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This research examined the applicability of the eight entitativity properties on family brand evaluations. Research results indicated that participants did see substantial variation among the family brands. These eight properties accounted for a substantial portion of the variation in entitativity. Seven properties, except permeability, were positively correlated with entitativity, whereas goals and duration were the most influential predictors of entitativity. Eventually, five clusters of family brands were classified. Cluster 1 family brands were small and have high levels of goals and similarity. Cluster 2 family brands were low in similarity, interaction, and outcomes, but of moderate duration and size. Cluster 3 family brands were high in duration and size, but low in outcomes and similarity. Cluster 4 family brands were relatively low in outcomes, size, importance, and interaction. Cluster 5 family brands were high in duration, goals, and similarity.
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inconsistent toilet bowl cleaner package a claim was made that the packaging reflects an attempt to be environmentally friendly. The dependent measures taken in this study were identical to those in study two, however, additional measures of participants’ eco-friendliness were taken to rule out environmental consciousness as a possible confound.

The results of study three support the claim that trust is a mediating mechanism in evaluating product packaging elements. We found a significant interaction between the presence of trust-enhancing eco-friendliness claims and packaging (F(1,88)=15.47, p=.014) such that when eco-friendliness claims were not made regarding the product packaging, participants preferred the opaque toilet bowl cleaner significantly to the transparent toilet bowl cleaner in terms of product quality (mean \(\text{opaque}=3.48\) versus \(\text{clear}=1.69\)) but when eco-friendliness claims were made, participants did not evaluate the product qualities as being different from one another (mean \(\text{opaque}=3.54\) versus mean \(\text{clear}=3.45\)). Again, trust was found to be a significant mediator in this process. Though there seems to be clear preferences for product packaging across product categories, these preferences can be shifted when information is provided that will enhance the level of trust in non-traditional packaging.

In light of our significant findings related to packaging transparency and its influence on trust, willingness to pay, and perceived quality, product designers would be well served in contemplating which type of packaging in what contexts is appropriate. Going forward we would like to further investigate the process in which transparency influences attitudes toward products. For instance, when considering organic products the transparency of packaging may be a significant factor in relaying authenticity and perceptions of purity. While with other product categories transparency may negatively influence quality perceptions, for example when the package contains noxious chemicals such as bleach or when consumers prefer to avoid visual evidence of efficacy.
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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). On-line (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 on 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 (α=.38) and duration (α=.36) were the most influential predictors of entitativity, followed by interaction (α=.22), outcomes (α=.19), importance (α=.15), size (α=.15), permeability (α=.14), and similarity (α=.06). These eight properties were highly correlated with the entitativity measure (R=.88) and account for the large majority (R²=.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 variance in entitativity, which parallels the finding for social groups (Lickel et al. 2000). However, the pattern of inter-correlation across 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 x 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.
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