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THE IMPACT OF INTANGIBLE ASSETS EVALUATION ON CONSUMPTION CONCEPTS FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF MARKETING PSYCHOLOGY
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Background: Research related to evaluation found that large evaluations in intangible assets often arouse consumers’ favor more than small evaluations in intangible assets. When it comes to evaluation, people prefer large evaluations. For example, people are more likely to prefer large items to strengthen consumers’ preference for intangible assets; colors marked with large evaluations are more popular than colors marked with small evaluations; people have shown a preference for big numbers in many areas of life.

However, this “big is good” principle does not apply to all products. Existing studies have found that in some cases, consumers prefer to have smaller evaluations in intangible assets. For example, for hedonics and luxury goods, small assessments in intangible assets are often more popular. When the product is portable, consumers prefer products with small evaluations among intangible assets. So, what impact will the intangible asset evaluation have on consumption concepts? What is its internal mechanism? The existing research on the evaluation of intangible assets still lacks a unified theoretical framework.

This study is based on the limitations of previous studies, based on the theory of temporal and spatial consistency, and explores the impact of intangible asset evaluation on consumption concepts. First of all, Experiment 1 shows that consumers are more likely to perceive that product with large evaluations in intangible assets are more valuable, which leads to more positive product attitudes. Secondly, Experiment 2 explored the adjustment effect of the individual’s cognitive demand level, and established the corresponding boundary conditions for the main effect. The evaluation of intangible assets can effectively affect the attitude of individuals with low cognitive needs on the product, but will not significantly affect the attitude of individuals with high cognitive needs on the product.

Subjects and methods: Experiment 1 recruited 68 consumers (age 19-48 years old, M = 30.24, SD = 8.58, 52.94% female) in a shopping mall with a reward of 10 yuan to complete a series of activities on laptops. Participants were randomly assigned to 2 groups (large evaluation, small evaluation), and the final overall sample size was (n = 63), and the sample size of each group was (large evaluation = 32, n small evaluation = 31).

Certain assessments may have special meanings, for example: 13 means misfortune, 4 means death. In order to eliminate the influence of this effect, the researchers collected 43 machines on the internet, PIW00-27, PIW00-73, PIW00-33, PIW00-50, PIW00-67), and then asked participants whether the names of these intangible assets have special meaning. The results show that for the vast majority of participants (97.67%), the name of intangible assets used in Experiment 1 does not have a special meaning.

Study design: Participants performed a pre-test (age 17-49, M = 29.58, SD = 8.61, female proportion 48.84%), and presented all the intangible asset names used in Experiment 1 to the participants one by one (the order follows the researcher a virtual notebook computer intangible asset series “PIW00-”) was created, and different assessments were added to show the difference between intangible assets. First, participants were introduced to the other three products in the same intangible asset series (pictures, product information, intangibles). Asset name, PIW00-33, PIW00-50, PIW00-67) as a reference. For the large evaluation group, the evaluation of the target intangible assets obtained by the participants is larger than the evaluation of the reference intangible asset (PIW00-73); for the small evaluation group, the evaluation in the target intangible assets given to participants is smaller than the evaluation in the reference intangible assets (PIW00-27).

After that, the researchers asked participants to report their attitudes towards the product (7 points scale, 1 point dislike, 7 points like), the perceived value of the product (7 points scale, 1 point low, 7 points high), and some confusion Items, such as personal hobbies, understanding of such products, etc. Finally, the researcher asked the participants to recall the name of the target intangible asset, report whether the name of the intangible asset has a special meaning, whether the evaluation of the product depends on past shopping experience, and guess the purpose of the survey.

Methods of statistical analysis: SPSS18.0 software is used for data entry and analysis. The main statistical methods used are descriptive statistics and one-way analysis of variance.

Results: Operational test: 2 participants reported the wrong intangible asset name, 1 participant thought that the intangible asset name contained special meaning, and the evaluation of the product by 2 participants relied on past shopping experience, and no participant guessed this time. The real purpose of the
investigation, the experimental operation effectively affected most of the participants.

**Perceived value:** The results show that the evaluation of intangible assets will significantly affect the perceived value of the product. Participants in the large evaluation group tend to believe that the product has higher perceived value ($M_{\text{large}} = 5.03$, $SD = 0.78$; $M_{\text{small}} = 3.35$, $SD = 0.71$, $t(61) = 8.90$, $P < 0.05$, $d = 2.25$).

Consumption concept: The results show that participants in the large evaluation group have significantly higher attitudes towards products than those in the small evaluation group ($M_{\text{large}} = 5.31$, $SD = 0.86$; $M_{\text{small}} = 3.74$, $SD = 0.73$, $t(61) = 7.81$, $P < 0.05$, $d = 1.97$), which provides a basis for hypothesis 1a.

**Intermediary analysis:** In order to further verify the relationship between evaluation, perceived value and consumption concepts, this study analyzes the intermediary effect of perceived value through Bootstrapping (PROCESS Model 4, Hayes, 2013). It is found that the perceived value mediates the impact of the evaluation size on consumption concepts (95% confidence interval = 1.45; $CI = 1.10$ to 1.87), while the direct effect of intangible asset evaluation on consumer attitudes is not significant (Direct effect $0 = 0.12$; $CI = -0.24$ to 0.48), indicating that the perceived value completely mediates the relationship between the appraisal size and the consumption concept. The result verifies the hypothesis 1b. Please see Figure 1 for details.
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The experimental data results verify Hypothesis 1, which shows that intangible assets containing large evaluations can stimulate consumers' positive attitudes towards products more than containing small evaluations. Secondly, the experiment tested the mediating role of perceived value between appraisal size and consumption concept, and constructed an internal mechanism model.

**Conclusions:** This study shows that the evaluation of intangible assets will significantly affect consumers' attitudes towards products. Intangible assets containing large evaluations can stimulate consumers to love products more than intangible assets containing small evaluations. The experiment verified the mediating role of perceived value and constructed the internal mechanism model of the main effect. This study embeds the individual's cognitive needs level into the main research framework of the evaluation category of intangible assets, pays attention to its moderating effect on the evaluation effect of intangible assets, clarifies the boundary conditions for the main effect, and constructs a clearer theoretical and application field framework.

Current research only explores the impact of the size difference between a single assessment on consumption concepts, but the name of intangible assets may include a combination of multiple assessments and categories, for example: Is there a difference between DX1 and XD1? Follow-up research can further explore the impact of the difference between the assessment category combinations.
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**Background:** In Shakespeare's sonnets, the poet described two very different scenes. One is the bleak and withered winter, and the other is the fruitful late summer and early autumn. After reading the whole poem, we know that these two scenes are not both depictions of the objective world. The poet separates