The Human Brand?

What Social Psychology can teach us about Brand Perception
Stereotype Content Model

• Warmth:
  • Friend or foe?
  • Perceived intentions
  • Warm, sincere, friendly, trustworthy

• Competence:
  • Able or unable?
  • Perceived ability to implement intentions
  • Competent, able, gifted, motivated

Fiske et al. (2002; 2007)
Stereotype Content Model

Fiske et al. (2002; 2007)
Brands as Intentional Agents

[Diagram showing brands on a plane with axes labeled 'Intentions' and 'Ability']
## Troubled brands

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honda</td>
<td>Toyota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advil</td>
<td>Tylenol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Stanley</td>
<td>Goldman Sachs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelers Insurance</td>
<td>AIG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Troubled brands

• Nationally representative sample (n=1000 US adults)

• Dependent variables:  
  • Perceived intentions  
  • Perceived ability  
  • Buying intention  
  • Brand loyalty
Troubled brands

- Toyota
- Morgan Stanley
- Goldman Sachs
- AIG
- Travelers Insurance
- Advil
- Tylenol
- Honda

Intentions vs. Ability diagram
Troubled brands

- Toyota
- Morgan Stanley
- AIG
- Golman Sachs
- Advil
- Tylenol
- Honda
- Travelers Insurance

Intentions

Ability
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purchase intentions &amp; Loyalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>==</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tylenol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Stanley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldman Sachs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelers Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Negativity effect on intentions

- **Trait confirmation:**
  - Warm - Cold
  - Competent - Incompetent
  - Sincere – Suspicious
  - Able - Unable
  - Friendly – Unfriendly
  - Hard-working - Lazy
  - Honest – Dishonest
  - Motivated - Unmotivated

Skowronski & Carlston (1987)
Negativity effect on intentions

• **Trait confirmation:**
  • Warm - **Cold**
  • Competent - Incompetent
  • Sincere – **Suspicious**
  • Able - Unable
  • Friendly – **Unfriendly**
  • Hard-working - Lazy
  • Honest – **Dishonest**
  • Motivated - Unmotivated

Skowronski & Carlston (1987)
Intentions vs. Ability framing

• N=80 Colorado Springs residents

• Letter to Editor:
  • Intention vs. Ability framing
Intentions vs. Ability framing

• ... does it care about its neighbors downstream?
• ... ignoring its responsibility to the community.
• ... is it frank with the public?

• ... unable to keep up with the proper maintenance?
• ... do not have plan to efficiently perform the work.
• ... hiring people who are experienced and qualified?
Intentions vs. Ability framing

• Dependent Variables
  • How much to fine the utility?
  • How much time would have to pass before you feel the utility has really solved the problem?
Intentions vs. Ability framing
“What the hell did we do to deserve this?” (Apr 29)

“There’s no one who wants this over more than I do. I would like my life back.” (May 30)
BP spill - cause

- ... do they only care about their bottom line?
- ... they blatantly ignored their responsibilities to the coastal community.
- ... is BP not competent enough to be drilling in deep water?
- ... they do not fully understand the risks that come with deep-water drilling.
BP spill - response

- ... BP is taking their responsibility seriously.
- ... BP is listening to and responding to the needs of the people whose lives have been impacted by the spill.
- ... BP is responding proficiently.
- ... the current BP operations have proved themselves to be effective and well-executed.
### Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Warmth Response</th>
<th>Competence Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warmth Cause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence Cause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BP spill

Clean-up effort

- Warmth response
- Competence response

Causes:
BP spill

Recommended fine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warmth response</th>
<th>Competence response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cause

Warmth

Competence
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Warmth and competence are fundamental dimensions used to characterize people, animals, and even corporations. Based on observations from a preliminary survey (Study 1) on the impact of scandals on several brands, we predicted that an organization that caused a disaster would be judged more harshly if its warmth rather than competence reputation was called
Savouring morality
"#1 criteria for food purchase (Glanz et al. 2001): TASTE"
Criteria for food purchase:
- taste
- price
- ...
- healthiness
- ...
- morality
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