In contrast, as high-entitative groups suggest the underlying essences of stereotype, the abstracted traits are further processed to form or revise group impression (Stage 2) and transfer across group members (Stage 3). For high-entitative groups, the first stage processing of trait inference is the basis for stereotyping of the second stage and

the trait transference of the final stage. However, the further processing of stereotyping and trait transference (Stages 2&3) is not salient for low-entitative groups.

Following the trait abstraction at the first stage, the abstracted traits of high-entitative group are applied as the underlying essences of stereotype to form or revise group impression. The second stage processing associates each group member with the group's stereotype, from where the traits of each group member are conveyed to the stereotype of group. As the stereotypes of high-entitative groups are formed by the underlying essences of behavioral traits, the cognitive frameworks of high-entitative groups are more prototypic represented (Brewer and Harasty 1996). In contrast, as low entitativity does not suggest the underlying essences of stereotype, the processing of low-entitative groups is significant only at the first stage of trait abstraction, which leads to the results that the cognitive frameworks of low-entitative groups are more exemplar represented (Brewer and Harasty 1996).

As the underlying essences of stereotypes possess high inductive potential, the behavioral traits of group's stereotype are associated with each group member once the stereotype of high-entitative group is formed or revised. Consequently, the traits of stereotype transfer across, and become interchangeable (or common) traits of, all group members. The traits of the stereotype are not simply associated with their source individual members, but also with other individual members.

Following the trait generalization, perceivers make spontaneous dispositional inference on behavioral traits for high-entitative groups. An abstracted trait originally belonging to an individual member is perceived as a common trait of, and associated with, each group member. Under the circumstances, the perceived strength of abstracted traits is amplified. This induces a polarization effect that the properties of high-entitative groups (i.e., honest or intelligent) are more disproportionately judged, which polarizes the impression about high-entitative groups (Hamilton and Sherman 1996; Sherman et al. 1999).

As with social groups, the attribute transference across brand extensions is more likely to occur for high-entitative family brands and induces asymmetric effects on family brand evaluations. Given the same quality of brand extensions, high-entitative family brands shall be more favorably evaluated than low-entitative family brands because perceivers make more extreme judgments and form more disproportional polarized impressions on high-entitative groups (Hamilton and Sherman 1996; Sherman et al. 1999). Therefore,

H1: High- (vs. low-) entitative family brands are more favorably evaluated.

Cue-Diagnosticity Model

In social cognition, Skowronski and Carlston (1987) proposed a cue-diagnosticity model (CDM) in which the concept of perceived probability is advanced to explain the integration of positivity and negativity biases. The psychological process of impression formation is conceptualized as a diagnosticity-based categorization process to integrate biases. In this approach, diagnostic cues are salient information, suggesting one categorization over alternative categorizations (Skowronski and Carlston 1987, p. 689). A cue is identified as diagnostic if it induces a higher *perceived probability* that an object belongs to one category and a lower *perceived probability* that the object belongs to an alternative one. In other words, a cue is perceived as diagnostic if the difference in perceived probabilities of a target category and an alternative category is significant. Positivity biases occur if a positive cue suggests higher perceived probability for the target category (e.g., intelligent) than for the alternative category (e.g., stupid). In contrast, negativity biases occur if a negative cue suggests higher perceived probability for the target category (e.g., dishonest) than for the alternative category (e.g., honest). Positivity biases are ability-relevant (e.g., intelligent vs. stupid), whereas negativity biases are morality-relevant (e.g., honest vs. dishonest). Furthermore, consistent with the family resemblance conceptions of categorization (Rosch 1978), behavior cues suggest, but do not define, traits or categories.

Given the results of the first hypothesis, perceived entitativity induces asymmetric impacts on brand evaluations, where a high-entitative family brand is more favorably evaluated than a low-entitative one. A high-entitative family brand is polarized upwardly as a relatively higher quality family brand, whereas a low-entitative family brand is polarized downwardly as a moderate-quality family brand. Given the impact of the polarized perceived quality on high- and low-entitative family brands, the probability of launching a good quality brand extension for a high-entitative (which suggests high-quality) family brand is higher than that for a low-entitative (which suggests moderate quality) family brand. In contrast, given the impact of the polarized perceived quality of family brands, the probability of launching a negative brand extension for a high-entitative (which suggests high-quality) family brand is lower than that for a low-entitative (which suggests moderate quality) family brand.

Reciprocal effects of positive and negative extension information

Moreover, as extreme cues receive more weight on impression formation (e.g., Anderson 1981), the diagnostic cue of positive extension information is perceived as more extreme to, and will have more positive impacts on, a low-entitative family brand, which yields extremity and positivity biases (e.g., Skowronski and Carlston 1987). In contrast, the diagnostic cue of negative extension information is perceived as more extreme to, and will have more negative impacts on, a high-entitative family brand, which yields extremity and negativity biases. In other words, a low-entitative (or moderate-quality) family brand is expected to be more significantly enhanced by positive extension information, whereas a high-entitative (or high-quality) family brand is expected to be more significantly diluted by negative extension information. This result yields asymmetric (or disproportionate) impacts of positive and negative extension information on family brand evaluations, which is likely mediated by the prior perceived entitativity of family brands. Hence,

H2: Low- (vs. high-) entitative family brands are more significantly enhanced by

positive extension information.

H3: High- (vs. low-) entitative family brands are more significantly diluted by negative extension information.

STUDY 1

METHOD

Stimuli

Following previous research (e.g., Loken and John 1993), two fictitious XXX (high-entitative) and YYY (low-entitative) family brands in Consumer Reports' format were portrayed representing high- and low-entitative family brands respectively. In the semantic information, both family brands were described as moderately extended family brands comprised of the same *number* and *quality* of seven brand extensions. All the seven brand extensions of both family brands were of good quality and judged as Consumers' Best Buys by Consumer Reports. However, the seven brand extensions of XXX family brand (e.g., classic toothpastes, fresh mint toothpastes, whitening toothpastes, tartar control toothpastes, kids' toothpastes, active angle massage toothpastes, and flosses) were *similar* and *interdependent* brand extensions catering for the unique product function of oral care. In contrast, the seven brand extensions of YYY family brand (e.g., classic toothpastes, facial tissues, light bulbs, PC LCD monitors, alkaline batteries, mobile phones, and CD players) were *dissimilar* and *independent* brand extensions providing very different product functions. Both family brands had the same original (or first) brand of classic toothpastes, which indicated that the two family brands were built with the same starting point, but were leveraged on very different directions. In particular, this research manipulated the *interdependence* (or common goals) and *similarity* of brand extensions, which were two important antecedents of perceived entitativity (Lickel et al. 2000).

Anticavity toothpastes and *pain relievers* were selected as similar and

dissimilar brand extensions respectively based on a pre-test which requested respondents to list possible similar and dissimilar brand extensions of the hypothesized family brands. Four sets of semantic product information in the *Consumer Reports'* format were developed for the four brand extension scenarios of favorable anti-cavity toothpastes (positive similar extension), unfavorable anti-cavity toothpastes (negative similar extension), favorable pain relievers (positive dissimilar extension), and unfavorable pain relievers (negative dissimilar extension).

Measures

Independent variables

Perceived entitativity of the brand family was measured by a single item with a 9-point Likert scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (9) (Crawford et al. 2002; Lickel et al. 2000). The statement is as follows: "The brand extensions of (family brand name) are similar to each other and do not differ in many ways from each other. The brand extensions come from similar product categories and have similar product features, similar important product benefits, and similar product concepts. The seven brand extensions provide very similar product function for consumers."

Perceived quality of family brands and brand extensions was measured by four 7-point semantic differential attitude scales with endpoints labelled "Bad"(1)/"Good"(7), "Unfavorable"(1)/ "Favorable"(7), "Low-quality"(1)/"High-quality"(7) and "Inferior"(1)/"Superior" (7) (e.g., Loken and John 1993).

Categorical similarity of brand extensions was assessed by comparing the brand extension to each individual product in the existing brand family using a single item from Loken and John (1993). Responses were recorded on a 7-point scale from dissimilar (1) to similar (7).

Categorical similarity between the brand extension and the family brand as a whole was defined by the most similar paired comparison.

Dependent variables

Reciprocal extension effect index was measured by comparing the perceived quality of the hypothesized family brands before and after the experimental treatments.

Main study

Subjects and experiment procedure

One hundred and twenty five undergraduates were randomly assigned to one of the eight conditions in a 2 (information valence: positive vs. negative) x 2 (categorical similarity: similar vs. dissimilar) x 2 (perceived entitativity: high vs. low) between-subjects factorial design. Participants were told that the research purpose was to understand consumers' opinions about brands. In the beginning, they were asked to read the semantic information of XXX or YYY family brand carefully and evaluated the entitativity and the quality of XXX or YYY family brand, followed by the information about a newly launched extension. Again, they were asked to read the information carefully and evaluated the brand extension with the identical measures of family brand attitudes. Then, they were provided with, and asked to answer the questions of, two intervening tasks followed by the identical attitude measures to re-evaluate XXX or YYY family brand.

Results

Test of the asymmetric effect of perceived entitativity (H1)

Hypothesis 1 was tested by examining the main effect of entitativity on pre-test family brand evaluations. The test comparison of mean scores of high- and low-entitative family brands was highly significant ($M_{xxx} = 5.10$, $M_{yyy} = 4.28$, $F(1, 123) = 22.18$, $p < .001$). The high entitativity family brand was more favorably evaluated than the low entitativity family brand, confirming hypothesis 1.

Test of asymmetric feedback effects on family brands (H2 and H3)

The second and third hypotheses relate to the disproportionate impacts of positive and negative extension information on the evaluations of high- and low-entitative family brands. The most effective way to analyze changes is through the analysis of covariance using the change score as dependent variable but controlling for the initial score by entering it as a predictor as the first step. Since initial status is usually a strong predictor of change, failure to adjust for it can give misleading results. The results of a three-way ANCOVA yielded a significant main effect of information valence ($F(1, 115) = 25.30, p < .001$), with a negative brand extension inducing a reduction and a positive brand extension inducing an increase in family brand evaluations. There was also a significant interaction between information valence and perceived entitativity ($F(1, 115) = 16.38, p < .001$), indicating that the effect of the valence of extension information is different for high- and low-entitative family brands. Examination of the means shows greater dilution of the family brand by negative extension information for high entitativity brand families (mean changes are -1.16 and -1.76 for low and high entitativity brand families respectively). This confirms hypothesis 2. It also shows lower enhancement of the family brand by positive extension information for high entitativity brand families (mean changes are 1.05 and 0.57 for low and high entitativity brand families respectively). Thus hypothesis 3 is confirmed.

As the interaction between extension information valence and perceived entitativity is significant, a simple effects test on attitude change was performed to explore the interaction by examining the difference between high- and low-entitative family brands within one level (positive or negative) of the information valence. Simple effects tests use the within-cell variation for all the cases in the data set and will result in a smaller and more reliable error term, thus leading to higher testing power. When extension information valence is negative, the attitude change of the high-entitative family brand is significantly greater than that of the

low-entitative family brand ($M_{\text{high}} = -1.76$, $M_{\text{low}} = -1.16$, $F(1, 116) = 12.52$, $p < .001$).

Consistent with hypothesis 2, a high-entitative family brand is more strongly diluted by negative extension information. By contrast, when extension information valence is positive, the attitude change of the high-entitative family brand is significantly smaller than that of the low-entitative family brand ($M_{\text{high}} = .57$, $M_{\text{low}} = 1.05$, $F(1, 116) = 6.72$, $p < .001$). Thus, hypothesis 3 is also confirmed: a low-entitative family brand is more significantly enhanced by positive extension information.

Discussion

The study's results indicated that, when extension information was highly accessible, family brand images were enhanced and diluted by positive and negative extension information respectively, regardless of the categorical similarity of brand extension and the perceived entitativity of family brand. However, while both high- and low-entitative family brands were enhanced and diluted by positive and negative extension information respectively, the dilution and enhancement effects on high-entitative family brands were different from those on low-entitative family brands. A high- (vs. low-) entitative family brand was more significantly diluted by negative extension information (H2), whereas a low- (vs. high-) entitative family brand was more significantly enhanced by positive extension information (H3). The asymmetric result was caused by the polarization effect of perceived entitativity on family brand evaluations. Based on the GLTT model, attribute transference should be more significant for high-entitative family brands. The abstracted attributes of high-entitative family brands transferred across brand extensions and, eventually, associated with each individual brand extension. The strongly associated attributes across brand extensions amplified consumers' impressions about the attributes of high-entitative family brand and led to the result that a high-entitative family brand was more favorably evaluated (H1).

STUDY 2

Previous research indicated that feedback extension effects on family brand evaluations were moderated by the diagnosticity of brand extension information which was mediated by the accessibility of brand extension information (e.g., Ahluwalia and Gurhan-Canli 2000; Feldman and Lynch 1988). When extension information was highly accessible, both positive and negative extension information were diagnostic. As a result, family brands were enhanced and diluted by positive and negative extension information respectively. By contrast, when extension information was lowly accessible, the diagnosticity of brand extension information was mediated by the categorical similarity of brand extension. For similar brand extensions, negative extension information was diagnostic to family brand evaluations. For dissimilar brand extension, positive extension information was diagnostic to family brand evaluations. As a result, negative similar (vs. dissimilar) extension information was more detrimental to family brand evaluations, whereas positive dissimilar (vs. similar) extension information was more enhanceive to family brand evaluations. The first study examined the condition for high accessible extension information. The next study further examined the condition for low accessible extension information to compare if the results were different between these two conditions when the factor of family brand entitativity also involved.

The research design of the second study was similar to the first study, except intervening tasks were added to manipulate the low accessibility of brand extension information. A total of one hundred and ninety-four undergraduates participated in this research, including sixty-nine respondents in the pre-test of information accessibility and one hundred and twenty five respondents in experiments. Data were collected in undergraduate classes; participants automatically entered the lottery with twenty monetary prizes of US\$10 for each.

Pre-test

Information accessibility The accessibility of extension information was manipulated

by varying the intervening material between the experimental treatment of extension information and family brand evaluations. The intervening materials were confusing tasks designed to decrease the accessibility of experimental treatments (Feldman and Lynch 1988), which included a filler task (two personality scales, 44 items) and a confusing task (evaluations of three favorable and three unfavorable brands of digital camcorders, compact cars, and bubble-jet printers). The filler task was to clear the short-term memory of the respondents and increased the amount of *time* between the two evaluations of brand extensions and family brands. The brand-evaluation task provided intervening material in the same (vs. different) content domain as the initial cognition to decrease the initial *accessibility* of cognition.

The pre-test was conducted to validate the accessibility manipulation ($n = 78$) in which the higher and lower accessibility conditions were verified for positive and negative similar brand extensions (anti-cavity toothpastes). The procedure of the pretest was similar to the main study except the final step that the questions of family brand evaluations were replaced with an open-ended cognitive-response task. Respondents were asked to write down any thoughts about family brand XXX (including the new brand extension) that came into their mind. The accessibility of extension information was identified by the frequency and primacy (whether it was stated in the first two thoughts) of extension-related cognitions in the listed thoughts of respondents.

Two independent judges identified the number, and primacy, of extension-related thoughts in the thought-listing task, which was analyzed with a 2 (information valence: positive vs. negative) x 2 (accessibility: high vs. low) between-subjects design. A two-way ANOVA on the number of extension-related thoughts yielded only a main effect of accessibility ($F(1, 75) = 12.10, p < .001$). Independent-samples t-tests indicated that respondents under the high (vs. low) accessibility condition generated more thoughts about positive ($M_{\text{high}} = 1.29, M_{\text{low}} = .53, t(37) = 2.62, p < .05$) and negative ($M_{\text{high}} = 1.11, M_{\text{low}} = .45, t(37) = 2.73, p < .01$) brand extensions. Moreover, to test the primacy effect of accessibility, another two-way ANOVA on the arcsine transformations of the percentage of respondents indicating extension-related thoughts in the first two thoughts also yielded only a main effect of accessibility ($F(1, 74) =$

8.46, $p < .01$). Independent-samples t-tests indicated that a higher percentage of subjects generated extension-related thoughts earlier under the higher accessibility conditions as compared with the lower accessibility condition both for the positive ($M_{\text{high}} = .54$, $M_{\text{low}} = .20$, $t(34) = 2.29$, $p < .05$) and the negative ($M_{\text{high}} = .59$, $M_{\text{low}} = .20$, $t(35) = 2.56$, $p < .05$) brand extensions. Therefore, the results indicated that accessibility of extension information was appropriately manipulated. In conclusion, all the experimental stimuli were appropriately developed and were deployed as experimental treatments to the following experiments.

Results

The test of asymmetric effects of perceived entitativity (H1)

An ANOVA on family brand attitudes before experimental treatments indicated that participants perceived XXX family brand as higher quality than YYY family brand ($M_{\text{xxx}} = 5.07$, $M_{\text{yyy}} = 4.74$, $F(1, 123) = 6.41$, $p < .05$). The result suggested that, given the same number and quality of seven brand extensions of these two family brands, participants perceived a high-entitative family brand more favorably than a low-entitative family brand. Therefore, hypothesis 1 (H1) was supported. The perceived quality difference between high and low-entitative family brands served as a basis for subsequent family brand re-evaluations and led to disproportional feedback effects on high- and low-entitative family brands.

The test of asymmetric effects on family brand evaluations (H2 and H3)

A three-way ANCOVA on quality changes of family brands, with initial family brand quality as a covariate, yielded a main covariate effect of prior family brand quality ($F(1, 116) = 6.85$, $p < .05$), main factor effects of information valence ($F(1, 116) = 137.05$, $p < .001$) and perceived entitativity ($F(1, 116) = 4.82$, $p < .05$), and the interaction effect between categorical similarity and perceived entitativity ($F(1, 116) = 3.72$, $p < .05$). A further simple-effect test for the interaction effect indicated that reciprocal effects of similar extensions on high-entitative

and low-entitative family brands were equivalent ($F(1, 117) = .02, p > .05$), while unequivocal reciprocal effects of dissimilar extension on high- and low-entitative family brands were present ($F(1, 117) = 12.24, p < .01$). The results suggested that initial family brand quality might mediate reciprocal extension effect on family brand evaluations (H4), extension information valence moderates reciprocal extension effects on family brand evaluations (H2 and H3). Based on the ANCOVA, further analyses were performed as follows to verify hypotheses.

Independent-samples t-tests on family brand quality changes indicated that family brand YYY was more significantly enhanced than family brand XXX by favorable brand extensions ($M_{xxx} = .28, M_{yyy} = .58, t(56) = -2.23, p < .05$), whereas family brand XXX was more significantly enhanced than family brand YYY by unfavorable brand extensions ($M_{xxx} = -1.73, M_{yyy} = -1.11, t(65) = -2.21, p < .05$). The results suggested that enhancement effects of positive extensions on low-entitative (vs. high-entitative) family brands were more significant (H2), whereas dilution effects of negative extensions on high-entitative (vs. low-entitative) family brands were more salient (H3). Therefore, the second and the third hypotheses were both supported.

Discussion

The research results paralleled the first study. Both high- and low-entitative family brands were enhanced and diluted by positive and negative extension information respectively. However, as perceived entitativity induced asymmetric effects, high- (vs. low-) entitative family brands were more significantly diluted by negative (dissimilar) extension information, whereas low- (vs. high-) entitative family brands were more significantly enhanced by positive extension information.

By comparisons, highly accessible positive extension information was more diagnostic and, thus, more enhanceive than lowly accessible extension information on family brand evaluations ($M_{xxx, high} = 0.57, p < .001$ vs. $M_{xxx, low} = 0.28, p < .01$; $M_{yyy, high} = 1.05, p < .001$ vs. $M_{yyy, low} =$

0.58 , $p < .01$). However, the dilution effects of highly and lowly accessible negative extension information yielded no different results ($M_{xxx \text{ high}} = -1.76$, $p < .001$ vs. $M_{xxx \text{ low}} = -1.73$, $p < .001$; $M_{yyy \text{ high}} = -1.16$, $p < .001$ vs. $M_{yyy \text{ low}} = -1.11$, $p < .001$).

GENERAL DISCUSSION

This research had extended the research scope of reciprocal extension effects from the characteristics of extension information (e.g., the categorical similarity of brand extension) to the characteristics of family brands (e.g., the perceived entitativity of family brand). This study specifically further discussed asymmetric reciprocal extension effects on high- and low-entitative family brands under high and low accessibility situations. This research uncovered that the valence of extension information outweighed the categorical similarity of brand extension on family brand evaluations (e.g., Ahluwalia and Gurhan-Canli 2000). Family brand images (or names) were diluted and enhanced by negative and positive extension information respectively, regardless of extension information accessibility, brand extension similarity, and family brand entitativity. However, while family brands were enhanced and diluted by positive and negative extension information respectively, the reciprocal extension effect on high- and low-entitative family brands was disproportionate.

As attribute transference was more likely to occur for a high-entitative family brand (Crawford et al. 2002), the polarization effect was observed on the evaluations of high-entitative family brands, where high- (vs. low-) entitative family brands were more favorably evaluated. Given the same number and quality of brand extensions, a high-entitative family brand was perceived as of higher quality than a low-entitative family brand. Based on the cue-diagnostics model (Skowronski and Carlston 1987), the perceived probability that a good quality family brand would launch a good-quality new brand extension was significantly higher than that for a lower quality family brand. A good quality brand extension was relatively

more unexpected for a low (vs. high) quality family brand and was more diagnostic on the evaluation of low quality family brands. Based on the weighted averaging model (Anderson 1981), unexpected positive extension information was perceived as a more extreme and diagnostic cue, which received more weight on the evaluation of lower quality family brands. In contrast, the probability that a lower quality family brand would launch a low-quality new brand extension was significantly higher than for a high quality family brand. A low quality brand extension was relatively more unexpected for a high quality family brand and more diagnostic on the evaluation of a high quality family brand. Unexpected negative extension information was perceived as a more extreme and diagnostic cue, which received more weight on the evaluation of higher quality family brands. Therefore, the diagnostic cues of positive and negative extension information were more influential on the evaluation of lower and higher quality family brands respectively. A higher quality (or high-entitative) family brand was more significantly diluted by negative extension information, whereas a lower quality (or low-entitative) family brand was more significantly enhanced by positive extension information. Consequently, the polarized perceived quality of family brand mediated the reciprocal extension effect, which induced the asymmetric effect of perceived entitativity on family brand evaluations.

In conclusion, the contextual effect of perceived entitativity on family brand evaluations remained observable even when extension information was highly accessible. The diagnosticity of extension information on family brand evaluations was mainly contributed by the valence of extension information and partially by perceived entitativity. The extension information valence determined (or is diagnostic to) the direction of dilution or enhancement effects on family brand evaluations, whereas perceived entitativity decided (or is diagnostic to) the asymmetric enhancement and dilution effects on high- and low-entitative family brands for both highly and lowly accessible conditions. Moreover, based on the accessibility-diagnostics theory

(Feldman and Lynch 1988), highly accessible information was perceived as more extreme, and thus more diagnostic, than lowly accessible information (yielding extremity biases). As a result, highly accessible positive extension information was more diagnostic, and thus more enhancive, than lowly accessible extension information on good quality family brands. However, while highly accessible negative information is relative more accessible than lowly accessible negative information, the extremity between highly and lowly accessible extension information toward a positive category is similar. As a result, highly and lowly accessible negative extension information yields identical dilution effects (extremity and negativity biases) on family brand evaluations. In conclusion, except the factor of categorical similarity, the determination about the dilution and enhancement of brand extension information on family brands pretty much depended on the cue-diagnostics of extension information, rather than the accessibility.

REFERENCES

- Ahluwalia, Rohini and Zeynep Gurhan-Canli (2000), "The Effects of Extensions on the Family Brand Name: An Accessibility-Diagnosticity Perspective," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27 (December), 371-381.
- Anderson, N. H. (1981), *Foundations of Information Integration Theory*. New York: Academic Press.
- Brewer, M. B. (1988), "A Dual Process Model of Impression Formation," in *Advances in Social Cognition*, Vol. 1, T. K. Srull and R. S. Wyer, eds. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Brewer, M. B. and A. S. Harasty (1996), "Seeing Groups as Entities: The Role of Perceiver Motivation," in *Handbook of Motivation and Cognition*, Vol. 3, E. T. Higgins and R. M. Sorrentino eds. New York: Guilford Press, 347-370.
- Campbell, D. T. (1958), "Common Fate, Similarity, and Other Indices of the Status of Aggregates of Persons as Social Entities," *Behavioral Science*, Vol. 3, 14-25.
- Crawford, M. T., S. J. Sherman, and D. L. Hamilton (2002), "Perceived Entitativity, Stereotype Formation, and the Interchangeability of Group Members," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83 (5), 1076-1094.
- Feldman, Jack M. and John G. Lynch (1988), "Self-Generated Validity and Other Effects of Measurement on Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 73 (August), 421-435.
- Fiske, S. T. and S. L. Neuberg (1990), "A Continuum of Impression Formation, from

- Category-Based to Individuating Processes: Influences of Information and Motivation on Attention and Interpretation,” in *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 23, M. P. Zanna, ed. New York, NY: Academic Press, 1-74.
- Gaertner, L. and J. Schopler (1998), “Perceived Ingroup Entitativity and Intergroup Bias: An Interconnection of Self and Others,” *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 28, 963-980.
- Gurhan-Canli Z (2003), “The effect of expected variability of product quality and attribute uniqueness on family brand evaluations,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 30, 105-114.
- Hamilton, D. L. and S. J. Sherman (1996), “Perceiving Persons and Groups,” *Psychological Review*, Vol. 103, 336-355.
- Hamilton, D.L., S.J. Sherman, and J.S. Rodgers (2003), “Perceiving the groupness of groups: Entitativity, homogeneity, essentialism, and stereotypes,” in Yzerbyt V, Judd CM, and O. Corneille (Eds). *The Psychology of Group Perception: Contributions to the Study of Homogeneity, Entitativity, and Essentialism*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press, 39-60.
- Lickel, B., D. L. Hamilton, G. Wierzchowska, A. C. Lewis, S. J. Sherman, and A. N. Uhles (2000), “Varieties of Groups and the Perception of Group Entitativity,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 78, 223-246.
- Loken B (2006), “Consumer psychology: Categorization, inferences, affect, and persuasion,” *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57 (January), 453-485.
- Loken, Barbara and Deborah Roedder John (1993), "Diluting Brand Beliefs: When Do Brand Extensions Have a Negative Impact?" *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 57 (July), 71-84.
- Milberg, S.J. and F. Sinn (2008), “Vulnerability of global brands to negative feedback effects,” *Journal of Business Research* 2008, 61(June), 684-690.
- Rosch, E. (1978), “Principles of Categorization”, In *Cognition and Categorization*, E. Rosch and B. B. Lloyd, eds. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 27-48.
- Salinas, E.M. and J.M.P. Perez (2009), “Modeling the brand extensions’ influence on brand image,” *Journal of Business Research*, 62(January), 50-60.
- Sherman, S. J., D. L. Hamilton, and A. C. Lewis (1999), “Perceived Entitativity and the Social Identity Value of Group Membership,” in *Social Identity and Social Cognition*, D. Abrams and M. Hogg, eds. Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 80-110.
- Skowronski, John J. and Donal E. Carlston (1987), “Social Judgment and Social Memory: The Role of Cue Diagnosticity in Negativity, Positivity, and Extremity Biases,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 52(4), 689-699.

國科會補助專題研究計畫項下出席國際學術會議心得報告

日期：100 年 3 月 31 日

計畫編號	NSC 98-2410-H-004-007-		
計畫名稱	家族品牌延伸的互換性之研究		
出國人員姓名	樓永堅	服務機構及職稱	國立政治大學 企業管理學系教授
會議時間	99年10月7日至 99年10月10日	會議地點	Jacksonville, Florida
會議名稱	(中文)美國消費者行為研究學會 2010 年會 (英文)2010 Association for Consumer Research Conference		
發表論文題目	(中文)實體性認知與可及性/診斷性對雙向延伸效果之影響研究 (英文) PERCEIVED ENTITATIVITY AND ACCESSIBILITY-DIAGNOSTICITY AS MODERATORS OF RECIPROCAL EXTENSIC EFFECTS		

一、參加會議經過

二、與會心得

三、考察參觀活動(無是項活動者略)

四、建議

五、攜回資料名稱及內容

六、其他

出席國際學術會議報告

2010 Association for Consumer Research Conference, Jacksonville, Florida,
October 7-10.

一、參加會議經過

消費者研究學會ACR (Association for Consumer Research) 是研究消費者行為最重要的組織，每年在北美舉行的年會，皆吸引全球各地數百位學者及博士班學生前來與會發表最新研究成果。今年共吸引830篇投稿，但接受率只有48%左右，競爭相當激烈，而其出版之大會論文集 *Advances in Consumer Research*，雖然只是研討會論文集，但其影響力很大，甚至，比一些期刊還重要，更被評為所有行銷期刊中最具影響力的第十三名。可見其水準之高，學術地位之重要性。

年會論文發表分成四大部分：一是競爭論文(competitive paper session)，是學者已完成的研究成果，二是特別議題(special session)，是集合數篇在議題取向類似，或是針對某一新興研究取向，提出一整合性探討。可能是研究成果，也可能只是概念的分享，但往往是未來許多最新研究課題的激發，三是工作論文(working paper session) 可能是尚未成為完整論文形式或是理論架構完成但還未實際測試，或是雖未達競爭論文水準，但仍有潛力，而以 poster 的方式呈現。另外，則是圓桌論壇(Roundtable)，針對某些特殊議題，由參與者進行討論。今年有八場，涵蓋社會行銷，質性研究方法，刻板印象，家庭消費，食物消費行為等。在三天的時間中，每天有四個時段，同時有八場研討會進行，共約有四百篇論文發表。

ACR 年會的另一個特色，是在正式年會的前一天，為博士班學生舉辦 Doctoral Symposium，由大會邀請在消費者研究領域中，學有專精的重量級人物或是歷任期刊(*Journal of Consumer Research*)主編為這些未來的研究生力軍講解如何進行研究，如何進行期刊的投稿，發表，如何與期刊主編和審稿人對話，以及學術生涯的規劃等議題進行深入分析，以便這些生力軍能及早適應未來的學術生活。自去年年會開辦以來，廣受好評，費用十美元(含晚餐)，更重要的是，沒有配額限制。只要是 ACR 的學生會員，每年皆可參加，是值得國內博士班學生考慮參與。

本人此次投稿競爭論文 (competitive paper session) 倖獲錄取，被歸在品牌與消費 (consumption and branding strategies) 之場次，論文題目是 PERCEIVED ENTITATIVITY AND ACCESSIBILITY-DIAGNOSTICITY AS MODERATORS OF RECIPROCAL EXTENSION EFFECTS，主要探討家族品牌成

員實體性的高低，是否影響消費者對於母品牌的態度，以及對其他品牌延伸的評估。在會場中與許多學者充分交換意見，並得到許多寶貴的意見，對未來進一步的探討及延伸收穫良多。

二、與會心得與建議

ACR 年會每次皆吸引數百位學者及博士班學生與會，提供學者們一個互相交流及社交的機會，同時也讓博士班學生能及早接觸，了解學術生涯及生態，並建立人際網路或合作研究的基礎。另外，更有許多重量級學者幾乎每次皆參與，也提供博士班學生親炙大師風采，更進而有所請益的機會。再者，藉由每年年會的機會，檢視學者們研究的進展及成果，進而發覺可能的合作機會，也就是這樣暨合作又競爭的機制，使得學術水準不斷提昇。因此，國內似應更加強相關學術社群之互動機制，以提供學者持續交流的機會，並加強博士班學生互動，以彼此激勵與學習

再者，本次大會所發表的四百多篇文章中，與品牌相關的論文似有逐年大幅增加的趨勢。其中與大陸相關的論文，更是逐年攀升，並吸引爆滿的學者與會，並且熱烈的討論，欲罷不能。大陸市場似乎不僅吸引了企業的注意，也成功的吸引學者關注。其中，更不乏許多重量級學者的投入。面對這股學術的大熱潮，我們應如何自處，如果西方學界不斷投入大陸的研究，透過快速增加的大陸留學生而建立與大陸學界的聯繫管道或直接的合作研究，則台灣將喪失原有同文同種的優勢，將更難對世界整體的知識提昇有所貢獻。因此，本人認為國內似應更積極的強化大陸消費者行為的研究，或是將本土化的消費者研究放在更大的華人文化的架構下，與國際主流接軌，方能確保立足之地。

三、攜回資料

攜回大會手冊，與會人員名單。至於大會論文集將結集出版，預計明年中可以發行。

國科會補助計畫衍生研發成果推廣資料表

日期:2011/04/08

國科會補助計畫	計畫名稱: 家族品牌延伸的互換性之研究
	計畫主持人: 樓永堅
	計畫編號: 98-2410-H-004-007- 學門領域: 行銷
無研發成果推廣資料	

98 年度專題研究計畫研究成果彙整表

計畫主持人：樓永堅		計畫編號：98-2410-H-004-007-					
計畫名稱：家族品牌延伸的互換性之研究							
成果項目		量化			單位	備註（質化說明：如數個計畫共同成果、成果列為該期刊之封面故事...等）	
		實際已達成數（被接受或已發表）	預期總達成數（含實際已達成數）	本計畫實際貢獻百分比			
國內	論文著作	期刊論文	0	0	100%	篇	
		研究報告/技術報告	0	0	100%		
		研討會論文	0	0	100%		
		專書	0	0	100%		
	專利	申請中件數	0	0	100%	件	
		已獲得件數	0	0	100%		
	技術移轉	件數	0	0	100%	件	
		權利金	0	0	100%	千元	
	參與計畫人力（本國籍）	碩士生	0	0	100%	人次	
		博士生	1	0	100%		
		博士後研究員	0	0	100%		
		專任助理	0	0	100%		
國外	論文著作	期刊論文	0	0	100%	篇	
		研究報告/技術報告	0	0	100%		
		研討會論文	1	0	100%		
		專書	0	0	100%		章/本
	專利	申請中件數	0	0	100%	件	
		已獲得件數	0	0	100%		
	技術移轉	件數	0	0	100%	件	
		權利金	0	0	100%	千元	
	參與計畫人力（外國籍）	碩士生	0	0	100%	人次	
		博士生	0	0	100%		
		博士後研究員	0	0	100%		
		專任助理	0	0	100%		

<p style="text-align: center;">其他成果</p> <p>(無法以量化表達之成果如辦理學術活動、獲得獎項、重要國際合作、研究成果國際影響力及其他協助產業技術發展之具體效益事項等，請以文字敘述填列。)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">無</p>
---	--------------------------------------

	成果項目	量化	名稱或內容性質簡述
科 教 處 計 畫 加 填 項 目	測驗工具(含質性與量性)	0	
	課程/模組	0	
	電腦及網路系統或工具	0	
	教材	0	
	舉辦之活動/競賽	0	
	研討會/工作坊	0	
	電子報、網站	0	
	計畫成果推廣之參與(閱聽)人數	0	

國科會補助專題研究計畫成果報告自評表

請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況、研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性）、是否適合在學術期刊發表或申請專利、主要發現或其他有關價值等，作一綜合評估。

1. 請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況作一綜合評估

達成目標

未達成目標（請說明，以 100 字為限）

實驗失敗

因故實驗中斷

其他原因

說明：

2. 研究成果在學術期刊發表或申請專利等情形：

論文： 已發表 未發表之文稿 撰寫中 無

專利： 已獲得 申請中 無

技轉： 已技轉 洽談中 無

其他：（以 100 字為限）

本研究成果已經發表於 2010 Association for Consumer Research Conference, Jacksonville, Florida, October 7-10.

3. 請依學術成就、技術創新、社會影響等方面，評估研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性）（以 500 字為限）

本研究目的即運用群體層次的屬性轉化(Group-level trait transference, GLAT) 模式來探討群體成員實體性的高低，是否影響消費者對於母品牌的態度，以及對其他品牌延伸的評估。研究結果顯示，失敗的品牌延伸將對實體性高的家族品牌產生負面的影響；相反地，成功的品牌延伸將對實體性低的家族品牌產生正面的影響。

本研究擴大了過去以單一品牌延伸為基礎的外譯和回饋效果之研究，至家族品牌的延伸產品之效果的研究，同時引進了社會學裏的時體性概念來說明家族品牌內過品項之間的相似性，及其對品牌延伸的影響，讓家族品牌之研究得以進一步的分析，在理論或實務運用上，應有相當之貢獻！