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Abstract

Consumers’ Willingness to Pay More for Character Licensed Merchandise

Hong Fang
Department of Consumer Science
The Graduate School
Seoul National University

The purpose of this study was to investigate the potential mediating effect of perceived consumer value in the relationship between the consumer intimacy with a character (character familiarity, character self-congruity, and character identification) and willingness to pay more for a character-licensed merchandise. Direct effect, partially mediated, and fully mediated models were compared. Online convenience survey was conducted and totally 582 participants in China did the investigation. In the survey, two T-shirts, one with an officially licensed character (such as Spider-man), the other with the same color and style but without character, were designed to measure consumers' willingness to pay for a character in the context of T-shirt. To generalize the results, more than one character (Spider-man, Abe no Seimei, and Pikachu) was chosen based on the familiarity score in the first pretest. In the main study, contingent valuation method (CVM) with open-end questions was used to measure consumers WTPM for a character-licensed T-shirt. At the beginning of the survey, Participants were asked to offer their highest price for buying an ordinary T-shirt (no character), and then after giving their scores on character familiarity, they were asked to offer their highest price again for buying a character T-shirt. In the remaining part, participants were required to answer self-congruity, identification and consumer value related questions.
According to the results of the study, price premium for a character indeed exists. And most of the participants (86.3%) were willing to pay for a character-licensed T-shirt less than twice price of that without a character. Moreover, the results of model testing showed, fully mediated model (model C) was more parsimonious, and were chosen as most representative of this data set. The direct-effect model (model A) did not fit the data and was eliminated from further consideration. Partially mediated model (model B) had adequate fit, while the total effect of the model did not reach the significance. Also, because the direct paths of familiarity, self-congruity, identification as well as consumer value to WTPM were not significant, and only indirect paths were significant, the models (B and C) became equivalent. As a result, the fully mediated model was used to represent this data set.
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CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

1.1.1 A Double Life and 2-D Related Products

“A double life” is an apt description of adults nowadays. In the day, they might do their job, ride the bus, debate a problem seriously with their colleagues in the work. However, at night, they become warriors and fight for peace, or command armies and conquer worlds. Entirely different appearances presented by adults on and off work. It does not constitute an exception only for the adults who play video game, but for the majority (adults). This is a world where people live with a double life. That is, 2-D (2 dimensional world) life and 3-D (real world) life. The life in 2-D world, corresponding to the life in a 3-D world (real world), it is created by the imagination and thus means ideal and fantasy, which is usually presented via the movie, video game, fantasy novel series or other creative things. No one, actually would refuse to be addicted in such world where one can get achievement easier, escape from the annoyance, as well as concentrate on the only thing they are interested in. In other words, they live as they imagine. People who are addicted in the 2-D world life say it is a means to find themselves, even salvage themselves from this confusing world, though, some critics assail it is an excuse to abandon themselves and escape from their real life.

If someone would want to break down the walls between the 2-D and 3-D world, and try to link and interact them together, then how would s/he do? One of the ways is via consumption. As we know, individuals are accustomed to attempting to achieve their desires, hope and other internal needs through shopping and consumption. Therefore, in this case, individuals consume 2-D culture related products to materialize their ideal world and integrate to the real world. For example, they buy a licensed merchandise with their favorite hero character from their favorite video game to make themselves believe that they like or be a hero in the real world.

Therefore, this research, primarily, assumes that individuals’ consumption behavior of a 2-D world related products is a way to break the obstacle between two
worlds, which embody their hope to continue their imagery life in the real world. Based on this assumption, the reasons why individuals buy, for example, character-licensed merchandise, increase from the only one to more. “The only” or the most direct reason is their likeness, that is they buy a character-licensed merchandise because they love the character, the money they would like to pay also decided by their love level.

However, if they buy those licensed merchandise is for continuing their 2-D world in the real world, then the possible reasons for purchase become more. For example, they buy the character-licensed merchandise because the character is consistent with how they see themselves, or reflects who they are, or is a mirror image of them, or because they can easily relate to the character in real world (such as, when they see skyscrapers, they would relate to Spiderman and his heroics), or because they see the character as their personal role model in real world.

In this research, the reasons why consumer purchase 2-D world related products are studied and confirmed based on the assumption, that is, breaking down the walls between two worlds as a motivation for purchasing behaviors of 2-D world related products. The research specifically studies on the character-licensed merchandise which considered as the representative and welcomed the 2-D world related products.

1.1.2 Global Licensing Market

The Global Licensing market is on the rise and showing its strength to the world. This had been anticipated by the president of LIMA (International Licensing Industry Merchandisers’ Association), Charles Riotto in 2016. Soon it had been corroborated by the performance of the global licensing market of that year. According to 2017 LIMA survey (2017 LIMA Annual Global Licensing Industry Survey), sales of licensed products and services rose 4.4% to $262.9 billion in 2016 (Licensing.org, 2017). With no doubt, we could expect the market in 2018, as well. Prediction shows that the size of the global licensing market will be continuing to increase in next few years, especially for those emerging or unsaturated market like Western Europe and East Asia. Compared to those mature markets like U.S. and Canada, East Asia draws attention with its high growth rate, especially the market of Chinese mainland (HKTDC Research, 2014). HKTDC Research (2014) says that the Chinese mainland is the sole market to expand at a double-digit compound average growth rate (CAGR) during the
period 2008-2013. The CAGR of chinese mainland was 14% in 2013, which was substantially higher than that of any other licensing market in Asia, establishing it as the second largest licensing market in Asia, second only to Japan (HKTDC Research, 2014).

1.1.3 Character Licensing Market

Retail Sale of Character-Licensed Merchandise

Character-licensed merchandise, among all the categories of licensed merchandise, plays a key role in the retail sale of licensing market. Depending on the International Licensing Industry Merchandisers' Association (LIMA) (2018), the retail sales of entertainment/ character licensing account for US$121.5 billion, or 44.7% of the total global licensing market. Moreover, it expects from strong growth in the years ahead and remain the largest product category for a long time. Thereinto, considering the product categories, apparel sales accounted for 15.1 percent of all global sales of licensed merchandise. Identical to the global market, character properties have dominated the Chinese licensing market in recent years as well (HKTDC Research, 2014). HKTDC research has pointed out that based on the views gathered from surveyed mainland licensees, 87% of the licensed properties were in the category of character and entertainment, way above fashion and lifestyle (19%), and brands and trademarks (14%).

Character Licensing Adult Market

The character licensing market for adults rapidly developed with the licensing industry as well. A report of adult fashion shows that "adult fashion is diverse in terms of licensing types, while the character is still one of the biggest licensing types in the industry" (EUROMONITOR INTERNATIONAL, 2017). It mentions that adult-targeted classic characters’ appeal benefits from a nostalgia factor, and even some child-orientated franchise are marketed secondarily to adults by creating a "cool" factor around them. No matter using which factors, many companies can look forward to carrying out marketing strategies which launch character licensed merchandise mainly target adults, particularly in the fashion, cosmetic and design market. Because of the huge potential of the character licensing adult market and rapid reaction and expansion by marketers, the character licensing adult market is blossoming. “KaKao friends”,
“Line Friends”, “Disney Princess”… related licensed merchandise attracts many young adult consumers. Video game, comics and movie characters expand the age and gender of adults who consume the products.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The market is prosperous, though, not many studies are concerned with the character-licensed merchandise. Most of the studies are in the business field related to how to attract consumers in perspective of promotion, distribution channels, and other marketing issues. Several of studies indirectly examine the topic to define the “kidult” image in the fields of sociology and psychology. Only few of studies, for example Wang (2012), have attempted to examine the factors affecting adult consumers’ behavior in purchasing character licensed merchandise. Fortunately, previous studies on consumption behavior related to licensed-merchandise (such as a sport-team licensed merchandise) have provided an important theoretical understanding of the behavior of those who consume character licensed merchandise. Therefore, this study based on previous studies of licensed merchandise, attempts to 1) explain adult consumers’ consumption behaviors of character-licensed merchandise based on the assumption mentioned above; 2) use willingness to pay more (WTPM), different to previous studies (i.e., which focus on purchase intention) , as a dependent variable to measure how much price premium consumers are willing to pay for a character-licensed merchandise, in contrast to a non-character licensed merchandise; 3) explore the mediating effects of consumer values (i.e., functional, emotional and social) on the relationship between three predictors (familiarity, self-congruity and identification with the character) and the WTPM. Three models (direct effect model, partially mediated model and fully mediated model) are examined separately; 4) explore how the WTPM varies based on select demographic variables. Therefore, the purposes of this study are four: 1) examine the factors which affect the adult consumption behaviors of character-licensed merchandise; 2) confirm whether the “More” or “price premium” is existed for a character; 3) examine the mediating effects of consumer values (i.e., functional, emotional and social); and 4) explore the demographic difference of the WTPM.
1.3 Significance of the Study

The contributions of this study are threefold. First, on the theoretical front, it investigates whether consumer value mediates the strength of three factors (familiarity, self-congruity theory, identification theory) effect on WTPM. Three models are examined, though these have been used in other licensing contexts (i.e., Kwon, Trail and James, 2007), they have not been applied in character-related research, and thus it can effectively fill up the vacancy. In addition, to our best knowledge, this study is the first to apply WTPM to measure the value perceived by the consumers on a character. Most studies related to the licensed merchandise (i.e., sport team or university licensed merchandise) concern about the attitude and purchase intention. Measuring WTPM is a direct way to know how much adults value the character and transfer this value to the price. Additionally, this study attempts to draw a price premium distribution which helps to illustrate the main range of additional price that adults are more likely to pay. Therefore, current study provides a new research direction for the licensing industry. Since it directly asks consumer their highest price for paying a licensed merchandise, the result would be closer to the actual purchase behavior and thus possess more practical meanings and significance.

Second, on the methodological front, this study illustrates the application of the CVM approach to measure WTP. CVM is a common method and has been applied in many projects of WTP, while it is the first attempt to use it in character licensed merchandise context.

Third, on the managerial front, it provides empirically based insights into the extent to which consumers will pay a price premium, triggered by the perceived consumer values. These insights are of substantial value to character licensing marketing managers designing a pricing strategy. Thus, this study’s findings provide managerial support for decisions related to consumer value-oriented pricing, price differentiation, and market segmentation (Monroe, 2003).
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 The Concept of Licensed Merchandise

2.1.1 The Definition of Licensing

The definition of licensing given by Meyer, Tinney & Tinney (1985) is “the granting of the right to use such properties as patents, processes, business formats, trademarks, or copyright in return for royalties or other compensation”. It was a relatively early and comprehensive definition and later licensing was considered as a branding strategy “based on leasing a legally protected property” which including “a brand name, likeness, a logo, graphic, words, signature, character, or a combination of several of these elements” (White, 1990). Compared to Meyer et al., the latter was more precise and focused on the brand market. Similarly to White, Raugust (2008) defined “licensing is a process of leasing the right to a legally protected entity”. While Agran & Katırcı (2002) and Sherman (2003) emphasized “agreement” or “contract”. Specifically, Agran & Katırcı (2002) suggested that licensing is a type of agreement that authorizes an organization to use the name of the brand, the patent, the commercial secrets, and other facilities of another organization in exchange for a price or a privilege. In other words, as Sherman (2003) said using a contractual method to draw up and exploit intellectual property by transferring rights of use to another organization without transfer of ownership. However, the fact is that some of licensing happen in a same company or organization, and thus no transfer occurs. For example, Disney holds the ownership of Elsa, produces and sells merchandise related to Elsa with the brand name “Disney” as well. Therefore, in the current study, licensing is defined in terms of branding strategy; that is, consider a property or entity as a brand, and according to its spectrum characteristics, use marketing strategies to develop, exploit and package it. The end of licensing is always sales and profits.
2.1.2 The Definition of Licensed Merchandise and Character

Licensed Merchandise

The use of characters has been investigated for a long time (with the first character appearing on the package in 1955s). While most studies are focused on how to use it in the realm of advertising, character is also called as spokes-character by the advertisers and marketers. Phillips (1996) defined a spokes-character as “an animate being or animated object that is employed to promote a product or service”. He considered it in the context of advertising and as a tactic of marketing. Callcott and Lee first developed a typology for classifying spokes-characters. They called it the AMOP framework and each capital letter presents one dimension related to the characters: 1) Appearance, 2) Medium, 3) Origin, and 4) Promotion. The AMOP framework is also presented from the views of advertising. First, appearance is related to the configuration of the character- either human, animal, mythical, or product personification (Phillips and Gyoerick, 1999). Phillips and Gyoerick asserted the configuration of the character was important since different forms might have different uses. They suggested that human characters might build consumer identification and animals might symbolize product attributes. Human characters could be a live human character such as Ronald McDonald or characters who is not alive such as the oats man (Phillips and Gyoerick, 1999). Animals can be also subdivided into those that are “portrayed fairly realistically” and those that are “highly personified”. They thought that only when the product comes to life would be the product personification occurs. The second parameter for classifying spokes-character mentioned by Callcot and Lee is medium. Nowadays, marketing strategy for a character would not cover only a single channel, most of them would associate all the channels online and offline. Third, characters also can be sorted by their origin. Phillips and Gyoerick subdivided characters into two types accordingly; celebrity and non-celebrity characters. They noted that celebrity characters are those with a non-advertising origin. They might be from comic strips, TV programs, movies, video game or novels. These characters like Spiderman, Abe no Seimei, even Pikachu, etc, which have characteristics of people, some of them look like humans while some of them do not have human bodies but can communication with others in human language. Non-celebrity characters, according to Phillips and Gyoerick, are created specifically for advertising purpose so that have an
advertising origin. “Tony the Tiger and the Pillsbury Doughboy are examples of noncelebrity characters” (Phillips and Gyoerick, 1999). However, the range of origin is quite broad as it for celebrities. The definition of celebrity/ non-celebrity character would make sense as they consider it in the context of advertising. While if it is discussed in other industries, such as licensing industry, the rationale should be reserved. The last parameter for spokes-character classification concerns promotion, that is “whether a character is active or passive in promoting a product”. Phillips and Gyoerick (1999) state that active characters usually were featured in the ad and they could speak for the product, while passive characters did not act and only occurred on the package of the product. Based on Phillips and Gyoerick’s understanding of Callcot and Lee’s AMOP framework, it is easier to find the differences between the characters in advertising and those in licensing. One primary difference is that a character in advertising is a marketing tool or a tactic to promote products, services and brands. While in licensing, characters play several roles. It basically is a tool, as it in advertising, for promoting a movie, game, novel, or TV program where it originated. Further, when it becomes popular, then its position would be totally changed and takes a leading role that could be treated like a brand. Many products could bear the images, such as apparel, accessories, food/ beverage, cosmetics, furniture, etc. A customized marketing promoting plan would also help to build its image. Gradually, it obtains celebrity, many followers/ fans, and even loyalties. The definition of a character fan borrowed from Bishop’s (2001) definition of a sport team or a player fan. It could be defined as an individual who follows the “exploits” of a character by attending activities related to it, joining a fan club about it, searching for its information via the mass media, etc.. For example, a fan of Spider-man, might read the book “Amazing Fantasy”, watch movies of “SPIDERMAN”, search for pictures or words related to it, and even easily relate to it in daily life. In addition, Bishop (2001) concludes that being a fan also means actively buying a range of goods of his/ her adored objects (sport team or player). That generate “licensed merchandise”.

Licensed merchandising defined by Meyer, Tinney & Tinney (1985) as the association of one firm or organization’s name, likeness, a logo or other creation with someone else’s product or service, and the product or service licensed with those materials is called licensed merchandise. Meyer et al. are the people who first point out that the categories of merchandise included character-licensed merchandise, designer-
licensed merchandise and corporate trademark licensed merchandise. As the name suggests, character-licensed merchandise associates a character or several characters from a movie, video game or novel with a product, such as a Mickey Mouse cup. Designer-licensed merchandise refers to a creation, design style, or a distinguishing color combination such as Gucci classical green-red-green color scheme. Corporate trademark licensed merchandise is commonly recognized in the university or sport marketing. Take Adidas as an example. Many universities cooperate with Adidas to manufacture university/collegiate licensed merchandise. Sport team (logo) licensed merchandise is related to the corporate trademark licensed merchandise such as the National Football League as well. Among these categories, the character licensed merchandise provides the most substantial portion of industry sales of a licensing market. According to the 4th Annual Global Licensing Industry Survey released by LIMA, Entertainment & Character licensing type generated $121.5B in retail sales and other revenue (44.7% of total global licensing revenue) in 2017, 2.7 percent higher than in 2016 (LIMA, 2018). Compared with other categories of licensed merchandise, character-licensed merchandise is distinct. First, the origin of character is relatively abundant, as described above, it can stem from a series of movies, a best-selling novel, a popular internet/mobile game, and even a cartoon image of a celebrity. It can cover almost all of pop culture, which is one of the reasons why entertainment/character-licensed merchandise would be the top category in global licensing industry. In addition, character properties are relatively simpler and easier to manage, since “they are generally associated only with the specific character and are not tied up with the image of a product, brand, or company” (Meyer, Tinney & Tinney 1985). Meyer et al. emphasized that as for designer licensing issues, the selection of licensees was important, as “whose products are in step with the market and image of the original productive line” is required, otherwise failure occurs. And as for corporate trademark licensing, “compatibility with the original product, brand, or corporate image and market position” have to be considered rigorously as well. Therefore, management of designer and corporate trademark licensed merchandise from a strategic perspective are more difficult and that is why they are slower to blossom in the merchandise licensing industry. Reversely, a character due to its simple relationship, could sudden rise to fame. Cute behavior or a charming dance movement in a movie may attract popularity. However, problems also emerge. For example, suddenly rising to fame may also result
in sudden falling. Identification with a character would not be as high as it with a sport team or a brand. A fan of a sport team buying team licensed merchandise is showing the person’s love for the favorite team, and his purchase behavior represents a sign of allegiance (Bishop, 2001) while this kind of allegiance is not common in the context of characters. Moreover, the perceived features of a character by different spectators are diversified. Some people consider Spiderman as a hero while their counterpart might regard Spiderman as disgusting. Self-congruity with the character also generate diversified answers among spectators. Finally, Özer and Argan (2006) mentioned that teams promote their licensed merchandise to urge the individuals to be a part of the team. They said that “the color and the other specifying points of the sport team are sufficient to represent the related sport team as fans give great importance to be related to the team”. However, unreal story plots where a character appears make no room for character-licensed merchandise buyers to consider themselves to be a part. Therefore, the interaction, identification, communication, participation and so on are totally different in the sport or brand context.

2.1.3 Previous Studies on Licensed Merchandise Consumption Behavior

Previous studies on consumption behavior related to licensed merchandise have provided an important theoretical support for understanding of these purchasing behaviors. Studies mainly concentrate on the sport team-licensed merchandise (Fisher and Wakefield, 1998; Kwon and Armstrong, 2002, 2006; Kwon and Trail, 2003; Özer and Argan, 2006; Kwon, Trail and James, 2007; Lee, Cianfrone and Schoenstedt 2009; Kwak and Kang, 2009; Lee and Trail, 2011; Kim, Trail and Ko, 2011; Chen, Lin and Chang, 2013; Ahn, Suh, Lee and Pedersen, 2013) and several on collegiate/ university licensed merchandise (Yang, Park and Park, 2007; Kwon, Kim and Mendello, 2008), or sports teams affiliated with universities which trigger consumer to buy the licensed merchandise (Phillips, Roundtree and Kim, 2014). While whatever collegiate licensed merchandise or sport team-licensed merchandise, they both are a part of corporate trademark licensed merchandise, according to the categories defined by Meyer, Tinney & Tinney (1985). To the best of our knowledge, with the exception of Levin and Levin’s
(2010), and Wang’s (2012), which focus on the consumers’ purchase intention for character licensed merchandise, no previous studies have further and extensively examined character licensed merchandise. Table 2-1 summarizes and reorganizes previous empirical research on licensed merchandise consumption behavior based on the table made by Kwon and Kwak (2014).

In accordance with Wann and Branscombe’s (1990, 1993) study of team identification effect on fan behavior, Fisher and Wakefield (1998) investigated the factors that lead to identification across successful and unsuccessful groups, and the results revealed member involvement is an important factor leading to identification for unsuccessful groups, while perceived group performance plays a role in leading to identification for successful groups. A study by Özer and Argan (2006) indicated that fans purchase with their identification that is affected from being a part of a group, and they further inferred that the effect of identification on purchasing sport teams licensed merchandise has demographic difference. In 2013, Ahn, Suh, Lee and Pedersen subdivided team identification into three levels and identify the effect of team identification on brand attitude and purchase intention in terms of logo changes. They discovered highly identified fans might be unwilling to accept the logo changes, that is, highly identified fans’ attitudes towards brand/team logo were significantly decreased. However, their purchase intentions were still significantly increased with the redesigned logos, which could be explained that highly identified fans have no choice but to simply purchase items with a redesigned logo to maintain their existing attitudes toward their team. Other studies (Kwon and Armstrong, 2002; Mahony & Howard, 1998; Wakefield, 1995; Wann and Branscombe, 1993) showed similar results. Highly identified fans show their attachment to team brands and purchasing team merchandise. In addition to identification, Kim, Trail and Ko (2011) investigated whole relationship quality constructs including trust, commitment, intimacy, identification and reciprocity, and drew a similar conclusion showing relationship quality with the team explained 66% of intention to purchase licensed merchandise. In the context of impulsive behavior, identification also has significant effect on impulse buying of sport team-licensed merchandise (Kwon and Armstrong, 2002). They pointed that sport team identification influenced the amount of money consumers spent as well. Literature of character licensed merchandise is limited, but it also identifies the effect of perceived identification with character on purchasing intention of character licensed merchandise.
(Wang, 2012). While, contrary to these significant effects, Cheng, Yeh and Wong’s (2014) study for 2009 World Game (WG) related licensed merchandise finds no direct effect between respondent WG identification and intention to purchase licensed merchandise. Before them, Kwon, Trail and James (2007) also found an insignificant effect of identification on purchase intentions. The findings by Kwon et al. (2007) indicate that team identification alone did not drive the purchase intentions and perceived value of the team-licensed merchandise should be taken into account. Regrading to the antecedents of identification, product attributes, product involvement, personal value (Lee, Cianfrone, Byon and Schoenstedt, 2009) and perceived self-congruity (Wang, 2012) are significantly associated with identification.

To sum up, most previous studies indicate there is a significant impact of identification with sports team, university or character on attitudes and intention to purchase licensed merchandise while several of them suggest that perceived value of products mediate the effect so that identification alone has no significant effect. However, this is not sufficient. The discrepancy between the attitude, purchase intention and actual behavior shows different stories would perform if consider them in a real purchasing scenario. While this kind of study is ignored, therefore, in the current study, willingness to pay more (WTPM) is used as dependent variable instead of attitude or intention, to investigate effect of the factor- identification would have on purchasing a licensed merchandise.
Table 2-1. Previous Studies on Licensed Merchandise Consumption Behavior (Based on the table made by Kwon & Kwak (2014))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Study type</th>
<th>Licensed merchandise</th>
<th>Factors→Dependent variable</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheng, Yeh, &amp; Wong (2014)</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>2009 World Game</td>
<td>Consumers’ identification with World Games, perceptions of quality and attitudes toward collecting → Purchasing intention of licensed merchandise</td>
<td>Hypothesis supported: Attitudes toward collecting → Purchasing intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>related-licensed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived quality of the merchandise → Attitudes toward collecting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>merchandise</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hypothesis unsupported: WG identification → Purchase intention for licensed merchandise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwon &amp; Kwak (2014)</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>Team-licensed</td>
<td>Multidimensional consumer values (i.e., functional, emotional, and social) and team identification → Purchase attitude; The attitude toward team-licensed merchandise → Purchase intention</td>
<td>All hypotheses supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips, Roundtree &amp; Kim (2014)</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>Collegiate/University licensed merchandise</td>
<td>University programs (athletic programs, academic programs and religious values) → Purchase motivations Merchandise quality → Purchase decision</td>
<td>The significance of athletic programs is over academic programs and religious values in motivating purchases of licensed university merchandise;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Study Type</td>
<td>License Type</td>
<td>Key Findings</td>
<td>Empirical Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ahn, Suh, Lee & Pedersen (2013) | Empirical | Team-logoed merchandise         | Team identification $\rightarrow$ brand attitude  
Team identification $\rightarrow$ purchase intention | All hypotheses supported |
| Chen, Lin, & Chang (2013) | Empirical | Team-licensed merchandise        | Social influence (type of reference, group cohesiveness, and susceptibility to influence) $\rightarrow$ Impulsive purchasing behavior | All hypotheses supported |
Self-congruity $\rightarrow$ Purchase intention  
Identification $\rightarrow$ Purchase intention | All hypotheses supported |
<p>| Kim, Trail &amp; Ko (2011) | Empirical | Team licensed merchandise        | Relationship quality constructs (Trust, Commitment, Intimacy, Identification, Reciprocity) $\rightarrow$ Behavioral intentions: attendance, media consumption, and licensed merchandise consumption | All hypotheses supported |
| Lee &amp; Trail (2011)   | Theoretical | Team licensed merchandise        | Personal values, team identification, attitude (toward brand and product), past experience, perceived product attributes, expectancy disconfirmation, satisfaction $\rightarrow$ Purchase intention (brand and product) | Theoretical model not empirical |
| Levin &amp; Levin        | Empirical  | Character-licensed               | Brand name familiarity, cartoon characters/celebrity endorsers familiarity $\rightarrow$ Product | Brand name familiarity was a more important factor than familiar cartoon |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Study Title</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Product Type</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Kwak &amp; Kang</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>Sport team-licensed merchandise</td>
<td>Self-congruity $\rightarrow$ Purchase intention</td>
<td>All hypotheses supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived quality $\rightarrow$ Purchase intention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Lee, Cianfrone, Byon &amp; Schoenstedt</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>Licensed Team Merchandise</td>
<td>Personal values, team identification, personal involvement and product attributes $\rightarrow$ Purchase intention</td>
<td>All hypotheses supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Kwon, Kim &amp; Mondello</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>CO-branded licensed apparel of a university in the U.S.</td>
<td>Attitude toward the manufacturer $\rightarrow$ Purchasing CO-branded licensed products</td>
<td>All hypotheses supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived value $\rightarrow$ has partially mediating and the fully mediating effect in the relationship between team identification and purchase intention; Team identification alone did not drive the purchase intentions;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Kwon, Trail &amp; James</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>Collegiate team-licensed apparel (T-shirts)</td>
<td>Team identification $\rightarrow$ Perceived value $\rightarrow$ Purchase intention (Direct effect, partially mediated effect, and fully mediated effect)</td>
<td>Summarized by Kwon &amp; Kwak (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Study Type</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang, Park &amp; Park (2007)</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>Two large Midwestern universities’ licensed products (ULP)</td>
<td>Information search motivation and perceived risk $\rightarrow$ Attitude toward shopping via online channels</td>
<td>All hypotheses supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwon &amp; Armstrong (2006)</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>Sport team licensed merchandise</td>
<td>Personal factors (impulsivity), psychosocial attachment, and situational factors $\rightarrow$ Impulsive purchasing behavior</td>
<td>All hypotheses supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Özer, &amp; Argan (2006)</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>Sport teams licensed merchandise</td>
<td>Demographic and behavioral variables (team identification, store atmosphere, friend group, loyalty and shopping enjoyment) $\rightarrow$ Purchasing decision</td>
<td>Demographic difference exist; Identification had the greatest influence on buying behaviors; Summarized by Kwon &amp; Kwak (2014)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwon &amp; Trail (2003)</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>Two US midwestern universities’ football team products</td>
<td>Reexamine Mahony et al.’s (2000) psychological commitment to team (PCT) scale</td>
<td>No gender differences; Team identification is the only significant antecedent to impulse buying; Summarized by Kwon &amp; Kwak (2014)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwon &amp; Armstrong (2002)</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>merchandise displaying the sport team’s logo</td>
<td>Team identification $\rightarrow$ Impulsive purchasing behavior; Team identification $\rightarrow$ Amount of money spent; Demographic characteristic $\rightarrow$ Impulsive</td>
<td>Team identification influence the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher &amp; Wakefield (1998)</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>Home &amp; away team merchandise in a professional sport league</td>
<td>Member involvement $\rightarrow$ Group identification Perceived group performance $\rightarrow$ Group identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer, Tinney &amp; Tinney (1985)</td>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>Trademark licensing</td>
<td>Definition of licensing, licensed merchandise; merchandise categories; advantages and problems of licensed merchandising; approaches to the problems;</td>
<td>Summarized by Kwon &amp; Kwak (2014)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Summarizes and reorganizes based on a table made by Kwon & Kwak (2014).
2.2 The Concept of Willingness to Pay More (WTPM)

2.2.1 The Definition of WTP and WTPM

Willingness to pay (WTP) is defined as the maximum amount of money a customer is willing to spend for a product or service (Cameron and James, 1987; Cha, Chun and Youn, 2009; Homburg, Koschate, and Hoyer 2005). Similar definitions are also given by other researchers like Kalish, Nelso, Kohli, Mahajan et al. who defined WTP as the maximum price a buyer accepts to pay for a given quantity of goods or services (Kalish and Nelson, 1991; Kohli and Mahajan, 1991; Wertenbroch and Skiera, 2002). Economists refer to willingness to pay as the reservation price (Monroe, 1990; Kalish and Nelson, 1991; Kristensen and Gärling, 1997; Krishna, Wagner and Yoon, 2006) or the “floor reservation price” which conceptualize WTP in terms of margin (Wang, Venkatesh and Chatterjee, 2007). Therefore, “the floor reservation price corresponds to the maximum price at which, and under which, the consumer is 100% certain to buy the product” (Le Gall, 2009), otherwise they would not buy it. In other words, Le Gall (2009) defined it as the “the upper threshold of the acceptability margin” and “is of interest in analyzing consumer reactions to prices on an individual level”.

From the perspective of definition, it is noted that one of advantages of WTP is that it can measure “the value that a person assigns to a consumption or usage experience in monetary units” (Kim, Gupta and Lee, 2013) which enables direct comparison.

Compared with the WTP, willingness to pay more (WTPM) obviously emphasize on the word “more” which present “excess price”, “over and above the fair price that is justified by the true value of the product” (Rao and Bergen, 1992), or “price premium” (Nault, 1995). Usually when there are improved situations, good changes or unique features which do not exist in other products or services, then “more” make sense and is worth being discussed. For example, consumers’ willingness to continue purchasing from the online vendor even though there is an increase in price (Fullerton, 2003). Also, compared with import wheat products, how many price premium consumers are willing to pay for domestic wheat products (Jin, 2011); how much more consumers would like to pay for a favorable country image (Koschate-Fischer, Diamantopoulos and Oldenkotte, 2012) or for environmentally friendly products (Laroche, Bergeron and Barbaro-Forleo, 2001). Based on previous definitions, the present study defines
willingness to pay more as consumers’ willingness to pay the price premium for a character licensed merchandise, with respect to non-character licensed merchandise.

2.2.2 Previous Studies on WTP

The WTP first has been studied in economics literature more than a century ago (Davenport, 1902). At that time, it was designed to determine prices for public goods and services. For example, used in the health industry for minimization of risks threatening human life (Jennings and Jennings, 2000); in the art industry, such as public financing of the arts (Thompson et al, 2002); WTP was commonly used to solve the problems occurring in politics, for instance, programs for the prevention of domestic violence (Sorenson, 2003) or the reunification of Korea (Yoo, 2004). It appeared in marketing literature more recently. In 1984, Goldberg, Green and Wind, along with Horsky, evoked the question of calculating the WTP for a service package using conjoint analysis. Cameron and James (1987) proposed using contingent valuation as an alternative to existing methods in pre-test markets. In 1991 Kohli and Mahajan revisited the concept and proposed a model enabling calculation of WTP using data produced through conjoint analysis, then simulating the optimal price for different concepts of new products. Finally, in 1991, Krishna demonstrated that the frequency of promotions, when at regular intervals or perceived as strong, can influence WTP for a discounted brand. Recently, WTP has inspired new research, including measurement in stores (Wertenbroch and Skiera, 2002), in online auctions (Jiang, 2002), in website content (Dou, 2004), for products with quality labels (Vlosky, Ozanne and Fontenot, 1999) or for a new vaccine (Sapede and Girod, 2002). Other research work has focused on definition and measurement (Le Gall, 2000; Wertenbroch and Skiera, 2002; Chung and Rao, 2003; Derbaix, Siningaglia and Zidda, 2003; Krishna, Wagner and Yoon, 2006; Wang, Venkatesh and Chatterjee, 2007).

In 1998 Gafni summarized and pointed that WTP methodology could be used in two distinct contexts: cost-benefit analysis (CBA) and market research. Gafni referred that these two most common areas of use WTP deal with totally different questions. As for CBA, it attempts to solve a social valuation question, which means it focuses typically on the benefits produced and foregone in the economy as a whole, the welfare of a society. For example, whether the investment projects should be undertaken at all
(Gafni, 1998). However, as for market research, it is built on positive consumer theory and concerns pricing-demand and attempts to estimate a market demand curve. For instance, what is the ratio between potential prices and quantities to be purchased by potential customers? Obviously, the present study lies in the market research context to ascertain the position of price and quantity of character licensed merchandise.

2.2.3 Methods to measure WTP

Along with the time line of studies, the most common methods used to measure WTP can be classified into three categories: conjoint analysis, contingent valuation and price tests using a simulated purchase price. Conjoint analysis, in fact, is to assess product profiles by their attributes which include price while contingent valuation is a method that direct interviews using an open-ended question on WTP or a closed question on purchase intention at the proposed price (Le Gall, 2009). The last method mentioned by Le Gall is to design a purchasing scenario which should be as close as that of the real purchasing, and then do the sequential test with a single sample and a series of test prices or do the monadic test with several samples but a single test price per sample.

2.3 The Concept of Multidimensional Consumer Value

Woodruff (1997) defined consumer value as “a perceived preference for and evaluation of product attributes, attribute performances, and consequences arising from use that facilitate (or block) achieving the customer’s goals and purpose in use situations.” This definition incorporates desired and received consumer values together and demonstrates three levels of two consumer values. Woodruff called it “customer value hierarchy” and proposed that from the bottom to the top were attributes, consequences and goal. Three levels of desired customer value, namely, “desired product attributes and attribute performances” (at the bottom of the hierarchy), “desired consequences in use situations” (at the middle), and at the top of the hierarchy “customers’ goals and purposes” (Woodruff, 1997). Received customer values are described equally well. During the evaluation process, consumer would use “the same
desired attribute, consequences and goal structure that they have in mind at that time” (Gardial et al. 1994; Zeithaml 1998) to compare with the received value. Previous studies on the definition of consumer values including which given by Woodruff (1997), Zeithaml (1988), Anderson, Jain & Chintagunta (1993), Monroe (1990), Gale (1994), and Butz & Goodstein (1996), etc., have commonalities in three dimensions: 1) the importance of use, that is, “customer value is inherent in or linked through the use to some product” (Woodruff, 1997); 2) consumer perception- “customer value is something perceived by customers rather than objectively determined by a seller” (Woodruff, 1997); and 3) trade-off, that is, “these perceptions typically involve a trade-off between what the customer receives and what he or she gives up to acquire and use a product” (Woodruff, 1997).

Concerning multidimensional consumer values, previous research in the business and marketing realm has documented well. Sheth, Newman and Gross (1991) conceptualized that the choice of product is a function of multiple values and in any given choice and situation more than one value dimension can transpire. And then they further suggested five categories of value which might be provided by a product, that is, functional, social, emotional, epistemic, and conditional value. Holbrook (1994) also agreed that consumer are able to perceive one or more values of a product, while he suggested only two aspects on which types of consumer value differ, such as intrinsic and extrinsic consumer value, or self-oriented and other oriented consumer value. Burns (1993) classified the types of customer value according to the consumer’s evaluation process and concludes with four types- product value, value in use, possession value, and overall value.

In this study, multiple consumer values are classified as the suggestion given by Sheth, Newman, and Gross (1991) that is, five categories of value (functional, social, emotional, epistemic, and conditional value) might be provided by a product, which also has been endorsed and applied to many empirical studies in different contexts (e.g., Sweeney et al., 1996 Sweeney & Soutar, 2001; Wang, Lo, Chi & Yang, 2004). Among the five dimensions, functional, social and emotional dimensions of values are focused on various studies. For example, Sweeney, Soutar, Whiteley and Johnson (1996) attempted to qualitatively test the three main dimensionalities- functional, social and emotional.
In the licensed merchandise consumption context, it seems plausible that fans would be motivated by various value dimensions above and beyond the functional quality of the product. In the current study, to facilitate our understanding of multidimensional consumer values in the character licensed merchandise domain, it seems appropriate to incorporate three value propositions (functional, emotional and social values). For instance, buying a T-shirt with a character which originate from a cosmic being watched at young age, you might have nostalgic feeling (emotional value) and might be easier to feel acceptable when you wear this T-shirt (social value), as well as you perceive acceptable standard of quality of this T-shirt (functional value).

Functional value is defined as the “perceived utility acquired from an alternative’s capacity for functional, utilitarian, or physical performance” (Sheth et al., 1991), which is concerned with the effectiveness and efficiency of a product (good or service). It includes quality, performance and other physical attributes. As for emotional value, it derives from the feelings and emotions that a product (or service) generates for consumers. That is, it is more inclined to internal consequences that are triggered when you use the product (or service). In this sense, it is more subjective and personal than functional value because of its self-purposeful and self-oriented attributes (Holbrook & Batra, 1987). Lastly, social value is defined as “the utility derived from the product’s ability to enhance social self-concept” (Sweeney and Soutar, 2001). In other words, it enhances or weakens an alternative’s association with one or more specific social groups (Sheth et al., 1991), that is, a social group’s assessment of a product (or a service) is a key in understanding social value.

2.4 The Concept of Familiarity Theory

2.4.1 Brand Familiarity

Familiarity is a concept related to knowledge and information search, and in the business context, is commonly seen as brand familiarity. With the frequency of information search increasing, related knowledge would increase and result in the increase of familiarity, theoretically. While the relationship between familiarity and information search is not so simple as it seems. Gursoy (2001) identified that familiarity
and information search has an U-shaped relationship. Simply to say, is that when consumers have low brand familiarity, they required information search to increase more knowledge for making a rational decision. As their prior brand knowledge (familiarity) increases they tend to make their decisions based on what is in their memory, therefore, reliance on information search decreases. However, as they are planning to learn more (high familiarity), they realize that they want more detailed information. As a consequence, they start searching for additional external information again. In this sense, it is not a single direction while actually is in a circulation process.

Familiarity has two states, in its static state, it means the whole amount of prior knowledge or related information to the brand. While the problem is no one can accurately demonstrate his/her whole knowledge, the discrepancy between the stated familiarity and the actual always exists so that measure bias is unavoidable. Simonin and Ruth (1998) attempted to measure the perceived familiarity with a car brand and a chip brand through three seven-point semantic differential scales assessing the degree to which the respondent was familiar/unfamiliar, recognized/ did not recognize, and had heard of/ had not heard of the brand before. It was a successful attempt, and many followers obtained good results as well. On the other hand, familiarity in its dynamic state, is a process of accumulating information or knowledge “related to the amount of time spent on processing information about the brand” (Baker et al, 1986). Studies measure dynamic familiarity, commonly investigate “frequency”. For example, in travelling studies, this construct is mostly operationalized by measuring the number of previous trips taken to a particular destination (Woodside and Ronkainen, 1980; Gursoy, 2001). Seemingly “frequency” is able to quantify familiarity efficiently. However, “frequency” question is likely to be complex if you consider multiple sources of familiarity. Since familiarity represents stages of learning or collecting information, consumers are likely to gain knowledge and, therefore, familiarity through an ongoing information search such as reading guidebooks, other related books, advertising and write ups in newspapers and magazines, watching advertisements on TV and listening to advertising on radio and talking to friends and relatives, etc (Gursoy, 2001). In this case, familiarity with the destination in travelling studies, only calculating one’s frequency of going there is not sufficient. In other words, even though someone has never been there, s/he could increase familiarity via various sources, such as watching magazines, searching travel websites, or asking others who have been there before. If
all these sources are counted, the story is liable to be tediously long. An efficient and effective model has not appeared yet.

There has been extremely little research on character familiarity, compared with brand familiarity. However, brand familiarity still provides useful reference for learning character familiarity. As the definition of licensing described above, licensing can be considered as a process of branding. Then, character licensing can be regarded as a character-centered branding, which means, a character itself becomes the object to be a brand, and character licensed merchandise become the products related to this “brand”. However, it is noted that the branding process for a character is relatively simpler than that for a real brand. Based on this assumption, the character familiarity is able to be explained and identified in the terms of brand familiarity.

2.4.2 Character Familiarity

Previous studies of brand familiarity provide us an important understanding of character familiarity, though, no literature has given an accurate definition of the “Character familiarity” yet. According to the brand familiarity, it is easier to relate that character familiarity derives from the number of character-related experience the consumer has had (Alba and Hutchinson, 1987) and character-related information search. Take Spider-man as an example, consumers are familiar with it, at first, through a series of movies. Along with releasing, abundant promotions and advertisements of the movie appear all around the consumer, and then gradually increase familiarity with the Spider-man in the context of the movie. Consumer would actively search additional information or increase experience if they are interested to know more, and thus familiarity and information have positive correlation, but individual also would stop to further accept information if they have bad, at least no specific impression on it. What’s more, the correlation between familiarity and information becomes complex if information is accepted due to outside force. For instance, when you walk along the road, you see a line of advertisements about movie “SPIDERMAN 2”. Even though, you did not do any active search, you would still know that the movie “SPIDERMAN 2” is on leasing and very popular among the people around you, but your knowledge about the spider-man is limited and superficial (or external). In this case, your familiarity with the spider-man or the movie remain at a low level, and it
does not increase substantially, though many people, advertisements or other information sources never stop to trigger your interest. In other words, information accepted passively both quantity and quality are in the relatively low place. While, totally differently, information actively accepted not only increase familiarity substantially, but also stored as favorable knowledge which produce feelings of greater satisfaction (Ha and Perks, 2005) and transfer satisfaction to its related products.

2.5 The Concept of Self-congruity Theory

The congruity between self-image and referent image is termed as “self-congruity”. Sirgy (1986) defined that self-congruity is the process of “involving the match or mismatch between a stimulus representing a perceived self-image and a referent self-image”. It is generally believed by scholars that people have both a self-image and an ideal image. Self-image is what an individual perceives him/herself to be, and an ideal image is the image that the individual wants to be or want others perceive to be. Bandura’s social cognitive theory (1986) which asserted that people’s change in their behavior is based on noticing whether there is a similarity between the model and themselves, such as based on whether his self and/ or ideal image is congruent or incongruent with a referent model. For example, an individual imitates the way of dressing of his favorite singer, because he thinks the singer’s image is congruent with his self-image or his ideal image. The congruence between self-image and referent image is easy to realize while it between the ideal image and referent image tends to be more complex and changeable. That is because the ideal image would always change with the people he meets, the experience he has, or just emotion he feels.

Applying this theory from social psychology, researchers have asserted that self-congruity can also be applied to consumer behavior (Sirgy, 1982; Sirgy, 1986). They have explored whether an individual’s self-image congruency with a product image is a substantial factor that determines consumers’ purchase decision. Sirgy (1982) posited that consumers’ purchase intention would be motivated by the congruity between self and product image. While product image here is not simply the image it appears, it refers to its symbolic image. For example, the image of a product- luxury handbag, it not only presents luxury, but also stands for wealth power, prestige, attitudes toward fashion, as well as life style. In other words, product image refers not only to an object,
picture or other obvious appearance, but also some other ideas or feelings that symbol
elicits (Levy, 1959). In addition, consumer purchasing merchandise which has
congruent image with self-image or ideal image is not the final purpose, on the
contrary, utilizing product image to express his self-image or ideal image is the real
goal (Grubb & Grathwohl, 1967; Schenk & Holman, 1980).

In this study, character image is considered. Self-congruity here refers to the
congruency between the self-image or ideal image and the character image. For
instance, an individual asserts himself as a brave young boy and then he would buy a
product with a knight character since the knight has the image of braveness,
handsomeness. While a strict person would not allow him to buy a product with a cute
character since its image is not consistent with his self-image or ideal image.

2.6 The Concept of Identification Theory

Kelman (1961) defined identification as a way of “establishing or maintaining the
desired relationship to the other, and the self-definition that is anchored in this
relationship”. Influencing agents are the counterpart in this relationship, who can be an
influential individual or group. An individual would adapt his behaviors from another
influential individual or group. According to Kelman’s theory of identification (1961),
there are two forms of identification that is “classical identification” and “reciprocal-role
relationship”. “classical identification” emphasizes that individuals attempt to be like or
actually to be the one is the influencer by imitating or other useful behaviors, that is, it
attempts to take over the influencing agent’s identity. For example, a child imitates his
parents’ behaviors to be like his parents. While “reciprocal-role relationship” occurs
when two entities’ behaviors mutually influence each other since they share the same
expectation with each other. In other words, when an individual finds something
valuable in the influencing agent during self-defining, he tends to behave in a certain
way to meet the agent’s expectation. These two entities usually are in the specific
relationship, such as friends, or manager and employee. Reciprocal- role relationship
doesn’t ask individuals to be the influencing agents, instead, it directs individual
changing his behavior to meet the expectation of the influencer. In the situation, when
the influencer is a group, classical identification and reciprocal-role relationship could
occur simultaneously. As a group member, an individual has to not only behave in a
certain way but also meet other members’ expectation. For example, a fan of a singer, may behave in a way that only identify by the fans of that singer, and also meets fan club’s expectation. They have their own language, as well as symbol and features.

Burke’s dramatism theory (1950) noted that when people share the same characteristics, values or beliefs as the character, identification with the characters then occurs. Besides, individuals imitate characters’ behaviors or features to be like the characters. For example, a girl who considers herself as a princess of Disney, she might dress like the princess and dance with her “prince”.
CHAPTER 3. HYPOTHESIS AND MODEL

3.1 Willingness to Pay More as Dependent Variable

Willingness to pay has been studied for many years, such as in economic literature it designed to determine prices for public goods and services and also it commonly used to solve the problems occurring in politics. In this sense, it is obvious to note that willingness to pay is more like a method or a tool for measuring price or solving problems. Gafni (1998) summarized and pointed that willingness to pay methodology was widely used in two distinct contexts: cost-benefit analysis (CBA) and market research where concerns pricing-demand things, and attempts to estimate a market demand curve by measuring willingness to pay. Willingness to pay more, compared with the willingness to pay, emphasizes on "more" which refers to the price premium that consumers are willing to pay. It is commonly seen in the services industry, no matter public or business. Usually, it solves the problems like whether a consumer is willing to pay extra money for the new function or new services, how much extra money consumer is willing to pay if the price increases, etc.. While no study shows that willingness to pay more is used in the licensed merchandise issues.

Many research on licensed merchandise explore the relationship between factors and purchase intention, and some of them consider about the purchase attitude and purchase motivation, while none of them concern about the willingness to pay more.

In this study, we use willingness to pay more for the dependent variable for three reasons: 1) willingness to pay or willingness to pay more naturally cover the meaning of purchase intention. When an individual is willing to pay for a product, it implies that he has good attitudes toward the product and has intention to buy it. 2) Besides, this study investigates the value of the character not the product, while purchase intention or purchase behavior directly refers to the product itself rather the character. Consumer purchases the product might have thousands of purchasing reasons such as because of its beautiful design, attractive style, famous brand, etc.. Instead, this study designs two T-shirts with the same style but one has a character and then ask them the highest price they are willing to pay for each T-shirt, and therefore, the difference between two prices could be considered as the value that character is perceived. Thus, using
willingness to pay more as the dependent variable directly refer to the character instead of the product. 3) Purchase intention presents the intention that consumer is willing to purchase, while the discrepancy between the purchase intention and actual purchase behavior cannot be ignored. The final purchase behavior is impacted by many reasons, such as high price, that is, even though I desire to buy the product, I do not have enough money so that I am not able to. In this sense, willingness to pay more makes a price in the perspective from the consumer and directly predicts purchase behavior.

3.2 Effects of Familiarity, Self-Congruity and Identification on Perceived Consumer Value and WTPM

Studies of the relationship between character familiarity and willingness to pay more are limited. While from the researches on brand familiarity, we may assume the positive relations between these two exist. Character familiarity accumulates based on the information search. In this sense, it is reasonable to assume that individuals spend time and effort searching information about the character due to the reason that they want to know more about the character, so they would give a higher price to the character. Besides, the more knowledge they know about the character and the more detailed information about the character they would get, the more values they might perceive from the character, which finally induces them to pay a higher price.

H1a. Familiarity will have a direct and positive effect on the willingness to pay more.

H1b. Perceived consumer value has mediated effect on the relationship between familiarity and willingness to pay more.

Previous researchers have recognized the importance of self-congruity to social behavior. For example, Wang (2012) found that consumers’ perceived self-congruity affected the purchase intention for character-licensed merchandise. What’s more, findings by Kwak & Kang (2009) also revealed that self-image congruence had a direct positive effect on purchase intention of team licensed merchandise. Both of them examined and confirmed the relationship between self-congruity and purchase intention. Based on these studies, it is possible to hypothesize that the congruence between self and character will have a direct and positive effect on the willingness to
pay more. That is, the more individuals perceive self-character congruity, the more they are willing to pay extra money. Besides, Sirgy (1982) stated that self-congruity has self-esteem motive which induces people to meet their ideal self-image and achieve a self-image to meet social approval (social value). And Kwak & Kang (2009) found that consumer’s perceived quality (functional value) acted as a mediator between self-congruity and purchase intention. In this sense, we hypothesize that consumer perceived value of character (i.e. functional value, emotional value, social value) has mediated effect on the relationship between self-congruity and willingness to pay more.

H2a. Self-congruity will have a direct and positive effect on the willingness to pay more.

H2b. Perceived consumer value has mediated effect on the relationship between self-congruity and willingness to pay more.

The effects of identification on purchase attitudes and intention have been examined in many studies, especially in terms of team-identification. For example, a study by Kwon & Kwak (2014) revealed that team identification was shown to influence purchase attitude and intention. Ahn, et al (2013), Lee & Trail (2011), Lee, et al (2009) and Ozer & Argan (2006) also concluded that identification has a positive effect on purchase intention. While some studies show that there is no direct relationship between identification and purchase intention. Instead, they are mediated by perceived consumer value, such as perceived quality. Cheng, Yeh, & Wong (2014) suggest that the greater the perceived quality of licensed merchandise, the more positive the consumer attitude toward collecting and then intention to purchase while they find that there is no direct effect between respondent world game identification and intention to purchase licensed merchandise. Based on these findings, we hypothesize:

H3a. Identification will have a direct and positive effect on the willingness to pay more.

H3b. Perceived consumer value has mediated effect on the relationship between identification and willingness to pay more.

In the current study, three consumer values are considered. Functional value is defined as the “perceived utility acquired from an alternative’s capacity for functional, utilitarian, or physical performance” (Sheth et al., 1991); emotional value (often called experiential value) derives from the feelings and emotions that a product (or service) generates in consumers; and according to Sweeney and Soutar (2001), social value is
defined as “the utility derived from the product's ability to enhance social self-concept”. According to Sheth et al. (1991), a consumer value theory “may be used to predict consumption behavior, as well as to describe and explain it”. Previous studies have recognized and the results do show consumer value has a significant influence on behavioral intentions. The researches of consumer value and purchase attitude and intention are abundant, while no one has ever attempted to discover the relationship between consumer value and WTP or WTPM. Actually, WTP or WTPM naturally cover the meaning of purchase intention. When someone is willing to pay more for a product, it implies that s/he has good attitudes toward the product and have intention to buy it. Based on the studies of consumer value and purchase intention, in the current study, we posit that consumer are willing to pay a price premium for a character-licensed merchandise due to their perceived value of that character-licensed merchandise. The perceived value is including functional, emotional, and social value. Then assume the higher functional value they find in the character-licensed merchandise, the higher premium they are likely to pay; identical assumption is made for emotional and social value; That is, the higher emotional value, and/ or social value they perceived the higher premium they are willing to pay. Besides, consumer perceive not only one value of a product, their WTPM may be also affected by two or three values together. And thus, consumer perceived multidimensional value (combining three values together) of a character-licensed merchandise impact the their willingness to pay more as well.

H4. Perceived consumer value will have a direct and positive effect on the willingness to pay more.

3.3 Model (Direct, Partially Mediated, Fully Mediated Model)

An investigation by Kwon, Trail and James (2007) reveal that there is a potential mediating effect of perceived value in the relationship between team identification and the purchase intention. They examined the mediating effect in the context of collegiate team-licensed apparel. Direct effect (team identification and perceived value as each having a direct effect on purchase intention, but they are independent each other), partially mediated effect (team identification having both a direct effect on purchase intention and indirect effect through perceived value), and full mediated effect (no direct effect of identification on purchase intention, only indirect effect through perceived
value) are examined. The results show that direct effect model did not fit the data and even though partially mediated model had adequate fit, the path between team identification and purchase intention was not significant. As a result, the full mediated model is chosen for further analysis. In the current study, we also posit in the context of character-licensed merchandise, the consumer perceived value of a character licensed merchandise is likely to have fully mediated effect on WTPM.

**Model A: Direct Effect Model (Figure 3-1)**

The direct effect model depicts character familiarity, character self-congruity, character identification and perceived value of a character licensed merchandise as each having a direct effect on the willingness to pay more for a character licensed merchandise, but they are independent of each other. (Support for the relationship between familiarity and willingness to pay more comes from both theory and empirical).

**Model B: Partially Mediated Model (Figure 3-2)**

The partially mediated model shows familiarity, self-congruity and identification as having both a direct effect on the willingness to pay more and an indirect effect through perceived consumer value. The only difference between Models A and B is the presence of a relationship between familiarity, self-congruity, identification and perceived consumer values.

**Model C: Fully Mediated Model (Figure 3-3)**

Model C (fully mediated model) differs from Model B (partially mediated model) in that the path from familiarity, self-congruity and identification to the willingness to pay more does not exist. This suggests that there would be no direct effect of familiarity, self-congruity and identification on the willingness to pay more, only indirect effect through perceived consumer values (functional, emotional, and social value).
Figure 3-1 Model A: Direct Effect Model

Figure 3-2 Model B: Partially Mediated Model
Figure 3-3 Model C: Fully Mediated Model
CHAPTER 4. METHOD

4.1 Character Licensed T-shirt as a Stimuli

Wang (2012), have done a study about “the impact of self-congruity and identification on consumers’ purchase intention for character licensed merchandise”. In that study, Wang discussed the degree of identification and self-congruity with the character affects consumers’ purchase intention for a character-licensed T-shirt and obtained significant results. The reasons Wang gave for using T-shirt as a stimuli are 1) apparel/ accessories/ footwear was the biggest product category in terms of retail sales of global licensed merchandise; 2) T-shirts were one of the most commonly purchased apparel, and 65% of people who had bought character merchandise in 2010 bought character T-shirts (MINTEL, 2011); 3) people judge others by what they wear, considering clothing as a part of their image and self-expressing (Miller, 1997). Wang (2012) asserted that “people who purchase and wear a character T-shirt should have a certain degree of identification and self-congruity with the character since the character would be easily noticed by others when they wear that character licensed T-shirt” and with high degree of identification and self-congruity, consumers would have high purchase intention. The current study also conducts in the context of T-shirt identically to Wang (2012), but to examine the price premium that consumers are willing to pay for a character-licensed merchandise. That is, we investigate the price premium that consumers are willing to pay more for a character-licensed T-shirt, comparing with an ordinary T-shirt.

T-shirt is a type of product with low involvement which require less effort and information. Consumers are easier triggered by the emotion and affection when they make a purchase decision. In this context, we assumed that consumers are more likely to pay a high premium for a T-shirt due to their love for the characters. Similarly, the retail sales of apparel was the top product category among global sales of licensed goods and services in 2017, as well, and we found that apparel generated $40,665B in retail sales, 15.0% of total global licensing revenue in 2017(International Licensing Industry Merchandisers’ Association [LIMA], 2018). In the current study, we asked respondents their WTPM (willingness to pay more) for a character-licensed
merchandise, which means, purchasing experience of licensed merchandise, at least normal merchandise should possess. They should have some knowledge of the price of commodities. T-shirt is very common in our daily life and almost all of the adults have experience to purchase T-shirt. All the reasons we have pointed and given by Wang (2012) showed that T-shirt was a good stimulus of the study.

However, some problems may also cause if we use T-shirt as our stimulus. One big problem is the price dispersion. It includes two aspects: price dispersion among the T-shirts and price dispersion among the consumers. Price dispersion among the T-shirts is caused by the style, brand, design, promotion and so on. Consumers would spontaneously consider about these issues when they are asked to answer questions related to the price. To avoid this or reduce the impact of this, in our study, we gave them two treated pictures of T-shirts- no recognizable brand name or tag, same design. One was a brand-invisible white T-shirt, describing as “it is a common brand white cotton T-shirt”, and another one was the same brand-invisible white T-shirt but with a character, describing as “it is a common brand white cotton T-shirt with Spiderman (official licensed)”. It is inevitable that respondents may still consider about brand or other issues when they give their price of the T-shirt, although they have been shown the picture and told the detail about T-shirt. Price dispersion of a piece of T-shirt among the consumers is significantly large as well. Even showed in the same T-shirts, and people may give a large range of price. One piece of T-shirt may value 50RMB for one person while value 500 RMB for another. Because consumers behaviors are always affected by their material standard of living, their previous purchase behaviors, and surroundings. Poor people at their highest price for paying T-shirt would definitely lower than the rich. Considering about this, when we calculate the value of WTPM, our concern its percentage rather than the difference. Which means, the WTPM of a character-licensed T-shirt equals the ratio of the difference between the highest price that consumers are willing to pay for a character-licensed T-shirt and an ordinary T-shirt for the highest price that for ordinary T-shirt. (See the following equation):

\[
WTPM = \frac{\text{WTP of a character licensed T shirt} - \text{WTP of an ordinary T shirt}}{\text{WTP of an ordinary T shirt}}
\]

As the aforementioned criteria, this study controlled the brands, design, color, advertisement or other aspects related to the price, we only focused on the T-shirt with/without a character. Thus, we downloaded a picture of white T-shirt with no
obvious style, and made a further edition, such as removing the tag, changing a few of the original pattern so that no specific T-shirts from brands can be related.

4.2 Pretest

4.2.1 Character Choice

During the pre-test, eight characters were selected. Among them, half of them came from U.S., and half of them from Japan, and also five of them were comics characters and the last three were game characters. Eight characters include queen Elsa of Arendelle, (animation character from Walt Disney), Super Mario (game character from Nintendo), Mickey Mouse (Walt Disney mascot), Pikachu (video games, animated show character from The Pokemon Company), Minion (DC Comics superhero), Spider-Man (Marvel Comics superhero), Abe no Seimei (mobile game character), and Cardcaptor Sakura (Manga-Japanese comics character published by Kodansha).

4.2.2 Pretest and Pretest Results

Two pretests were conducted prior to the main study. The first pretest was to determine appropriate stimuli for the main study. Since main study was for Chinese consumers, therefore, we asked a Chinese student at Seoul National university for the first pretest. Elven including 6 female and 5 male Chinese students were recruited. In this pretest, participants were presented eight characters (Elsa, Super Mario, Mickey Mouse, Pikachu, Minion, Spider-Man, Abe no Seimei and Cardcaptor Sakura) and asked their familiarity to these characters. They were asked to write down the name of the character, and to measure three questions: 1) to which extent they were familiar with the character, 2) to which extent they could recognize and 3) had heard it before. In addition, they were required to write down one or more adjectives to describe the characters. This pretest was mainly to identify which or several of which were adapted for the main study. To this end, three characters were selected based on the different
level of familiarity and various perceived images (test by the adjective description part). We chose three characters rather than one character because we wanted to examine whether our hypotheses could be supported for different characters. In addition, there should be a significant difference in perceived familiarity with each character. That is, the three characters can separately cause significantly different variation in perceived familiarity among participants. The second pretest was to ascertain the sequence of the questions which was important to make sure there was no induced error. In addition, the feasibility of the scales incorporated in the questionnaire was also tested. Even though most of the items have been used in many previous studies and were found to be statistically sound, there was still a need for subsequent testing regarding their applicability to this particular study. Furthermore, since the investigation target for China, while the original questionnaires were designed in English, therefore, validating translated questionnaires were also required. To be convenience, we first translate English version into Chinese and then asked a friend who was a Chinese but now embarked on a PhD in Florida University, U.S. for help to translate the Chinese version again back to English, to see whether the description match each other. A small interview with two Chinese students living in Seoul was conducted to see whether the Chinese version was easy to read and understand, and asked them to explain the meaning of the questions to validate the Chinese version. To the end, several expressions were modified.

**Pretest results**

The first pretest was to determine appropriate characters for the main study. Totally eight characters (Elsa, Super Mario, Mickey Mouse, Pikachu, Minion, Spider-Man, Abe no Seimei and Cardcaptor Sakura) and respondents’ familiarity with these characters were tested. According to the familiarity mean and standard deviation, three characters finally were used in the main study. They were: Spider-man (M = 5.73, SD = 1.56) which had medium mean and SD representing medium familiarity, Abe no Seimei (M = 3.61, SD = 2.51) which had smallest mean but largest SD representing low familiarity, and Pikachu (M = 6.6, SD = 1.2) which had largest mean and smallest SD representing high familiarity (Table 4-1).
Table 4-1. The respondents’ familiarity with the eight characters in pretest 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pikachu</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mickey Mouse</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minion</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardcaptor Sakura</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spider-man</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super Mario</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsa</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abe no Seimei</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Main Study

4.3.1. Sample, Instrument and Procedure

Online convenience sampling procedures were employed to secure participants for the main study. It was conducted through “Baidu MTC”, a Chinese online investigation specialist who contributed to recruit the participants from the whole country. We limited participants’ age range from 18 to 46 years old for the following reasons. First, since main study investigated consumers’ willingness to pay more for a character-licensed merchandise, which means consumers must have opportunities to make purchase decisions on their own or have abundant experience for shopping. The survey asked them for the highest price they want to pay for a character T-shirt, then at least, it is better to have some knowledge about the price or be able to identify high and low price. For this reason, adult consumers were more suitable. In addition, the study emphasizes on the foreign characters, licensed merchandise with foreign characters, which means, participants should be familiar with one or several foreign characters. The fact is in China, characters, those from foreign countries are not known by Chinese consumers until 1980s. Considering the consumers who were born in 1970 may also enjoy their childhood with the foreign characters (at that time, they were under 10 years old) or be affected by their children, therefore, we are looking for Chinese participants who are over 18 (including 18) years old but under the age of 50.
Moreover, big data from “Baidu MTC” showed that the main age of Chinese netizen was 18 to 46 years old. These two age range almost overlap each other. To ensure the participants, we finally, limit the age of participants from 18 to 46 years old (to avoid the possibility of no participants over 46 doing the survey).

There were three sets of questionnaires each with a different character chosen based on the results of pretest 1 (Questionnaire A with Spiderman; Questionnaire B with Abe no Seimei; Questionnaire C with Pikachu). To ensure one participant only answer one questionnaire, repetitive exclusion had been set, that is, participants were randomly sent one version of questionnaire and had no access to the other two versions. In addition, we also had set answer time for each question, specifically, one question more than three seconds to eliminate the inefficient quick response.

The questionnaires for the main study contained a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study and the confidentiality of the participants’ responses. In the first part of questionnaire, participants were displayed a picture of fictitious white T-shirt (created by Photoshop) with a description—“this is a common brand ordinary white cotton T-shirt” and asked to give their highest price they were willing to pay for this T-shirt. Part 2 examined the variable—“character familiarity” and presented a picture of character for each version of the questionnaire (Spiderman for Questionnaire A, Abe no Seimei for Questionnaire B and Pikachu for Questionnaire C). Then again, they were asked to give their highest price for buying a T-shirt while this time, it was a T-shirt with a character. To control the influence of the brand, design and other factors, these two T-shirt were almost the same but only have a difference in the character (with/without character). In the next part, constructs under examination were 1) self-congruity; 2) identification; and 3) consumer value which included consumer functional value, emotional value and social value. The questionnaires consisted of items with a corresponding 7-point Likert scale (with “1” indicating strongly disagree and “7” indicating strong agreement) to ascertain the participants’ level of agreement with the statements presented.

4.3.2 Measurements

Familiarity was measured with Simonin, Bernard and Ruth (1998) three seven-point semantic scales. This scale was used because it is parsimonious and has shown
good internal consistency in previous studies (e.g., \( \alpha = .80 \) with a car brand, \( \alpha = .94 \) with microprocessor brands, Simonin and Ruth 1998). This scale consists of: “not at all familiar/ extremely familiar,” “definitely do not recognize/ definitely recognize”, and “definitely have not heard of it before/ definitely have heard of it before” (1= strongly disagree; 7= strongly agree).

Self-congruity was measured using Sirgy et al. (1997) five-item scale, which consists of: “this character is consistent with how I see myself,” “this character reflects who I am”, “people similar to me wear character T-shirts like this in casual situation,” “the kind of person who typically wears this character T-shirt in casual situation is very much like me,” and “the character is a mirror image of me.” All items were measured on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1= strongly disagree; 7= strongly agree).

Identification was measured by the scales of Basil (1996). All items were measured on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1= strongly disagree; 7= strongly agree). Total six items were examined, including: “I like this character,” “I can easily relate to this character,” “this character is easily understood,” “I think of this character as a good friend,” “I have no doubt this character and I would work well together” and “this character is a personal role model”.

Perceived multidimensional values were measured using fifteen items from Sweeney, Jillian and Soutar (2001), Soutar (2004). Six items were used to measure functional value (“this T-shirt: has consistent quality/ is well made/ has an acceptable standard of quality/ has poor workmanship/ not last a long time/ perform consistency”), and five items were used to measure emotional value (“this T-shirt: is one that I would enjoy/ would make me want to use it/ is one that I would feel relaxed about using/ make me feel good/ give me please”), and four items were used to measure social value (“this T-shirt: help me to feel acceptable/ improve the way I am perceived/ make a good impression on other people/ give its owner social approval”). All items were measured on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1= strongly disagree; 7= strongly agree).

Research data for measuring willingness to pay (WTP), the most common methods are 1) conjoint analysis (assessment of product profiles described by their attributes, including price), 2) contingent valuation method (CVM) which direct interviews using an open-ended question on WTP or a closed question on purchase intention at the proposed price, and 3) price tests using a simulated purchase price (preference between products in a context as close as possible to that of the purchase,
with a single sample and a series of test prices-sequential test-or several samples with a single test price per sample- monadic test). Among these methods, current study chooses to use the contingent valuation method (CVM), since it is simple, direct measurement of WTP, and appropriate to all types of product. It requires the respondent to directly express his WTP for a product-open-ended contingent valuation, for example, “please indicate the highest price you would accept to pay for this offer” or answer several successive questions on whether he would, or would not, buy the product at a given price- closed-ended contingent valuation, for example, “would be willing to pay X dollar for this offer?”. Considering online surveys, we finally decide use product-open-ended contingent valuation (OE-CVM). That is, at the beginning of the survey, respondents were asked to write down “the highest price that you would be willing to pay for this T-shirt (no character)”. After answered questions about familiarity, they were asked the same question again but change the picture of a character licensed T-shirt.

According to two answers of WTP (WTP for non-character T-shirt and for a character-licensed T-shirt), the WTPM of a character-licensed T-shirt equals the ratio of the difference between the highest price that consumers are willing to pay for a character-licensed T-shirt and an ordinary T-shirt to the highest price that for ordinary T-shirt. (See the following equation):

\[ WTPM = \frac{WTP \text{ of a character licensed T-shirt} - WTP \text{ of an ordinary T-shirt}}{WTP \text{ of an ordinary T-shirt}} \]

4.3.3 Demographic Characteristics

The total number of participants in the main study was 582 composed of female respondents 304 (52.2%) and male respondents 278 (47.8%). In terms of age, 25-29 years covered the highest percent of the total sample (33.7%), 30-34 years old next to it accounting for 24.4 percent, then 18-24 years old which made up 22.2 percent, and last was old group- 35-39 years old and 40-46 years old accounting for 11.9 percent and 7.9 percent, respectively. 48.3% of the total sample had 4 years college degree and 184 participants were graduated from 2-3 years college degree. Higher educational level (such as Master and Doctoral degree) and lower educational level (High school and middle school) both occupied a small proportion. The distribution of
marital status was unmarried 40.4 percent and married 58.2 percent. Participants had one or more kids accounted for 50.2 percent of the total sample, and 290 participants (49.8%) had no kids. Monthly personal income of total sample, was mainly clustered into 2 ranges, 3001-5000RMB (roughly 468-780 U.S. dollars) and 5001-8000 RMB (roughly $780-1248), represented 29.9 percent and 26.6 percent, respectively. National data (National Bureau of Statistics of China [2017]) pointed that the PCDI (per capita disposable income) of the year 2017 was 23821RMB for the people around the whole country, that was approximately 3716 U.S. dollar, which means 1985RMB ($309) per month. The main part of the participants in this study had higher monthly income compared to the situation of the whole nation. Demographic characteristics of all samples are presented in the Table 4-2.
Table 4-2. Demographic Characteristics of the Whole Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>All f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>All f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>All f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>All f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>All f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>All f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>Income (RMB)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td>kids</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24 years</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>≤ 2000</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29 years</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2001-3000</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34 years</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>2-3 years college degree</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>3001-5000</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39 years</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>4 years college degree</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>5001-8000</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-46 years</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>Master/PHD degree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8001-12000</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12001-20000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>≥ 20000 RMB</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Among them, Questionnaire A conducted stimuli with Spider-man, total 199 participants engaged in the survey, around 34.2% of the whole sample. The distribution of female and male was 55.3 percent for female and 44.7 for male. The share of the female in the sample A was the largest among all the samples (sample B, C and the sample all), correspondingly, male accounting for the smallest share. Identical to the age pattern of the sample all, 25-29 years old remain the largest group (that is, 37.7% a little higher than its share in the sample all), 30-34 years old went to the next, and then followed by the group of 18-24 years old and 35-39 years old making up 25.1%, 15.6% and 15.1%, respectively. 40-46 years old remained the smallest share, only 6.5% of the entire sample A. Over half of the participants owned 4 years college degree (exactly saying: 51.8%). The proportion of participants had 2-3 college degree was 27.6 percent, 4% smaller than it in the sample all. The share of higher education degree went up and reached the highest percentage (10.1percent) among all of the samples. Again, the proportion of married and with one or more kids also was the largest, comparing to the other three, accounting for 62.8% and 53.3% each. More than half (59.2%) of the participants had their personal monthly income range from 3001RMB (468 U.S. dollars) to 8000RMB (1248 U.S. dollar), and only 13 percent of participants had monthly income more than 8000RMB (1248 U.S. dollar).

In the questionnaire B, participants tested with Abe no Seimei. Sample B consisted of total 187 participants, roughly 32.1% of the whole sample. The distribution pattern of age was similar to the sample all. 25-29 years old participants accounted for the largest share, and 30-34 years old, then 18-24 years old ensued, which occupied 30.5%, 26.7% and 21.9%, respectively. The proportion of participants who were in the older age group (40-46 years old), was the largest (11.2%) in comparison with the proportion in other three samples, and first exceeded the proportion of 35-39 years old (9.6%). The gender pattern for this sample almost to the same extent (female 50.3%, male 49.7%). This sample comprised the largest share of college degree 82.3 percent of the participants (including 35.8% of 2-3 years college degree and 46.5% of 4 years college degree). The distribution of marital status was corresponding to the pattern of total sample, 40.6% of unmarried participants and 57.8% of married participants. 89 respondents had no kids while 98 of them had one or more kids. 30.5% of the respondents earned around 3001 to 5000RMB (468 to 780 U.S. dollar) per month and
25.1% of them earned 5001 to 8000RMB (780 to 1248 U.S. dollar). 15% of them, a little higher than the share in the total sample (13.2%), gained up to 8000RMB (1248 U.S. dollars). The remaining proportion (29.4%) represented the respondents whose monthly income was lower than 3000RMB (U.S.$468).

Pikachu was conducted in the last questionnaire (questionnaire C) which consisted 196 participants and made up approximately 33.7% of the total sample. Unlike the other samples, the participants age 18 to 24 years old shared the second largest group in this sample, and 25 to 29 years old remained the largest one. 21.4 percent participants were 30 to 34 years old and fell to the third place. The distribution of gender was corresponding to that in the sample B. Also the percentage of the participants with lower degree (high school and less than high school) was 15.3 percent which were considered as the largest proportion relative to the other three samples. College degree still took up the main proportion, namely 78 percent of the sample (including 2-3 years college and 4 years college). Married participants took up 54.1% and unmarried made up 44.4% which were greater than it in the other three samples. Participants with no kids, similarly, reached 55.1% of the sample and for the first time, overtook the one with kids (44.9%). 66 participants were in lower income participants (less than 3000RMB), representing 33.7 percent of the sample C. 29.6 percent of participants in the survey C had monthly income 3001 to 5000 RMB and 25 percent of them had 5001 to 8000RMB which two were the biggest proportions in the sample C.

Demographic Characteristics of Questionnaire A, B and C are showed in Table 4-3.
Table 4-3. Demographic Characteristics of Questionnaire A, B and C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Spiderman</th>
<th>Abe no Seimei</th>
<th>Pikachu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24 years old</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29 years old</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34 years old</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39 years old</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-46 years old</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td>582</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td>582</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 years college degree</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years college degree (BA/BS)</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master and doctoral degree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td>582</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>235 40.4</td>
<td>339 58.2</td>
<td>8 1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72 36.2</td>
<td>125 62.8</td>
<td>2 1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76 40.6</td>
<td>108 57.8</td>
<td>1 1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87 44.4</td>
<td>106 54.1</td>
<td>3 1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>582 100.0</td>
<td>199 100.0</td>
<td>187 100.0</td>
<td>196 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kids</th>
<th>No kids</th>
<th>One or more kids</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>290 49.8</td>
<td>292 50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93 46.7</td>
<td>106 53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89 47.6</td>
<td>98 52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>108 55.1</td>
<td>88 44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>582 100.0</td>
<td>199 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly income</th>
<th>≤ 2000 RMB</th>
<th>2001-3000 RMB</th>
<th>3001-5000 RMB</th>
<th>5001-8000 RMB</th>
<th>8001-12000 RMB</th>
<th>12001-20000 RMB</th>
<th>≥ 20000 RMB</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94 16.2</td>
<td>67 11.5</td>
<td>174 29.9</td>
<td>155 26.6</td>
<td>52 8.9</td>
<td>18 3.1</td>
<td>7 1.2</td>
<td>15 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 11.6</td>
<td>17 8.5</td>
<td>59 29.6</td>
<td>59 29.6</td>
<td>16 8.0</td>
<td>8 4.0</td>
<td>2 1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 16.6</td>
<td>24 12.8</td>
<td>57 30.5</td>
<td>47 25.1</td>
<td>17 9.1</td>
<td>8 4.3</td>
<td>3 1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 20.4</td>
<td>26 13.3</td>
<td>58 29.6</td>
<td>49 25.0</td>
<td>19 9.7</td>
<td>2 1.0</td>
<td>2 1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>582 100.0</td>
<td>199 100.0</td>
<td>187 100.0</td>
<td>196 100.0</td>
<td>196 100.0</td>
<td>196 100.0</td>
<td>196 100.0</td>
<td>196 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1 Testing WTPM

A paired sample t-test by SPSS 23 was applied to test whether consumers are willing to pay a price premium for a character-licensed merchandise. The results (Table 5-1) show that the price premium for purchasing a character-licensed merchandise indeed exists. The highest price that consumers are willing to pay for a character-licensed T-shirt is significantly higher than pay for an ordinary T-shirt. The mean highest price given by the consumers for a character-licensed T-shirt \((M=87.77, \ SD=103.959)\) and for an ordinary T-shirt \((M=64.78, \ SD=97.849)\) differ significantly \((t=11.838, \ df=581, \text{two-tailed } p=.000)\).

Table 5-1. Paired sample t-test results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>(M)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>(df)</th>
<th>(t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest price for a character licensed T-shirt – Highest price for an ordinary T-shirt</td>
<td>22.990 CNY (1CNY=16,500KRW)</td>
<td>46.854</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>11.838***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of the WTPM (Table 5-2) showed that participants were willing to pay a price premium for a character-licensed T-shirt range from 10.17% to 66.67%. Most of them (86.3%) would be willing to pay less than 1 time more than pay for non-character licensed T-shirt. Only 10% of participants are willing to pay higher than 150% of the ordinary T-shirt and another 10% of the participants do not want to pay any price premium for a T-shirt with a character. They think the value of the T-shirt would not change for a character and even some of them consider that the value would reduce due to the character. Therefore, some scores of WTPM turn to be negative. Since the mean value is larger than the median, extremely large score exists and affects the distribution of the WTPM.
Table 5-2. The distribution of WTPM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentile</th>
<th>WTPM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>56.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>150.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Testing Measurements

Before started to examine three models, measurement test did first. Totally three questionnaires were designed and 582 participants were engaged. Questionnaire A conducted stimuli with Spider-man, total 199 participants engaged in the survey, around 34.2% of the whole sample. In the Questionnaire B participants tested with Abe no Seimei. Sample B consisted of total 187 participants, roughly 32.1% of the whole sample. Pikachu was conducted in the questionnaire C which consisted 196 participants and made up roughly 33.7% of the total sample.

First split the total sample into two groups, each group consisted of half of each three samples, and examined the measurement model with each group (Gorsuch, 1983; Sharma, Shimp and Shin, 1995). A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was carried out to assess measurement properties of the various scales with the first half of the total sample (N= 291). After examining communality of variables, factor loadings, and fit indices, removed 7 items and conducted another CFA with second half of the sample (N= 291). This approach is typically used when some items should be excluded in factor analysis (cf. Gorsuch, 1983; Sharma, Shimp and Shin 1995). With regard to using a relatively small sample size, we followed a set of rules to determine the appropriateness of our sample size: 1) the absolute number of cases and 2) subject-to-variable ratio. First, Gorsuch (1983) and Kline (1979) recommended at least 100 cases as the absolute minimum number. Second, many researchers suggest a subject-to
variable ratio of 5:1 is appropriate in conducting a CFA. Given that our study included 30 variables for the first CFA \( \left( \frac{N/\text{variable}}{30} = 9.7 \right) \) and 23 variables for the second CFA \( \left( \frac{N/\text{variables}}{23} = 12.65 \right) \), our two samples met these two criteria of the minimum sample. This current study, for model fit indices, we considered the CFI, TLI, and IFI.

The first CFA on the first half of the sample showed satisfactory fit indices \( \left( \frac{\chi^2}{df} = 2.598; \text{CFI} = .902; \text{TLI} = .892; \text{IFI} = .903; \text{RMSEA} = .074; \text{p-value} = .000 \right) \), but the factor loadings for the first item of functional value (that is, this T-shirt has consistent quality, \( \beta = .543 \)), the fourth item of functional value (i.e., this T-shirt has poor workmanship, \( \beta = .075 \)), fifth, item of functional value (i.e., this T-shirt would not last a long time, \( \beta = .155 \)) and the sixth item of functional value (this T-shirt would perform consistency, \( \beta = .498 \)), were lower than the suggested cutoff of .60 (Nunnally, 1978). Also, regarding the communalities of variables, the third emotional value item (i.e., this T-shirt is one that I would feel relaxed about using, .394), as well as the identification item 1 (.444) (that is, I like this character) and item 2 (.493) (that is, I can easily relate to this character), were lower than the cutoff .50. Therefore, we eliminated these seven items. After excluding these seven items, the second CFA on the second half of the sample was conducted and provided better overall fit indices \( \left( \frac{\chi^2}{df} = 2.353; \text{CFI} = .972; \text{TLI} = .967; \text{IFI} = .972; \text{RMSEA} = .048; \text{p-value} = .000 \right) \). All factor loadings were greater than the cutoff of .60 and the communalities of all variables were greater than the cutoff of .50. Following Sharma et al.’s (1995) procedure, the analysis on the second partial sample was repeated for the total sample. The CFA on the total sample \( \left( N = 582 \right) \) showed satisfactory fit indices \( \left( \frac{\chi^2}{df} = 2.353; \text{CFI} = .972; \text{TLI} = .967; \text{IFI} = .972; \text{RMSEA} = .048; \text{p-value} = .000 \right) \) and factor loadings of all 23 variables were greater than .60 and the communalities of all these variables were greater than .50.

In the final step of testing the measurement model, we examined construct reliability (CR; otherwise known as composite reliability), average variance extracted (AVE) Maximum Shared Squared Variance (MSV), and Average Shared Squared Variance (ASV) for each construct with the total sample. As showed in 5-2, results indicated that all constructs met the recommended level of construct validity and reliability of each scale. Regarding convergent validity. Each CR score was greater than 0.7 and its AVE score was greater than 0.5 (Fornell and Larcker, 1981; Hair et al., 2010). Two tests were performed to evaluate the discriminant validity. First, each MSV
score and ASV of the five factors were less than its AVE score. Second, except the correlation between the consumer value and identification exceed the square root of AVE. All other correlations did not exceed the square root of AVE (Fornell and Larcker, 1981; Hair et al., 2010). Partial dimensions exhibited both convergent and discriminant validity.

Table 5-3. Summary of Reliability Coefficients, AVE, MSV, ASV and Correlations Among Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential variable</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>MSV</th>
<th>ASV</th>
<th>CV</th>
<th>FA</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>WTPM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumer value (CV)</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>.904</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity (FA)</td>
<td>.932</td>
<td>.932</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-congruity (SC)</td>
<td>.903</td>
<td>.905</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.794</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification (ID)</td>
<td>.894</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.881</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of fit indices: $\chi^2/df = 2.353$; CFI = .972; TLI = .967; IFI = .972; RMSEA = .048; p-value = .000

Note. Composite Reliability (CR); Average Variance Extracted (AVE); Maximum Shared Squared Variance (MSV); Average Shared Squared Variance (ASV); $^a$ indicates the square root of a given construct's AVE

5.3 Testing Models

The fit statistic of the three models is presented in Table 5-4. The ratio of $\chi^2$ to $df$ exceed 3 (Ratio of $\chi^2$ to $df \leq 2$ or 3, useful for nested models/model trimming, Schreiber, Stage, King, Nora and Barlow, 2006) and thus, the fit indices indicated that Model A (direct effect) did not fit the data. Paths from familiarity, self-congruity and identification to willingness to pay more were insignificant, while only the path from perceived consumer value to willingness to pay more is significant ($p<0.01$). Model A was eliminated from further consideration since the effect was worst among the three
models. The $\chi^2$ to $df$, RMSEA, CFI, TLI, IFI scores were almost the same in model B and model C. However, the total effect of model B did not show a significant result. Total effect was the additional effects of direct effect and indirect effect. Model B examines the both direct and indirect effect of the familiarity, self-congruity identification as well as perceived consumer value on the WTPM. Though, the indirect effects in model B were significant, that is the paths from familiarity, self-congruity and identification had significantly indirect effect on willingness to pay more through perceived consumer value, neither the direct effects nor the total effects show another significant. In Model C (fully mediated effect), character familiarity, character self-congruity and character identification were significantly associated with perceived value ($\beta$ familiarity = -.08; $\beta$ self-congruity= .23 ; $\beta$ identification= .73), explaining 80% of the variance in the latter variable. Perceived consumer value was significantly associated with WTPM ($\beta$=.25), explaining 6% of the variance.
Table 5-4. Fit Measures and Latent Path Coefficients for All Three Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>( \chi^2/df )</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>IFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Factors → Perceived Value</th>
<th>Perceived Value ( \rightarrow ) WTPM</th>
<th>Factors → WTPM</th>
<th>Total Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA → PCV</td>
<td>SC → PCV</td>
<td>ID → PCV</td>
<td>FA → WTPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model A</td>
<td>5.009</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td>.901</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-0.211***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model B</td>
<td>2.353</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>FA → PCV</td>
<td>SC → PCV</td>
<td>ID → PCV</td>
<td>-0.083***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model C</td>
<td>2.325</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>FA → PCV</td>
<td>SC → PCV</td>
<td>ID → PCV</td>
<td>-0.084***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Familiarity (FA); Self-congruity (SC); Identification (ID); Perceived consumer value (PCV); Willingness to pay more (WTPM); ‘p < 0.1, “p< 0.05, and ***p < 0.01
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5.4 Testing Effects of Demographic Characteristic on WTPM

The results of t-test and one-way ANOVA show that there is no statistically significant relationship between age and WTPM ($F_{4,577} = 0.617, p=0.650$). Different education levels have no significant differ on the WTPM ($F_{4,577} = 1.487, p=0.205$). Also, monthly income level has no significant effects on the WTPM ($F_{7,574} = 1.029, p=0.410$). In addition, gender ($F_{1,580} = 0.082, p=0.775$), and kids ($F_{1,580} = 2.509, p=0.114$) would not influence the WTPM they for a character-licensed merchandise as well. While only marital status is found that has significant differ on the WTPM ($F_{1,572} = 6.112, p=0.014$), that is, mean WTPM given by married individuals (Mean=65.0%) is significant higher than which given by unmarried individuals (Mean=45.5%).

To this end, we conclude the WTPM for a character-licensed merchandise is not related to the demographic characteristics of participants except marital status. The results of effects of demographic characteristic on WTPM are showed in Table 5-5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristic</th>
<th>≤ 2000 RMB</th>
<th>2001-3000 RMB</th>
<th>3001-5000 RMB</th>
<th>5001-8000 RMB</th>
<th>8001-12000 RMB</th>
<th>12001-20000 RMB</th>
<th>≥ 20000 RMB</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24 years old</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29 years old</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34 years old</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39 years old</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-46 years old</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 years college degree</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years college degree (BA/BS)</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master and doctoral degree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No kids</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more kids</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 2000 RMB</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-3000 RMB</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3001-5000 RMB</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001-8000 RMB</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8001-12000 RMB</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12001-20000 RMB</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 20000 RMB</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-5. Effects of Demographic Characteristic on WTPM
6.1 Price Premium of Character Exist

This study investigated the price premium that Chinese consumers are willing to pay for their favorite characters. From the result, it can be seen that price premium indeed appear, 90% of participants chose to offer a price premium (WTPM) above zero and even 13.7% of them are willing to pay double money to buy a character-licensed T-shirt, compared to an ordinary T-shirt. While the price premium given by the participants was not always positive. The mode of WTPM score was 0%, which means many of the participants considered that no significant value difference exists between the T-shirt with a character and without a character. What’s more, 10% of them offered a negative WTPM score, illustrating the character of the T-shirt decreased the value of T-shirt. Self-congruity theory gives us a reason for the negative WTPM. According to the theory, when individuals considered the character image is 1) not similar to the self-image; and also 2) not relate to the ideal image and individuals would trigger a negative impression or evaluation on it. Besides, identification theory is also able to account for this. Lower identification of the character triggers consumer’s incomprehension toward the character, such as misunderstanding the behaviors of the character or selective ignoring the information about it. Misunderstanding or ignoring might make them offer a low price to the character with low identification. In social, for example, it is commonly seen that people full of masculinity are misunderstanding why so many girls and women like some cute and pink character. As for these manhood people, it is impossible to pay a high price for the character they don’t understand.

6.2 Familiarity, Self-Congruity and Identification in Model C

The findings of fit statistic of the three model show that only model C fits the data. Model A is eliminated from further consideration since the effect is worst among the three models, and model B is eliminated because the total effect of model B does not show a significant result and only the indirect effects in model B are significant. Model
C refers to fully mediated effect, which means character familiarity, character self-congruity and character identification is significantly associated with perceived value and perceived consumer value is significantly associated with WTPM. In other words, familiarity, self-congruity and identification alone did not drive the WTPM in this study. It is important to take into account the perceived value of the character-licensed merchandise. Kwon, Trail & James (2007) also make a similar conclusion. They investigated the potential mediating effect of perceived value in the relationship between team identification and intent to purchase collegiate team-licensed apparel. The Goodness-of-t statistics indicated that the partially mediated and the fully mediated models fit equally well, while the direct effect model did not fit the data which means, team identification alone did not drive the purchase intentions.

Besides, the results of model C revealed that familiarity with the character had a negative effect on the perceived consumer value (β = -.084, p = .000). This was surprising, because we fully anticipated that consumers would increase their perceived values of a character licensed t-shirt as they know more about that character. One reason by guessing that different with a logo of sport team or college, a character after all is a vigorous image that even consumer does not know it well, they can also judge it rely on it appearance, gestures, actions, colors and other external dimensions. Perhaps, the WTPM also might be affected by those external conditions. Moreover, when they have some knowledge about the character, their interesting or curious about the character would decrease, especially, when the knowledge about the character do not trigger their identification with the character, which means, you know it more, hate it more. Also, “thing with rare be expensive” when the character could be found everywhere, the value of consumers’ mind would probably decrease. What’s more, this study assumes that familiarity accumulation based on information search which means consumer get information about the character on their own initiative, while there is always many chance to receive information passively. For example, those all-pervasive ad or fragmented information which occupy your every minute forces you to accept. In this sense, even though your familiarity about the character increase, you are not willing to pay a higher price premium. Therefore, positive way or passive way to receive information is important in this case, and also information sources such as information distribution channels might have influence on the WTPM.
Character self-congruity as well as identification are found to support the hypotheses of this study. Character self-congruity and identification have positive effects on the willingness to pay more for a character separately, while they are fully mediated by consumer perceived value (functional, emotional and social value). In other words, high congruence between self and character derives a high perceived value, and then makes high WTPM. For instance, a person views superman as his hero and want to be superman as well, and thus his preference for the superman makes him perceive high quality of the product which has a superman image (perceived high functional value) and feel happy and please when he uses the product (perceived high emotional value). What’s more, people’s good impression on superman like brave, kind, strong, etc., would transfer to the individual who likes superman which help the individual acquiring social approval easier (perceived high social value). Therefore, due to these values they perceiving from the character, they are willing to pay higher price premium. All in all, the higher congruence between self and character, the higher value they could perceive from the character, the higher price premium they would be willing to pay. Identification describes as similar picture as the self-congruity. Some individuals with high identification of the character consider character as another themselves. Usually, they would treat the character as their friend, feed it, talk with it, understand and concern it. Identifying with the character makes individual perceiving high value of the character, and willing to pay more for the character.

6.3 Effect of Demographic Variables on WTPM

As for demographic variables, only marital status has a significant difference on the willingness to pay more. That is, individuals who are married are likely to pay more for a character than individuals who are unmarried. The reasons might be including 1) after marriage, double income provides money support; 2) kids love character, higher price premium due to their love for kids. However, in this study, results show that kids and income have no effects on WTPM. Then, the reasons why married people would pay more than unmarried become confused. Psychology study reveals that marriage to some extent, add stress to the adults. People addicted in game, living in a virtual world, buying 2-D world related products and other abnormal behaviors are to divert their
stress. Maybe reducing pressure is one of the reasons why adult married consumer is willing to pay more price premium than the unmarried, while no studies have been tested. Besides, married people may consider the character as an affection link between husband and wife. Since character things unlike other topics such as work, professional knowledge, politics or the economy, are simple, acceptable and might be a good topic to talk. It is a reasonable guess while still need to be tested.

No gender difference is also supported by other studies. For example, Kwon & Armstrong (2002) mentioned that no gender differences were revealed in terms of sport team licensed merchandise. Even though character and sport are totally different things, the results are still acceptable.

No income difference is also comprehensible. After all, character is an affordable and luxury product. In this study, the “more” of willingness to pay more refers to the character, which measure the value of the character in consumers’ mind. Therefore, participants only consider the value of the character itself rather than the T-shirt, bag, or other carriers. Of course, type of the merchandise impact on the price offered by consumer. Consumer obviously would offer a higher price for a handbag than for T-shirt. However, in this study, WTPM is calculated in the form of percentage, which avoids the many external factors (brand name, type, style and so on) perfectly.

Kids have no significant relationship with WTPM, which reveal that participants offer WTPM to the character based on the consideration of their own familiarity, self-congruity, identification and consumer values, not their kids'.
CHAPTER 7 IMPLICATION AND LIMITATION

7.1 Implications

7.1.1 Academic Implications

In this study, three models are examined (direct model, partially mediated mode, and fully mediated model), and finally only fully mediated model passed the test. It means, familiarity, self-congruity, identification with the character of each affects WTPM only mediated by the consumer values. Previous study by Kwon, Trail and James (2007) also came to a similar conclusion which indicated team identification alone did not drive the purchase intentions, and it was important to take into account the perceived value of the team-licensed merchandise. However, many other studies have likewise concluded that factors especially identification (i.e., team identification) had the greatest direct influence on buying behaviors of team-licensed merchandise. While, there still has a gap between the real purchase and the purchase intention which is examined quite often in previous studies. WTPM is based on the actual purchase, when they offer their highest price for a character licensed merchandise, they would remind their previous experience, their income constraint, utility and other factors which impact on the value they perceived on the products. In this sense, WTP or WTPM has its advantages in real purchase conditions, compared with other dependent variables such as purchase attitude or intention.

In addition, comparing to the other product categories, WTPM given in this study is quite higher than in other areas. For example, a study investigated consumers’ willingness to pay for domestically produced wheat products in South Korea (Jin, 2011) showed that the extra amount of money that they were willing to pay range from 38% to 50.5%, while in this study, half of them were willing to pay more than 50%, and 10% of them even would like to pay extra money exceeding 150%. Although wheat products example is not conducted in the context of licensed merchandise, it still gives us a research suggestion. That is, whether product categories or involvement would have moderate effects on the relationship between familiarity, self-congruity, identification, consumer value and WTPM. A similar study conducted by Kwon and Kwak (2014) has
testified that product category (utilitarian products and hedonic products) moderated the relationship between team identification and consumer values as well as the relationship between team identification and purchase attitude. And they said the relationship between team identification and perceived consumer values was significantly strong for hedonic products, while the impact of team identification on attitudes toward sport licensed merchandise was significantly pronounced for utilitarian products. It is a good attempt to take in future in the context of character licensed merchandise.

Lastly, the distribution of WTPM shows only 13.7% of participants are willing to pay double money for a character, which means, the majority are in a reasonable and controllable rage. Many psychology scholars are worried about “kidult” phenomenon. Infantilist adult or kidult refers to adult who avoids responsibility, behave like a spoiled kid, love childish things, lack self-control and so on. However, this study give them a perfect refutation that even though individuals (adults) love the character, or have high self-congruity and identification with the character, they still offer the character of a reasonable price.

7.1.2 Practical Implications

Adult consumer is rational, as mentioned above, even though they would like to pay more for their favorite character, they still consider to external factors, such as the quality of the products, the brand value and, so on. It implies that the additional value of a character licensed merchandise transferring from consumers’ love is limited, and the better way to increase additional value is increasing technology or creativity content.

Besides, model C shows that perceived values have important mediated effects on the relationship between familiarity, self-congruity, identification and willingness to pay more. That is to say, character companies or licensing manufacturers should pay attention to the values of the products. Marketing strategies could focus on how to increase consumer’s self-congruity and identification with the character, and how to help consumer perceive the value of the character.

Moreover, the negative relationship between character familiarity and WTPM implies familiarity in some extent is not a good thing. The more familiar, the less novelty consumer would feel, the less they are interested in. “Things are expensive if
they are rare” also apposite in this case. Therefore, selecting information distribution channels to effectively and efficiently deliver information instead of high frequency of information dissemination.

Lastly, demographic variables except marital status have no significant difference on WTPM, which implies character licensing market is a diversifying market. Not only young women like the character and would like to purchase character licensed products, but also married men, well-educated people, and people with high income etc., would like the character and want to buy it. Therefore, enriching the product variety, designing diverse character image (not just cute), expanding distribution channels as well as strengthening the brand cooperation in different industry are important as for current character licensing market.

7.2 Limitations

In this study, the WTPM of a character-licensed T-shirt is calculated by the ratio of the difference between the highest price that consumers are willing to pay for a character-licensed T-shirt and an ordinary T-shirt at the highest price that for ordinary T-shirt. Participants are asked to fill the question-“The highest price I am willing to pay is…” while this kind of question is too simple to ensure that the price given by Participants is the highest. Participants write 300 CNY which doesn’t mean 301 CNY or 310 CNY is unacceptable. The difference between 301 CNY and 310 CNY presents totally distinct meaning in the context of different participants. In other words, participants think 300 CNY is the highest price they are willing to pay, while actually, they give the range of the highest price, above or below 300 CNY. The size of the range is changed according to participants’ income, purchase experience and so on. Therefore, more scientific method to measure WTPM should be explored in the future study.

This study emphasizes the relationships between 4 factors (familiarity, self-congruity, identification and perceived consumer values) and willingness to pay more, and the mediated effect of perceived consumer values, while ignore the correlation between familiarity, self-congruity and identification. Another research on character licensed merchandise by Wang (2012) found that self-congruity led to identification. Armed with this research, it is reasonable to guess that familiarity will lead to self-
congruity or identification and vice versa. Therefore, it is important to explore the correlation between these three factors.

This study illustrated familiarity, self-congruity, identification with the character indirectly impact on WTPM through a mediator- consumer values. However, we cannot know which values explained most. Would it be emotional value? Functional value? Or social value? The different answer would make a totally different market strategy for a character-licensed merchandise. Besides, is it possible that familiarity has negative effects on the emotional value, but has positive effects on the functional value. Also, is it possible that the emotional value has partially mediated effects while social value has fully mediated effects and function value has no mediated effects. In this sense, it is a good suggestion to test functional value, emotional value and social value separately in the upcoming study.
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[Appendix 1] Pretest

[PART 1]
What follows is a character. After viewing this picture, please respond to the items and questions that follow.

1. Do you know the name of the character?
   Please write down the name of it. _______________

2. Take a moment to think about the character you just saw. Please indicate how familiar you are with this character.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all familiar</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
<td>Extremely familiar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely do not recognize</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
<td>Definitely recognize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely have not heard of it before</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
<td>Definitely have heard of it before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Think about the character again, then describe this character using one or more personal adjective such as, stylish, classy or whatever adjectives you can use to describe the character in your mind.

____________________________________________________________________
[PART 2]

What follows is a character. After viewing this picture, please respond to the items and questions that follow.

1. Do you know the name of the character?
Please write down the name of it. ______________

2. Take a moment to think about the character you just saw. Please indicate how familiar you are with this character.

   1. Not at all familiar _______________________________ 7. Extremely familiar

   2. Definitely do not recognize _______________________________

   3. Definitely have not heard of it before _______________________________

3. Think about the character again, then describe this character using one or more personal adjective such as, stylish, classy or whatever adjectives you can use to describe the character in your mind.
[PART 3]
What follows is a character. After viewing this picture, please respond to the items and questions that follow.

1. Do you know the name of the character?
Please write down the name of it. _____________

2. Take a moment to think about the character you just saw. Please indicate how familiar you are with this character.

   
   
   
   
   
   1
   2
   3
   4
   5
   6
   7

   1.Not at all familiar ____________________________________________________________________________
   2.Definitely do not recognize _________________________________________________________________________
   3.Definitely have not heard of it before _______________________________________________________________________

   Extremely familiar
   Definitely recognize
   Definitely have heard of it before

3. Think about the character again, then describe this character using one or more personal adjective such as, stylish, classy or whatever adjectives you can use to describe the character in your mind.

____________________________________________________________________
[PART 4]

What follows is a character. After viewing this picture, please respond to the items and questions that follow.

1. Do you know the name of the character?
   Please write down the name of it. _______________

2. Take a moment to think about the character you just saw. Please indicate how familiar you are with this character.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   1.Not at all familiar ___________________________________________________________ Extremely familiar
   2.Definitely do not recognize ____________________________________________________ Definitely recognize
   3.Definitely have not heard of it before ____________________________________________ Definitely have heard of it before

3. Think about the character again, then describe this character using one or more personal adjective such as, stylish, classy or whatever adjectives you can use to describe the character in your mind.
[PART 5]
What follows is a character. After viewing this picture, please respond to the items and questions that follow.

1. Do you know the name of the character?
Please write down the name of it. ______________

2. Take a moment to think about the character you just saw. Please indicate how familiar you are with this character.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

   1. Not at all familiar ___________________________________________ Extremely familiar
   2. Definitely do not recognize _____________________________________ Definitely recognize
   3. Definitely have not heard of it before ____________________________ Definitely have heard of it before

3. Think about the character again, then describe this character using one or more personal adjective such as, stylish, classy or whatever adjectives you can use to describe the character in your mind.

   ___________________________________________________________________
[PART 6]
What follows is a character. After viewing this picture, please respond to the items and questions that follow.

1. Do you know the name of the character?
Please write down the name of it. _____________

2. Take a moment to think about the character you just saw. Please indicate how familiar you are with this character.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Not at all familiar</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
<td>Extremely familiar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Definitely do not recognize</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
<td>Definitely recognize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Definitely have not heard of it before</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
<td>Definitely have heard of it before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Think about the character again, then describe this character using one or more personal adjective such as, stylish, classy or whatever adjectives you can use to describe the character in your mind.
____________________________________________________________________
[PART 7]
What follows is a character. After viewing this picture, please respond to the items and questions that follow.

1. Do you know the name of the character?
Please write down the name of it. _____________

2. Take a moment to think about the character you just saw. Please indicate how familiar you are with this character.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Not at all familiar</td>
<td>__________________________</td>
<td>Extremely familiar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Definitely do not recognize</td>
<td>__________________________</td>
<td>Definitely recognize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Definitely have not heard of it before</td>
<td>__________________________</td>
<td>Definitely have heard of it before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Think about the character again, then describe this character using one or more personal adjective such as, stylish, classy or whatever adjectives you can use to describe the character in your mind.

____________________________________________________________________
[PART 8]
What follows is a character. After viewing this picture, please respond to the items and questions that follow.

1. Do you know the name of the character?
Please write down the name of it. _______________

2. Take a moment to think about the character you just saw. Please indicate how familiar you are with this character.

1. Not at all familiar
2. Definitely do not recognize
3. Definitely have not heard of it before

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
_______________________________
_______________________________
_______________________________

Extremely familiar
Definitely recognize
Definitely have heard of it before

3. Think about the character again, then describe this character using one or more personal adjective such as, stylish, classy or whatever adjectives you can use to describe the character in your mind.
____________________________________________________________________
[Appendix 2] Main Study (take Spider-man as an example)

[Part 1]
What follows is a photo of an ordinary white cotton T-shirt. After viewing the photo, please respond to the question that follow.

Please write down the highest price that you would be willing to pay for this T-shirt.

The highest price I am willing to pay is __________ RMB / U.S. dollar / Won.
Take a moment to think about the character you just saw. Please indicate how familiar you are with this character.

1. Not at all familiar  ____________________________________________________________________________  Extremely familiar
2. Definitely do not recognize  ____________________________________________________________________________  Definitely recognize
3. Definitely have not heard of it before  ____________________________________________________________________________  Definitely have heard of it before

3. Think about the character again, then describe this character using one or more personal adjective such as, stylish, classy or whatever adjectives you can use to describe the character in your mind.

______________________________________________________________________________________________
[Part 3]
There is a white cotton T-shirt with a character- Spiderman (official licensed), such as, the T-shirt shown in the following picture. See the picture and image it. Then please respond to the items and questions that follow.

Please write down the highest price that you would be willing to pay for this T-shirt.

The highest price I am willing to pay is __________ RMB / U.S. dollar / Won.
[Part 4]
In this part, we are going to ask you questions about “self-congruity”, “identification” and “consumer value”.

Please recall your description of Spiderman and your imagination of the T-shirt with Spiderman. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements by placing an “O” to the response that best describes your level of agreement or disagreement.

Table 1 Formal Self-Congruity Questions (Spiderman and T-shirt with Spiderman)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>More or less disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>More or less agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Spiderman is consistent with how I see myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Spiderman reflects who I am.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. People similar to me wear T-shirts with Spiderman like this in casual situation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The kind of person who typically wears Spiderman T-shirt in casual situation is very much like me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Spiderman is a mirror image of me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Formal Identification Question (Spiderman)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>More or less agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>More or less agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. I like Spiderman.

10. I can easily relate to Spiderman.

11. Spiderman is easily understood.

12. I think of Spiderman as a good friend.

13. I have no doubt Spiderman and I would work well together.

14. Spiderman is a personal role model.

Table 3 Formal consumer value question (T-shirt with a character - Spiderman)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>More or less disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>More or less agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. The T-shirt with Spiderman has consistent quality.

16. The T-shirt with Spiderman is well made.

17. The T-shirt with Spiderman has an acceptable standard of quality.

18. The T-shirt with Spiderman has poor workmanship.

19. The T-shirt with Spiderman would not last a long time.

20. The T-shirt with Spiderman would perform consistency.

21. The T-shirt with
*Spiderman* is one that I would enjoy.

22. The T-shirt with *Spiderman* would make me want to use it.

23. The T-shirt with *Spiderman* is one that I would feel relaxed about using.

24. The T-shirt with *Spiderman* would make me feel good.

25. The T-shirt with *Spiderman* would give me please.

26. The T-shirt with *Spiderman* would help me to feel acceptable.

27. The T-shirt with *Spiderman* would improve the way I am perceived.

28. The T-shirt with *Spiderman* would make a good impression on other people.

29. The T-shirt with *Spiderman* would give its owner social approval.
국문초록

이 연구의 목적은 소비자와의 친밀감 (친숙, 자기 일치 및 식별)과 캐릭터 라이선스 상품에 대한 더 많은 지불에 대한 의지에서 인식된 소비자 가치의 잠재적 중재 효과를 조사하는 것이었습니다. 직접 효과, 부분 중재 및 완전 중재 모델을 비교했다. 온라인 편의성 설문 조사가 실시되었고 중국에 582 명이 참여했습니다. 설문 조사에서 공식 라이센스 캐릭터 (스파이더 맨 등)가있는 티셔츠와 같은 색과 스타일을 지녔지만 캐릭터가 없는 티셔츠 두 장이 소비자의 지불 의사를 측정하도록 설계되었습니다.

티셔츠 컨텍스트. 결과를 일반화하기 위해 첫 번째 예비 테스트에서 친숙도 스코어를 기준으로 한 명 이상의 캐릭터 (스파이더 맨, 아베노 세이 메이, 피카츄)를 선택했습니다.

주요 연구에서는 개방형 질문이 포함 된 조건부 평가 방법 (CVM)을 사용하여 캐릭터 라이선스 T 서츠의 소비자 WTPM 을 측정했습니다. 설문 조사가 시작될 때 참가자는 일반 T 서츠 (캐릭터 없음)을 구입할 때 가장 높은 가격을 제시 한 다음 캐릭터 친숙성 점수를 부여한 후 캐릭터를 사면 다시 최고 가격을 제시해야했습니다. 나머지 부분에서는 참가자들이 자기 일치, 식별 및 소비자 가치 관련 질문에 답해야했습니다.

연구 결과에 따르면, 성격에 대한 가격 프리미엄이 실제로 존재합니다. 그리고 참가자 중 대부분 (86.3 %)은 인물이 없는 캐릭터 라이선스 티셔츠의 2 배 가격보다 적은 금액을 지불하려고했다. 더욱이 모델 테스팅의 결과는 완전히 중재 된 모델 (모델 C)이 더 간결하고이 데이터 세트의 가장 대표적인 것으로 선택되었습니다. 직접 효과 모델 (모델 C)은 적절한 적합성을 가지지 만 모델의 전체 효과는 중요도에 미치지 못합니다. 또한 친숙성, 자기 일치 성, 소비자 가치, WTPM 에 이르는 직접 경로가 중요하지 않고 간접 경로 만 의미가 있었으므로 모델 (B 와 C)은 동일하게 나타났습니다. 결과적으로, 완전히 중재 된 모델이 이 데이터 세트를 나타 내기 위해 선택되었습니다.

키워드 : WTPM, 캐릭터 라이선스 상품, 소비자가 인식한 가치, 친근감, 자기 일치.
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