

# 科技部補助專題研究計畫成果報告 期末報告

對比性周邊效果修正之研究：修正涉入與偏誤知覺之調節作用

計畫類別：個別型計畫  
計畫編號：MOST 106-2410-H-003-011-  
執行期間：106年08月01日至107年12月31日  
執行單位：國立臺灣師範大學管理研究所

計畫主持人：蕭中強

計畫參與人員：碩士班研究生-兼任助理：丘佳融  
碩士班研究生-兼任助理：陳佳雯  
碩士班研究生-兼任助理：白家安  
碩士班研究生-兼任助理：王昭力

中華民國 108 年 02 月 26 日

中文摘要：過去由周邊效果研究所影響之偏誤校正理論已經被廣泛地發展並應用於探討各種社會問題和行銷方案。即使研究周邊效果之學者對於同化和對比偏誤如何會使目標評估產生影響已經投入幾乎相同的努力，但令人驚訝的是對比偏誤的修正研究相對應於同化偏誤的修正研究，在修正領域中卻獲得極少的關注。尤其至今學界對於對比性修正之涉入與偏誤知覺之獨立性研究，依然付之闕如。本研究提案旨在解析對比性修正之涉入與偏誤知覺之間可能存在的交互作用。本研究擬採行一2（偏誤提醒文章：有或無）乘2（修正涉入：高或低）乘2（周邊：高尊貴或普通）組間三因子實驗設計。本實驗設計之預期是：當高修正涉入之研究參與者(未)接收偏誤提示文章時，高尊貴的周邊品牌將比普通的周邊品牌更可能導致較佳(差)的目標評價，此即對比性修正(此即預設對比)。本研究貢獻如下。一、本研究對於修正涉入與偏誤知覺在對比性修正中所扮演之調節變數角色，提出迄今最有說服力的論理及驗證，彌補修正理論之不足。二、本研究跳脫出傳統修正研究中，侷限於實驗室設計操縱與真實行銷情境不甚相符之處，並建立了與消費者日常行銷活動相符的修正實驗情境。三、本研究為第一個直接測量所抱持之偏誤理論的研究。

中文關鍵詞：同化，對比，偏誤修正，修正涉入，偏誤知覺

英文摘要：Theories in bias correction, partially stemmed from the findings of context research, have been extensively developed over the past four decades to investigate a variety of social issues and marketing scenarios. Even though context effect researchers have engaged in nearly equivalent effort to the examination of how assimilative and contrastive biases might exert their impacts on target assessments, research in correction for contrastive bias has received surprisingly much less attention than its counterpart in correction for assimilative bias. In particular, none has worked on the scrutiny of how involvement to exert correction for contrastive bias might be independent from the awareness of contrastive bias. The current research proposal is aimed at the disentanglement of potential interplay between correction for the contrastive bias and awareness of the contrastive bias. An experiment employing a 2 (Bias-Alert Article: yes vs. no)  $\times$  2 (Involvement to Correct: high vs. low)  $\times$  2 (Context: high prestige vs. none) between-participants factorial design will be conducted to examine the proposed mechanisms. It is expected that highly involved research participants without receiving the bias-alert article are likely to evaluate the target product less favorably when the context brand is of high prestige than when the context brand is not as prestigious (i.e., the default contrast). More importantly, after receiving the bias-alert article, highly involved research participants are likely to

evaluate the target product more favorably when the context brand is of high prestige than when the context brand is not of high prestige (i.e., contrastive correction). The contribution of the current study is threefold. First, the current study produces the most compelling evidence to date of the moderating role of involvement to correct and awareness of bias in research stream of theory-based correction for contrast. Above and beyond the typical theorization supporting theory-based correction for contrast, the current study complements correction theories by postulating and substantiating the moderating role involvement to correct and awareness of bias may play to instigate the correction. Second, the current study pushes over the implicated edge of correction research. Instead of being constrained in the laboratory design manipulated by factors incompatible with the true marketing circumstances, the current study establishes the stage with which bias correction for contrast is likely for general consumers when they encounter marketing campaigns in their daily lives. Third, the current study is the first research to directly measure the theories of bias that respondents are supposed to hold, and the first research to provide the evidence associating the measured theories of bias with involvement to correct and awareness of bias.

英文關鍵詞：Assimilation, Contrast, Bias Correction, Involvement, Bias Awareness

## 十二、研究計畫內容：

- (二) 研究計畫之背景及目的。請詳述本研究計畫之背景、目的、重要性及國內外有關本計畫之研究情況、重要參考文獻之評述等。本計畫如為整合型研究計畫之子計畫，請就以上各點分別述明與其他子計畫之相關性。
- (三) 研究方法、進行步驟及執行進度。請分年列述：1.本計畫採用之研究方法與原因。2.預計可能遭遇之困難及解決途徑。3.重要儀器之配合使用情形。4.如為整合型研究計畫，請就以上各點分別說明與其他子計畫之相關性。5.如為須赴國外或大陸地區研究，請詳述其必要性以及預期成果等。
- (四) 預期完成之工作項目、成果及績效。請分年列述：1.預期完成之工作項目。2.對於學術研究、國家發展及其他應用方面預期之貢獻。3.對於參與之工作人員，預期可獲之訓練。4.預期完成之研究成果及績效（如期刊論文、研討會論文、專書、技術報告、專利或技術移轉等質與量之預期績效）5.本計畫如為整合型研究計畫之子計畫，請就以上各點分別說明與其他子計畫之相關性。

## **On the Biasing Correction of Contrastive Context: The Moderating Role of Involvement to Correct and Bias Awareness**

Theories in bias correction have been extensively developed over the past four decades to investigate a variety of social issues and marketing scenarios (Chien & Hsiao, 2015; Nisbett & Wilson, 1977; Wegner & Petty, 1995). One way to categorize the bias correction research would be following the direction to which the default bias or “correction-free” bias is at work. That is, some correction research can be readily classified as correction for assimilative bias, while the remaining of which can be correction for contrastive bias. Even though context effect researchers have engaged in nearly equivalent effort to the examination of how assimilative and contrastive biases might exert their impacts on target assessments (Chien, Wegener, Hsiao, & Petty, 2010; Herr, 1989; Mussweiler, 2003), research in correction for contrastive bias has received surprisingly much less attention than its counterpart in correction for assimilative bias. In particular, none has worked on the scrutiny of how involvement to exert correction for contrastive bias might be independent

from the awareness of contrastive bias. The current research proposal is aimed at the disentanglement of potential interplay between correction for the contrastive bias and awareness of the contrastive bias. It is of paramount importance to balance the correction research between assimilative biases and contrastive biases. The contribution of the current research is twofold. On the one hand, the theoretical mechanisms underlying the process of correction in not only assimilative context but also contrastive context will be fully complemented. The marketing practitioners and social stakeholders will also be able to better manipulate the correction related variables on hand and predict the subsequent correction scenarios in not only the assimilative but also contrastive settings on the other.

In the following sections, the literature review with regard to context effect, correction theories, and correction theories for the contrastive bias will be addressed. A tentative experimental design is followed and subject to modifications in accordance with the extensive literature review and updated theorization. The potential contribution in terms of academic and managerial implications is followed in the end.

## **Judgmental Effects Triggered by Contextual Biases**

Potential contextual biases may come in many diversified shapes and sizes. For example, marketing practitioners or social stakeholders might purposefully incorporate target irrelevant features, such as attractive background scenes (Miniard, Bhatla, Lord, Dickson, & Unnava, 1991), harmonized environmental melody (Gorn, Goldberg, & Basu, 1993), and attractive endorsers (Newman, Diesendruck, & Bloom, 2011; Petty, Cacioppo, & Schumann, 1983) into the context with which target products or politicians are judged in order to stimulate favorable target assessments. Contextual biases might not be necessarily accompanied with the target simultaneously as the judgement is made. That is, the assessment of target is likely to be affected by

the comparison of previously exposed contextual stimuli (Herr, 1989; Tormala & Petty, 2007) or by the applicability to interpret the target representation from the earlier presented contextual priming (Higgins, Rholes, & Jones, 1977; Yi, 1990). Some biases can be distinguished from the others following the direction with which the bias is at work. Assimilation refers to the judgmental scenario in which the target is perceived more like the quality of the biasing context than if the context were not present, whereas contrast stands for the shift of target perceptions away from the biasing context than would otherwise be the case. Assimilative biases have been theorized as more likely when consumers pay attention to the potential similarity between the contextual stimuli and the target (Mussweiler, 2003), when there is a feature match in the condition of an ambiguous target accompanied with a moderate context (Herr, 1989), or when there is an overlap in the interpretive ranges (i.e., the perceived values that can be readily taken on) of the context and the target (Chien et al., 2010). As one might expect, then, contrastive biases would be more likely to occur when consumers attempt to test the hypothesis that the contextual stimuli and the target are dissimilar from each other (Mussweiler, 2003), when there is a mismatch in features between the contextual stimuli and the target in the scenarios of an unambiguous target along with any context or an ambiguous target associated with an extreme context (Herr, 1989), when there is a lack of overlap in the interpretive ranges between the contextual stimuli and the target (Chien et al., 2010).

## **Earlier Theories of Bias Correction**

A variety of theories of bias correction have been developed to address settings in which the potential for bias turns out salient to people. The earliest of these theories were designed to point out assimilative biases produced by contextual priming or categorization. In these partialling/subtraction approaches, perceived

biased reactions are partialled out or subtracted from reactions to the target when particular reactions are deemed as reactions to the contextual stimuli rather than to the target per se. Such a process of partialling/subtraction might result in the reduction of the assimilation, the removal of the assimilative bias altogether, or even the creation of a contrastive bias especially when a subset of true reactions to the target are confounded as perceived reactions to the contextual stimuli and therefore partialled out or subtracted from one's representation of the target. This paradigm of mechanisms had been central to many studies inspired by the set-reset model (Martin, 1986; Martin, Seta, & Crelia, 1990) and the inclusion-exclusion models (Schwarz & Bless, 1992a, 2007). Despite significant similarities across these approaches, there are still some trivial differences. The main focus of the inclusion-exclusion model is on how accessible contextual information is used (Bless & Schwarz, 2010). *Inclusion* of contextual information in one's representation of the target is deemed as the default mental operation and therefore readily engender assimilation. *Exclusion* of contextual information from one's own representation of the target is generally hypothesized to require the support from substantially more cognitive resources (Schwarz & Bless, 1992a), even though there might be some other cognitive processes which could still lead to the occurrence of exclusion (Bless & Schwarz, 2010). Contextual information is likely to be excluded from one's own representation of the target as a result of the accessible contextual information failing to pass over one of the following three filters. The *relevance filter* scrutinizes the sources of contextual information. The exclusion of contextual information might be most likely triggered when the sources of contextual information are perceived from anywhere other than the target per se (such as target irrelevant contextual stimuli, e.g., Strack, Schwarz, Bless, Kübler, & Wänke, 1993). The *representativeness filter* examines the extent to which the contextual information may represent the target. When the accessible contextual information is suspected to

be atypical to or unrepresentative of the target, the exclusion thereof will be activated. The sensibility to instigate such an exclusion process would be enhanced especially when the features in the contextual information are regarded as divergent to those in the target (Herr, Sherman, & Fazio, 1983). Lastly, the *conversational norms* filter could fail if the contextual information is suspiciously perceived as conversationally inappropriate to function, such as the case when the contextual information is considered to violate norms of employing or administering nonredundant information, Schwarz, Strack, & Mai, 1991).

The inclusion-exclusion model also diverges from the set-reset model in that the contrast effects are not only driven by the exclusion or the removal of perceived contextual information from the representation of the target. When the contextual information is considered to be the comparison standard against which the target is judged, the exclusion of the contextual information from the representation of the target would be triggered. The use of the contextual information as a comparison standard might immediately enlarge the perceived difference between the contextual information and the target (Helson, 1964; Sherif & Hovland, 1961) or stretch the response scale anchors (Ostrom & Upshaw, 1968). By and large, Therefore, the exclusion of the contextual information is likely to annul the assimilative bias or even bring about the contrastive bias particularly when the contextual information is over recalibrated from the representation of the target or when the contextual information is so divergent from the target representation that it is perceived as a comparison standard against which the target is judged.

## **Theory-Based Correction**

Early social psychology theorists documented that people might get aware of the potential for bias and

then attempt to react against the perceived bias (e.g., Higgins, Rholes, & Jones, 1977; Wyer & Budesheim, 1987). Some social psychology researchers investigated the scenario in which the immediate perceptions toward the target irrelevant bias might be imprecise to characterize the true bias and such an incorrect belief on the bias might then result in an over- or under- recalibration of their assessments made to the target (Nisbett & Wilson, 1977; cf., Wilson & Brekke, 1994). People, unaware of the inaccurate perceptions of the bias at work, would still attempt to exert cognitive resources to achieve subjectively believed correct assessments following the use of their idiosyncratic naïve theories of bias (Petty & Wegener, 1993; Strack, 1992; Wegener & Petty, 1997; Wilson & Brekke, 1994).

Such theory-based corrections (e.g., the Flexible Correction Model, FCM; Petty & Wegener, 1993; 1997) are distinguished from the partialling/subtraction theories in quite a few aspects. Even though the partialling/subtraction theories hold that the default or uncorrected bias should always be of assimilation, the FCM theorizes that not only assimilative biases but also contrastive biases are likely to be default from any of a number of processes. Still the other main discrepancy between two streams of theories lies in the direction to which the correction is made. It could be readily understood that given the only type of default bias (i.e., assimilative bias) that partialling/subtraction theories suggest, the corresponding correcting process, be it out of excluding or resetting, should merely result in reduced assimilation, accurate judgment, or over-correction to assimilative bias. In the partialling approaches, corrections (resetting or exclusion) move judgments away from assimilation (to reduced assimilation, no bias, or contrast). However, since FCM proposes the flexible work of default biases (i.e., either assimilative or contrastive bias), the direction to which the correction is made would be much adaptable to accommodate not only assimilative but also contrastive correction.

## **Theory-Based Correction for Contrast**

The documentation of the potential corrections for perceived contrast biases would be particularly crucial to complement the theoretical utility of theory-based correction. However, no prior correction research has unambiguously addressed how involvement to correct may interplay with awareness to bias in the use of theories of bias per se. That is, no experimental manipulations of involvement to correct have been applied to the correction setting that would not also have blatantly reminded research participants to the potential for bias. The current study is aimed at unraveling the shortcomings of current research in theory-based correction. Whereas prior correction theorists have generally employed experimenter-provided instructions to obtrusively alert the research participants (Petty & Wegener, 1993; Priester et al., 2004; Wegener & Petty, 1995), the current study adopts subtle correction prompts that are embedded within the context of persuasive message (i.e., as an article exposed immediately before the target ad). Thus, such a heretofore unexplored approach to unobtrusively remind consumers or ad audiences of the potential for bias would be able to disentangle the long lasting confounding effects between involvement to correction and awareness of bias ubiquitously observable in the extant literature exemplifying bias corrections.

### **Overview of the Current Study**

It has been well supported in theories and in the field that a contrastive reaction toward the target (such as issues, persons, products, or brands) is most likely when the accessible context is perceived extremely

discrepant from the representation of the target (Tormala & Petty, 2007). Prior research in theory-based correction suggested that the correction, be it assimilative or contrastive, might be activated to discount, annul, or even reverse the perceived bias (Priester et al., 2004; Wegener & Petty, 1997, 2001). In the attempt to set the stage of realistic consumption contexts, the correction reminder is designed to be subtly embedded in an article exposed immediately before the target ad rather than obtrusively presented by the experimenter. By so doing, another important advantage of the current design would be the assurance to fully separate the manipulation of involvement to correct from the bias prompt. Inspired by the Sprite ads suggesting that “image is nothing”, the current study designs a bias-reminder embedded article listed in the target. Similar to “image is nothing” tagline in Sprite ads, it is expected that the designed bias-reminder embedded article would also be viewed and understood by research participants as a series of reading sessions in reality. It is also expected that research participants would engage in effortful correction for the contrastive bias only when the bias-reminder embedded article is present in the target ad and research participants have been manipulated to exert high involvement to correct.

## **Pretest**

A total of 60 college students is designed to examine the general lay belief on the bias and the corresponding naïve theories research participants in the main experiment might hold. The research participants’ naïve theories of contrastive bias are likely to be measured by asking how participants might react to the fictitious brand when it is exposed immediately after showing a set of extremely prestigious brands. The pretest responses was made on a 9-point scale ranging from “make the novel brand seem less

prestigious than if no extremely prestigious brands were previously encountered (-4) to make the novel brand seem more prestigious than if no extremely prestigious brands were previously encountered (4). Pretest participants reported that the fictitious brand would seem significantly less prestigious,  $M = -1.04$ ,  $t(59) = -5.68$ , than the scale midpoint, 0, when previously encountering the extremely prestigious brands.

## **Participants and Design**

A total of 360 college students were recruited to participate in the experiment. Each participant (plus 60 research participants in the pretest) received NT\$ 100 as an incentive to diligently finish the experimental material. Participants were run in a series of laboratory recruiting sessions with varied size. In each laboratory session, participants were randomly assigned to a 2 (Bias-Alert Article: yes vs. no)  $\times$  2 (Involvement to Correct: high vs. low)  $\times$  2 (Context: high prestige vs. none) between-participants factorial design.

## **Procedure**

The context-free target perceptions were collected in the beginning. Participants were asked to rate five brands, the first of which was the target ad, on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (low prestige) to 7 (high prestige). Four weeks later, the same participants were asked to participate in another two experiments. All three experiments (i.e., one experiment four weeks ago, and two experiments subsequently) were designed such that research participants were led to believe that experiments were independent from each other. Three

discrepant editorial styles and fonts were used in each of the three experiment questionnaires, and each experiment was administered by a different experimenter. In the beginning of the second experiment, research participants were informed that the questionnaire was used to collect college students' thoughts and opinions on about some real situations they might encounter in the real life. Then, on the next page of the questionnaire, research participants were asked to indicate how thinking and evaluating a particular (high prestigious) brand would influence their subsequent prestige rating of another (target) brand on a 9-point scale ranging from "make the (target) brand seem less prestigious than if no extremely prestigious brands were previously encountered (-4) to make the (target) brand seem more prestigious than if no extremely prestigious brands were previously encountered (4). Research participants would then be asked to further answer several different questions unrelated to contexts and targets, such as how beautiful melody would influence their evaluations of food when they had dined with their family in a restaurant, and how the heavy traffic noises outside the window would affect their attention to view movies in the living rooms. These irrelevant questions served as the filler. After finishing the second survey, research participants were instructed to enter another laboratory room.

Research participants are then informed that the purpose of the still another (third) experiment was the exploration of college students' reading comprehension on the printed media, such as newspapers and magazines, and some materials in the popular magazines and newspapers had been randomly excerpted from the public media. Then, all participants received an article randomly collected from a magazine. Half randomly assigned participants received the article about a business case in which two neutrally perceived and identical stores of a brand were located in two totally different positioned shopping malls. The business case was supposed to highlight the contrastive bias the background shopping might exert on the neutral brand.

Research participants were then asked to indicate how they evaluated the store on a 9-point scale ranging from “make the neutral brand seem less prestigious than if no extremely prestigious brands were nearby in the shopping mall (-4) to make the neutral brand seem more prestigious than if no extremely prestigious brands were nearby in the shopping mall (4). The business case article was supposed to enhance the awareness of contrastive bias. For the remaining half of participants, another article irrelevant to context bias was provided and therefore no contrastive bias was made salient. Then, all participants were asked to read three ads. The first ad was for an extremely prestigious brand to half of participants, but an average brand to the remaining half of participants. The target ad was followed, and then the last ad was an irrelevant ad. Participants were then asked to indicate their attitudes toward the target. After the measurements of manipulation checks, research participants were thanked, debriefed, and dismissed.

## **Independent Variables**

### ***Bias reminder***

By reading the bias-reminding article, half participants were manipulated to be prompted by the potential contrastive bias the contextual information was likely to instigate. The remaining half of participants reading a context-bias irrelevant article elicited the same level of accessibility to the contrastive bias as their counterparts. It was expected that the bias-reminding article would trigger a significant awareness of contrastive bias and such an activation of bias awareness would spill over to the subsequent ad evaluation tasks.

### ***Involvement to correct***

Immediately before receiving the ad task, half participants were instructed to carefully process the ads and make the product judgments as accurate as possible since their data would be scrutinized carefully. However, the other half of participants were simply asked to view the ads in the following pages. It was expected that participants who were asked to carefully process the ads would devote more of their cognitive resources in the ad evaluation task than their counterparts without such requests.

### ***Context prestige***

Before encountering the target ad, half of participants received an ad for an extremely high prestigious brand, but the remaining half of participants only received an ad for an average brand. It was expected that the default bias of contrastive context effect was activated when research participants exposed to the extremely high prestigious brand, whereas the context ad for an average brand would be less likely to instigate the default contrastive bias to the research participants.

## **Dependent Variable**

### ***Product assessment***

All participants evaluated the target brand and indicate their perceptions on a 7-point scale ranging from 1, low prestige, to 7, high prestige. Participants were also asked to indicate their assessments of the target on the dimensions of good(7)/bad(1), and favorable (7)/unfavorable(1). An index of Product Assessment is formed by averaging the three scales, Cronbach's alpha = .87.

## **Manipulation Checks**

### ***Bias reminder***

All participants were asked to report their perceptions of the contrastive bias on the target on a 9-point scale ranging from “make the target brand seem less prestigious than if no extremely prestigious brands were previously exposed (-4) to make the target brand seem more prestigious than if no extremely prestigious brands were previously exposed (4). It is expected that participants who receive the bias-reminder article will report a significant contrastive bias of the context. That is, the target brand will be reported to initially perceived as significantly less prestigious for the participants receiving the bias-reminder article than those who receive context-bias irrelevant article.

### ***Involvement to correct***

Participants are asked to report their involvement when reading the target ad on three 7-point semantic differential scales ranging from 1 = “Not Important to Answer Accurately,” “Not Prudent to Make the Accurate Answer,” and “Not Concentrating on Providing the Accurate Answer” to 7 = “Very Important to Answer Accurately”, “Very Prudent to Make the Accurate Answer,” and “Concentrating Very Much on Providing the Accurate Answer,” respectively. After checking for their internal consistency, the three items are averaged to index the level of involvement.

### ***Context prestige***

All participants are asked to indicate the perceived prestige toward the context brand on a 7-point scale ranging from 1, low prestige, to 7, high prestige. It is expected that the extremely prestigious brand is rated significantly more prestigious than that of the average brand.

## Results

**Manipulation checks.** A 2 (Bias-Alert Article)  $\times$  2 (Involvement to Correct)  $\times$  2 (Context) ANOVA on the check of bias reminder revealed only a main effect of context,  $F(1, 352) = 18.74, p < .001$ , and a context by bias-alert article interaction,  $F(1, 352) = 17.21, p < .001$ , on the bias reminder check. Participants receiving the high prestigious context reported the target brand less prestigious,  $M = -.31$ , than those receiving the low prestigious context brand,  $M = .23$ . Such a main effect is significantly contributed when the bias reminded article was present ( $M = -.66$  vs.  $.39, F(1, 352) = 35.94, p < .001$ ), but not so when the bias irrelevant article was present ( $M = .04$  vs.  $.07, F(1, 352) = .02, p = .90$ ).

A 2 (Bias-Alert Article)  $\times$  2 (Involvement to Correct)  $\times$  2 (Context) ANOVA on the check of involvement to correct revealed only a main effect of involvement to correct,  $F(1, 352) = 76.23, p < .001$ . Participants in the high involvement condition paid more attention to correct for the bias of the target ad,  $M = 5.11$ , than those in the low involvement condition,  $M = 4.10$ .

A 2 (Bias-Alert Article)  $\times$  2 (Involvement to Correct)  $\times$  2 (Context) ANOVA on the check of context prestige revealed only a main effect of context,  $F(1, 352) = 464.98, p < .001$ . Participants receiving the high prestigious context perceived the context brand more prestigious,  $M = 4.72$ , than those receiving the low prestigious context brand,  $M = 2.79$ .

**Product assessment.** A 2 (Bias-Alert Article)  $\times$  2 (Involvement to Correct)  $\times$  2 (Context) ANOVA on the index of product assessment showed a main effect of context,  $F(1, 352) = 35.85, p < .001$ . Participants receiving the high prestigious context brand reported the target brand less favorable,  $M = -.84$ , than those receiving the low prestigious context brand,  $M = .16$ . Most importantly, such a main effect is qualified by the three-way interaction,  $F(1, 352) = 4.25, p < .05$ . Supportive to the proposal of the current research, when the context brand is low prestigious, involvement to correct did not differ participants' target assessments, be it with the bias-alert article,  $F(1, 352) = .75, p = .39$ , or without the bias-alert article,  $F(1, 352) = .07, p = .79$ . When the context brand is high prestigious, involvement to correct did not differ participants' target assessments only in the condition without the bias-alert article,  $F(1, 352) = .54, p = .47$ , but not in the condition with the bias-alert article,  $F(1, 352) = 7.81, p < .01$ . That is, participants receiving the bias-alert article correct for the perceived bias from the high prestigious context brand when involvement to correct was high by annulling the contrast effect,  $M = -.38$ , but no correction for the contrast effect was made for the counterpart in low involvement condition,  $M = -1.31$ . No correction was found in other conditions.

## **Discussion**

The contribution of the current study is threefold. First, the current study produces the most compelling evidence to date of the moderating role of involvement to correct and awareness of bias in research stream of theory-based correction for contrast. Above and beyond the typical theorization supporting theory-based correction for contrast, the current study postulates and substantiates the moderating role involvement to correct and awareness of bias may play to instigate the correction. Second, the current study extends the implicated boundary of correction research. Instead of being constrained in the laboratory design manipulated

by factors incompatible with the true marketing circumstances, the current study establishes the stage with which bias correction for contrast is likely to general consumers when encountering marketing campaigns in their daily lives. Third, the current study is the first research to directly measure the theories of bias that respondents are supposed to hold, and the first research to provide the evidence associating the measured theories of bias with involvement to correct and awareness of bias. The theorization on the theory-based correction for contrast can now be further complemented. The marketing practitioners should pay attention to the possible scenarios in which the worse competing brand is likely to be more competitive and perceived close to the leading brand when theory-based correction of contrast is active. Following the conceptual reasoning and findings of the current study, marketing practitioners can now better control and predict contextual variables, be it from our own or from our competitors, especially when a contrastive default shift of the brand is instigated in the persuasive media.

## REFERENCES

- Bless, H., & Schwarz, N. (2010). Mental construal and the emergence of assimilation and contrast effects: The inclusion/exclusion model. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 42, pp. 319-373). San Diego, CA: Elsevier Academic Press.
- Chien, Y.-W., & Hsiao, C.-C. (2015). Be yourself, image is nothing: Bias correction when viewing ads in sequence. *Social Influence*, 10(1), 19-30.
- Chien, Y.-W., Wegener, D. T., Hsiao, C.-C., & Petty, R. E. (2010). Dimensional range overlap and context effects in consumer judgments. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37, 530-542.
- DeSteno, D., Petty, R. E., Wegener, D. T., & Rucker, D. D. (2000). Beyond valence in the perception of likelihood: The role of emotion specificity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 397-416.
- Glaser, J., & Banaji, M. R. (1999). When fair is foul and foul is fair: Reverse priming in automatic evaluation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 669-687.
- Gorn, G. J., Goldberg, M. E., & Basu, K. (1993). Mood, awareness, and product evaluation. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 2(3), 237-256.

Helson, H. (1964). *Adaptation-level theory: An experimental and systematic approach to behavior*. New York: Harper & Row.

Herr, P. M. (1989). Priming price: Prior knowledge and context effects. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16 (June), 67-75.

Herr, P. M., Sherman, S. J., & Fazio, R. H. (1983). On the consequences of priming: Assimilation and contrast effects. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 19, 323-340.

Higgins, E. T., Rholes, W. S., & Jones, C. R. (1977). Category accessibility and impression formation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 13, 141-154.

Isbell, L. M., & Wyer, R. S. Jr. (1999). Correcting for mood-induced bias in the evaluation of political candidates: The roles of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25(2), 237-249.

Kang, Y. S., & Herr, P. M. (2006). Beauty and the beholder: toward an integrative model of communication source effects. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 33(June), 123-130.

Maddux, W. W., Barden, J., Brewer, M. B., & Petty, R. E. (2005). Saying no to negativity: The effects of

context and motivation to control prejudice on automatic evaluative responses. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 41, 19-35.

Martin, L. L. (1986). Set/reset: Use and disuse of concepts in impression formation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 493-504.

Martin, L. L., Seta, J. J., & Crelia, R. A. (1990). Assimilation and contrast as a function of people's willingness and ability to expend effort in forming an impression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59 (July), 27-37.

Miniard, P. W., Bhatla, S., Lord, K. R., Dickson, P. R., & Unnava, H. R. (1991). Picture-based persuasion processes and the moderating role of involvement. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 18, 92-107.

Mussweiler, T. (2003). Comparison processes in social judgment: Mechanisms and consequences. *Psychological Review*, 110(3), 472-489.

Newman, G. E., Diesendruck, G., & Bloom, P. (2011). Celebrity contagion and the value of objects. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 38(August), 215-228.

Nisbett, R. E., & Wilson, T. D. (1977). Telling more than we can know: Verbal reports on mental processes. *Psychological Review*, 84, 231-259.

Ostrom, T. M., & Upshaw, H. S. (1968). Psychological perspective and attitude change. In A. G. Greenwald, T. C. Brock, & T.M. Ostrom (Eds.), *Psychological foundations of attitudes* (pp. 217-242). New York: Academic Press.

Petty, R. E., Briñol, P., Tormala, Z. L., & Wegener, D. T. (2007). The role of meta-cognition in social judgment. In E. T. Higgins & A. W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (2nd ed., pp. 254-284). New York: Guilford Press.

Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1984). Source factors in the Elaboration Likelihood Model of persuasion. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 11, 668-672.

Petty, R. E., Cacioppo, J. T., & Schumann, D. (1983). Central and peripheral routes to advertising effectiveness: The moderating role of involvement. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 10 (September), 135-145.

Petty, R. E., DeMarree, K. G., Briñol, P., Horcajo, J., & Strathman, A. J. (2008). Need for cognition can magnify or attenuate priming effects in social judgment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34, 900-912.

Petty, R. E., Harkins, S. G., & Williams, K. D. (1980). The effects of group diffusion of cognitive effort on

attitudes: An information-processing view. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38(1), 81-92.

Petty, R. E., & Wegener, D. T. (1993). Flexible correction processes in social judgment: Correcting for context-induced contrast. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 29, 137-165.

Petty, R. E., Wegener, D. T., & White, P. H. (1998). Flexible correction processes in social judgment: Implications for persuasion. *Social Cognition*, 16(1), 93-113.

Priester, J. R., Dholakia, U. M., & Fleming, M. A. (2004). When and why the background contrast effect emerges: Thought engenders meaning by influencing the perception of applicability. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31(December), 491-501.

Schul, Y., & Burnstein, E. (1985). When discounting fails: Conditions under which individuals use discredited information in making a judgment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 894-903.

Schwarz, N., & Bless, H. (1992a). Constructing reality and its alternatives: An inclusion/exclusion model of assimilation and contrast effects in social judgment. In L. L. Martin & A. Tesser (Eds.), *The construction of social judgment* (pp. 217-245). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Schwarz, N., & Bless, H. (1992b). Scandals and the public's trust in politicians: Assimilation and contrast effects. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18, 574-579.

Schwarz, N., & Bless, H. (2007). Mental construal processes: The inclusion/exclusion model. In D. A. Stapel & J. Suls (Eds.), *Assimilation and contrast in social psychology* (pp. 119-141). New York: Psychology Press.

Schwarz, N., Strack, F., & Mai, H. P. (1991). Assimilation and contrast effects in part-whole question sequences: A conversational logic analysis. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 55, 3-23.

Sherif, M., & Hovland, C. I. (1961). *Social judgment: Assimilation and contrast effects in communication and attitude change*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Strack, F. (1992). The different routes to social judgments: Experiential versus informational strategies. L. L. Martin & A. Tesser (Eds.), *The construction of social judgment* (pp. 249-276). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Strack, F., Schwarz, N., Bless, H., Kübler, A., & Wänke, M. (1993). Awareness of the influence as a determinant of assimilation versus contrast. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 23, 53-62.

Tormala, Z. L., & Petty, R. E. (2007). Contextual contrast and perceived knowledge: Exploring the

implications for persuasion. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 43, 17-30.

Wegener, D. T., & Carlston, D. E. (2005). Cognitive processes in attitude formation and change. In D. Albarracin, B. Johnson, & M. Zanna (Eds.), *The handbook of attitudes* (pp. 493-542). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Wegener, D. T., Clark, J. K., & Petty, R. E. (2006). Not all stereotyping is created equal: Differential consequences of thoughtful versus non-thoughtful stereotyping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 42-59.

Wegener, D. T., & Petty, R. E. (1995). Flexible correction process in social judgment: The role of naive theories in corrections for perceived bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68 (March), 36-51.

Wegener, D. T., & Petty, R. E. (1997). The flexible correction model: The role of naive theories of bias in bias correction. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 29, pp. 141-208). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Wilson, T. D., & Brekke, N. (1994). Mental contamination and mental correction: Unwanted influences on judgments and evaluations. *Psychological Bulletin*, 116(1), 117-142.

Wyer, R. S., & Budesheim, T. L., (1987). Person memory and judgments: The impact of information that one is told to disregard. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 14-29.

Yi, Y. (1990). The effects of contextual priming in print advertisements. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 17(September), 215-222.

Expected Schedule:

1 <sup>st</sup> Month	Literature Review
2 <sup>nd</sup> Month	Theory Construct
3 <sup>rd</sup> and 4 <sup>th</sup> Months	Experimental Design and Pretest
5 <sup>th</sup> to 8 <sup>th</sup> Month	Experiment Execution and Data Collection
9 <sup>th</sup> and 10 <sup>th</sup> Months	Data Coding and Analysis
11 <sup>th</sup> and 12 <sup>th</sup> Months	Result Summarization and Writing

106年度專題研究計畫成果彙整表

計畫主持人：蕭中強			計畫編號：106-2410-H-003-011-				
計畫名稱：對比性周邊效果修正之研究：修正涉入與偏誤知覺之調節作用							
成果項目			量化	單位	質化 (說明：各成果項目請附佐證資料或細項說明，如期刊名稱、年份、卷期、起訖頁數、證號...等)		
國內	學術性論文	期刊論文		0	篇		
		研討會論文		0			
		專書		0	本		
		專書論文		0	章		
		技術報告		0	篇		
		其他		0	篇		
	智慧財產權及成果	專利權	發明專利	申請中	0	件	
				已獲得	0		
			新型/設計專利		0		
		商標權		0			
		營業秘密		0			
		積體電路電路布局權		0			
		著作權		0			
		品種權		0			
		其他		0			
	技術移轉	件數		0	件		
		收入		0	千元		
	國外	學術性論文	期刊論文		0	篇	
			研討會論文		1		"Consumers' Bias Correction in Advertising" in Summer AMA Conference 2017, AMA Educators Proceedings Volume 287.
			專書		0	本	
專書論文			0	章			
技術報告			0	篇			
其他			0	篇			
智慧財產權及成果		專利權	發明專利	申請中	0	件	
				已獲得	0		
			新型/設計專利		0		
		商標權		0			
		營業秘密		0			
		積體電路電路布局權		0			

		著作權	0		
		品種權	0		
		其他	0		
	技術移轉	件數	0	件	
		收入	0	千元	
參與計畫人力	本國籍	大專生	0	人次	
		碩士生	4		Data Collection, Experiment Material Working
		博士生	0		
		博士後研究員	0		
		專任助理	0		
	非本國籍	大專生	0		
		碩士生	0		
		博士生	0		
		博士後研究員	0		
		專任助理	0		
其他成果 (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。)					

## 科技部補助專題研究計畫成果自評表

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（簡要敘述成果是否具有政策應用參考價值及具影響公共利益之重大發現）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（請於其他欄註明專利及技轉之證號、合約、申請及洽談等詳細資訊）

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200字為限）

Partial research outcome has been accepted and presented in 2017 Summer AMA Conference. A full paper is going to be submitted shortly.

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）

The contribution of the current study is threefold. First, the current study produces the most compelling evidence to date of the moderating role of involvement to correct and awareness of bias in research stream of theory-based correction for contrast. Above and beyond the typical theorization supporting theory-based correction for contrast, the current study postulates and substantiates the moderating role involvement to correct and awareness of bias may play to instigate the correction.

4. 主要發現

本研究具有政策應用參考價值： 否  是，建議提供機關

（勾選「是」者，請列舉建議可提供施政參考之業務主管機關）

本研究具影響公共利益之重大發現： 否  是

說明：（以150字為限）