

# 行政院國家科學委員會專題研究計畫 成果報告

## 家族品牌多樣性及其對品牌延伸影響之研究 研究成果報告(精簡版)

計畫類別：個別型  
計畫編號：NSC 96-2416-H-004-012-  
執行期間：96年08月01日至97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

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 98 年 04 月 07 日

# 行政院國家科學委員會補助專題研究計畫成果報告

## 家族品牌多樣性及其對品牌延伸影響之研究

計畫類別： 個別型計畫     整合型計畫

計畫編號：NSC 96-2416-H-004-012-

執行期間：2007 年 8 月 1 日至 2008 年 12 月 31 日

計畫主持人：樓永堅

成果報告類型(依經費核定清單規定繳交)： 精簡報告     完整報告

本成果報告包括以下應繳交之附件：

- 赴國外出差或研習心得報告一份
- 赴大陸地區出差或研習心得報告一份
- 出席國際學術會議心得報告及發表之論文各一份
- 國際合作研究計畫國外研究報告書一份

處理方式：除產學合作研究計畫、提升產業技術及人才培育研究計畫、列管計畫及下列情形者外，得立即公開查詢

一年  二年後可公開查詢

執行單位：國立政治大學企業管理學系

中 華 民 國 九 十 八 年 三 月 三 十 一 日

**The Perception of Family Brand Entitativity  
and Varieties of Family Brands**

Joseph W. Chang, Ph.D.  
University-College Professor of Marketing  
Faculty of Management  
Vancouver Island University  
900 Fifth Street  
Nanaimo, British Columbia, Canada V9R 5S5  
Tel: 1-250-753-3245, ext.: 2439  
Fax: 1-250-740-6551  
Email: [changj@viu.ca](mailto:changj@viu.ca)

Yung-Chien Lou, Ph.D.  
Professor of Marketing  
Department of Business Administration  
College of Commerce  
National Chengchi University  
64, Sec. 2, Chih-Nan Road,  
Taipei 116, Taiwan, R.O.C.  
Tel: 886-2-2938-7881  
Fax: 886-2-2939-8005  
E-mail: [yjlou@nccu.edu.tw](mailto:yjlou@nccu.edu.tw)

This Manuscript was accepted in the Working Paper session by the 2008 ACR  
Conference at San Francisco, October 23-26, 2008.

## **EXTENDED ABSTRACT**

### **Conceptualization**

Entitativity is defined as the degree to which a social aggregate is perceived as the degree of “being entitative” and “having the nature of an entity” (Campbell 1958, p. 17). Perceived entitativity has become the default concept of group perceptions for emerging research exploring the antecedents of perceived entitativity, as well as the organization, formation, function (or use), maintenance and revision of stereotypes (e.g. Fiske 1998). The antecedents of group perceptions, including interaction, importance, outcomes, goals, similarity, duration, size, and permeability (Lickel, Hamilton, Wieczorkowska, Lewis, Sherman and Uhles 2000), are suggestive cues for the perceptions of group coherence and entity, which lead to different routes of mental processes. Coherent groups are perceived as high entitative groups, whereas incoherent groups are perceived as low entitative groups.

The perceived entitativity then affects the following psychological mechanisms of the formation of mental representation (stereotyping), trait attribution (or endowment) to group members, and subsequent group judgments (Crawford, Sherman, and Hamilton 2002). Online (or integrated) processing is activated if the groups are perceived as high entitative groups, whereas memory-based (or retrospective) processing is elaborated if the groups are perceived as low entitative groups (McConnell, Sherman, and Hamilton 1997). As the cognitive processes underlying evaluations are common (Johar, Maheswaran, and Peracchio 2006; Loken 2006), it is expected that at least some influences on the perception of social groups apply also to the perception of family brands. The classification about social groups may be similar to the classification about family brands. Perceived entitativity may activate different cognitive processes and result in different evaluations about family brands. However, this concept has not yet been implemented to family brand evaluations. Therefore, this research examines the applicability of the eight entitativity measures in group perceptions on family brand evaluations.

### **Method**

The eight measures of perceived entitativity are utilized to measure 40 prestigious family brands (e.g., Coca-Cola, Microsoft, IBM, etc.) selected from the Top 100 Global Brands of BusinessWeek (2006). Around 70 students (200 valid cases expected) participated in this study and received a reward of course credits for the participation. Participants are undergraduate business students at a university in North

American. In order to ensure the quality of responses, voluntary participants were invited to a laboratory where the data were collected with one-on-one basis. To avoid systematic responding biases, participants were randomly assigned to one of the nine experimental groups with different orders of family brand names (three different orders) and measures (three different orders). In addition to a questionnaire of twelve pages, a 40-page booklet (one brand on a page) with color pictures of brand extension portfolios and brand logos of 40 popular family brands in consumer goods industries was provided for the evaluations. All the participants rated the 40 family brands on the extent to which each one qualified as a family brand (entitativity measure). Participants rated each family brand on a 9-point scale ranging from 1 (not a family brand at all) to 9 (very much a family brand) for the entitativity measure and then rated the same 40 family brands on the eight properties. In each case, after being given a definition of the property, participants rated the family brands on the 9-point scale. It took about 40 minutes to go through the rating process.

## **Results**

Descriptive analyses were performed for the mean ratings of each family brand, which yielded a range of mean ratings from 4.41 to 7.56. This evidence indicates that participants did see substantial variation among the family brands. Correlational analyses were conducted to identify how the properties of these family brands were related to each other and to entitativity. The results indicated that seven properties, except permeability (as expected), were positively correlated with entitativity. Moreover, size was inter-correlated with five properties (duration, importance, interaction, and similarity); goals and importance were inter-correlated with four properties (duration, outcomes, importance, and similarity; duration, interaction, size, and goals); duration, outcomes, and similarity were inter-correlated with three properties; and permeability was inter-correlated with only two properties.

Furthermore, regression analyses were performed to examine the relationship of these properties to entitativity. The results indicate that goals ( $E = .38$ ) and duration ( $E = .36$ ) were the most influential predictors of entitativity, followed by interaction ( $E = .22$ ), outcomes ( $E = .19$ ), importance ( $E = -.15$ ), size ( $E = .15$ ), permeability ( $E = .14$ ), and similarity ( $E = .06$ ). These eight properties were highly correlated with the entitativity measure ( $R = .88$ ) and account for the large majority ( $R^2 = .77$ ) of the variance in entitativity ratings. In conclusion, these results indicated that several of these variables were strongly correlated with entitativity and accounted for a substantial portion of the variation in entitativity, which parallels the finding for social

groups (Lickel et al. 2000).

However, the pattern of inter-correlation acrossing properties for family brand evaluations is slightly different from the pattern for social groups which showed five properties (interaction, importance, goals, outcomes, and similarity) were highly inter-correlated. Finally, k-means cluster analyses were conducted specifying between three and six clusters to examine whether there were different types of family brands defined by unique patterns of property ratings, as well as whether these different types of family brands differed in entitativity. A  $40 \times 9$  matrix in which each cell contained the average rating of a single family brand on a single property was created by averaging the 70 participants' ratings of each of the family brands for each of the nine properties. Clusters were then generated on the basis of the eight properties (entitativity exclusive). The five-cluster solution was found to be the most stable solution for the interpretation. Cluster 1 family brands (e.g., American Express) are small and have high levels of goals and similarity. Cluster 2 family brands (e.g., GE and Panasonic) are low in similarity, interaction, and outcomes, but of moderate duration and size. Cluster 3 family brands (e.g., Disney) are high in duration and size, but low in outcomes and similarity. Cluster 4 family brands (e.g., AVON) are relatively low in outcomes, size, importance, and interaction. Cluster 5 family brands (e.g., Toyota) are high in duration, goals, and similarity. Cluster 3 family brands are the highest in entitativity followed by Clusters 1, 2, 5, and 4.

In conclusion, the results indicated that, as with social groups, properties of perceived entitativity are effective antecedents that may cluster family brands into groups, which subsequently elaborate different cognitive processes for family brand evaluations.

## REFERENCES

- BusinessWeek, "The 100 Top Brands," BusinessWeek Online. Available from: <  
<http://bwnt.businessweek.com/brand/2006/>> [Accessed March 22, 2008].
- 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.
- 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.
- Johar, Gita Venkataramani, Durairaj Maheswaran, and Laura A. Peracchio (2006),  
"MAPping the Frontiers: Theoretical Advances in Consumer Research on  
Memory, Affect, and Persuasion," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 33 (June),  
139-149.
- 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, Barbara (2006), "Consumer Psychology: Categorization, Inferences, Affect,  
and Persuasion," *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 57 (January), 453-485.
- McConnell, A. R., S. J. Sherman, and D. L. Hamilton (1997), "Target Entitativity:  
Implications for Information Processing about Individual and Group Targets,"  
*Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 72, 750-762.