

# Effects Of Brand Personality Attitude, Perceived Quality On Brand Extension Evaluations And Brand Personality Changes

Seongdo Cho Seongmin Jeong, Kyungho Jung

Field of Research: Marketing

## 1. Introduction And Research Background

In the field of brand management, brand personality and brand extension have been important research areas since 1990(Aaker and Keller, 1990; Keller and Aaker, 1993; Aaker, 1997; Völckner and Satter, 2006), Brand personality is one of brand equity elements and brand extension is a critical brand strategy to maximize the effectiveness of brand leverage. However, so far, brand extension and brand personality research have been conducted separately and most research overlooked the effect of brand personality on brand extension evaluations. Therefore, this study attempts to develop the brand personality measurement to reflect a consumers' preference based upon Fishbein model and examine the effects of brand personality on brand extension evaluations. In addition, we try to reveal the effect of the interaction between brand personality and similarity on brand extension evaluations because prior research held that the similarity between parent products and new products was a core variable for brand extension success. Moreover, this study compares the effects of perceived quality and brand personality on brand extension evaluations because perceived quality represents functional dimension and brand personality reflects emotional dimension. Finally, we look at the brand personality change that could take place after brand extension.

## 2. Hypotheses

- H1. An attitude toward parent brands' personality is positively associated with brand extension evaluations.
- H2. An attitude toward parent brands' personality has a greater effect on brand extension evaluations under the condition of high symbolic involvement than high functional involvement.

---

Dr. Seong-Do Cho, Graduate School of Business, Chonnam National Univ., Gwangju, Korea E-mail: [matt@chonnam.ac.kr](mailto:matt@chonnam.ac.kr)

Seongmin Jeong, Graduate School of Business, Chonnam National Univ. Gwangju, Korea

E-mail: [jsm106@hanmail.net](mailto:jsm106@hanmail.net)

Kyungho Jung, Graduate School of Business, Chonnam National Univ. Gwangju, Korea

E-mail: [batkong@hatmail.com](mailto:batkong@hatmail.com)

- H3. Perceived quality has a greater effect on brand extension evaluation under the condition of high functional involvement than high symbolic involvement.
- H4. Similarity plays a moderating role in the relationship between perceived quality and brand extension evaluation. In contrast, it is not a moderator in the relationship between an attitude toward parent brands' brand personality and brand extension evaluation.
- H5. Sincere brand personality change is greater in low similar than high similar brand extension under the condition of high symbolic involvement. However, exciting brand personality change is not moderated by the degree of similarity.
- H6. Sincere and exciting brand personality change through brand extension are not moderated by the degree of similarity.

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1. Research Design And Manipulation Check

This study used an experimental design. We measured an attitude toward parent brands' personality through Fishbein model and used Aaker(1997)'s brand personality dimensions. Parent brands are "Clue" accessory and Tylenol painkiller. Clue represents high symbolic brands and Tylenol stands for high functional brands. According to Voss et al.(2004) and pretest we selected these brands. We extended Clue accessory to muffler (high similarity) and beer (low similarity). Tylenol was extended to vitamin (high similarity) and battery (low similarity). Before hypotheses testing, manipulation check was conducted by t-test. <Table 1>, <table 2> shows the results. The manipulation was successful.

<Table 1> Manipulation check for Clue accessory and Tylenol painkiller

Involvement	Products	Mean	T value
Symbolic involvement (N=160)	Accessory	3.97	26.86(p<.01)
	Painkiller	1.61	
Functional involvement (N=145)	Accessory	2.29	-10.71(p<.01)
	Painkiller	3.11	

<Table 2> Manipulation check for the target brands

Involvement	Products	Mean	F value	Post test(Scheffe)
Symbolic involvement (N=160)	Muffler	3.9	F=61.7(p<.01)	Muffler-vitamin(p<.01)
	Beer	2.66		Muffler-battery(p<.01)
	Vitamin	2.25		Beer-vitamin(p<.1,p value=.06)

	Battery	2.09		Beer-battery(p<.01)
Functional involvement (N=145)	Muffler	2.83	F=54.227(p<.01)	Muffler-vitamin(p<.01)
	Beer	2.70		Muffler-battery(p<.01)
	Vitamin	3.58		Beer-Vitamin(p<.01)
	Battery	4.34		Beer-Vitamin(p<.01)

In addition, in order to examine the changes of parent brands' personality we measured the parent brands' personality twice. In a first experiment's survey, we measured only parent brands' personality. A week later we presented brand extension situations and measured parent brands' personality once again.

### 3.2. Reliability Test And Hypotheses Testing Method

We conducted Cronbach  $\alpha$  analysis to test the reliability of all items. <Table 3> is the result. According to <Table 3> Cronbach  $\alpha$  coefficients of all items are over 0.6 and reliability is acceptable.

<Table 3> Reliability analysis result

	Functional Involvement	Symbolic Involvement	Attitude	Perceived quality
Accessory	.76	.67	-	-
Painkiller	.74	.85	-	-
Muffler	.82	.72	.81	.72
Beer	.87	.88	.91	.79
Vitamin	.88	.86	.92	.85
Battery	.66	.95	.86	.88

This study did regression analysis to analyze H1 and H4. Also in order to remove the multicollinearity we used residual centering technique (Lance, 1988). H2, H3 were statistically tested by Chow test.

## 4. Results And Discussion

### 4.1. The Impact Of An Attitude Toward Parent Brands' Personality On Brand Extension And The Moderating Role Of Similarity

According to <table 4> H1 and H4 are supported. Attitude toward parent brands' personality has a positive effect on brand extension evaluations significantly and the interaction between similarity and attitude toward parent brands' personality is not significant.

<Table 4> Regression analyses results (attitude toward parent brands' personality, perceived quality, similarity)

Hypotheses	Dependent variable	Independent variables	B	T value	P value	R <sup>2</sup>	F value
H1, H4	Attitude toward brand extension	Attitude toward parent brands' personality	.310	6.03	.000	.219	28.108
		Similarity	.309	6.00	.000		
		Brand personality*Similarity	-.036	-.698	.485		
H4	Attitude toward brand extension	Perceived quality	.219	4.15	.000	.191	23.629
		Similarity	.313	5.96	.000		
		Perceived*similarity	.146	2.81	.005		

#### 4.2. Relative Effects Of Perceived Quality And Brand Personality On Brand Extension Evaluations

Based on the types of involvement, this study investigated the relative effects of perceive quality and brand personality on brand extension evaluations. In order to test H2 and H3 we conducted Chow test. According to <table 5> and <table 6> brand personality had a stronger impact on brand extension evaluations in symbolic involvement products than functional involvement products. However, its effects were not significant statistically. Therefore, H2 and H3 are not supported.

<Table 5> the impact of brand personality on brand extension evaluations

		High symbolic-low functional involvement products	Low symbolic-high functional involvement products	Total products	Dependent variable/independent variable
N		160	145	305	Brand extension evaluation (attitude)/an attitude toward parent brands' personality
R <sup>2</sup>		.320	.035	.124	
Beta		.566	.188	.352	
T value		8.63	2.29	6.55	
P value		.000	.023	.000	
F value		74.45	5.25	42.85	
Sum of square	Linear regression	23.93	4.15	23.83	
	Residual	50.78	112.92	168.49	
Chow test		F=4.40 DF=(2, 301), p > .1			

<Table 6> the impact of perceived quality on brand extension evaluations

		High symbolic-low functional involvement products	Low symbolic-high functional involvement products	Total products	Dependent variable/independent variable
N		160	145	305	Brand extension evaluation (attitude)/an attitude toward parent brands' personality
R <sup>2</sup>		.05	.088	.074	
Beta		.224	.297	.27	
T value		2.894	3.72	4.92	
P value		.004	.00	.000	
F value		8.37	13.812	24.204	
Sum of square	Linear regression	3.76	10.312	14.23	
	Residual	70.95	106.76	178.09	
Chow test		F=.325, DF=(2, 301), p > .1			

### 4.3. Brand Personality Change

Based on Aaker, Fournier and Brasel (2004) this study classified nine brand personality dimensions into two brand personality groups. One is exciting brand personality and the other is sincere brand personality. We tested that similarity would moderate sincere brand and exciting brand personality change caused by brand extension in symbolic and functional involvement. <Table 7> and <table 8> shows the results of t-test. According to the results, H5 and H6 are supported.

<Table 7> Comparison of sincere and exciting brand personality change under high symbolic involvement products

	Sincere brand personality		Exciting brand personality	
	High similar	Low similar	Low similar	High similar
Brand personality change	.077	-.074	.025	-.028
T test	T value=2.44, DF=158, p value=.016		T value=.685, DF=158, p value=.495	

<Table 8> Comparison of sincere and exciting brand personality change under high functional involvement products

	Sincere brand personality		Exciting brand personality	
	High similar	Low similar	High similar	Low similar
Brand personality change	.0094	-.0098	.0069	-.0060
T test	T value=.183, DF=143, p value=.855		T value=.138, DF=143, p value=.890	

## 5. Conclusion

Prior research has not looked at the effects of brand personality on brand extension evaluations and the moderating role of symbolic and functional involvement. Brand personality changes caused by brand extensions and the moderating role of similarity have not been studied either. Therefore, the results of this study show that consumers' positive attitudes toward parent brands' personality could be the strong methods to make brand extension successful. Brand personality also could be one of sources to let low similar brand extensions successful. Moreover, because parent brands' personality, especially sincere brand personality, could be changed by brand extensions in symbolic involvement products, brand managers should be careful of the negative feedback on sincere brand personality dimensions arising from brand extensions in high symbolic products. Based on this research future research needs to consider longitudinal analyses and examine the relationship between brand personality and other strategic variables like retailer acceptance and marketing support that Völckner and Sattler(2006) mentioned.

## References

- Aaker, D. A. and K. L. Keller(1990), "Consumer Evaluations of Brand Extensions," *Journal of Marketing*, 54(1), 27-41.
- Aaker, J.(1997), "Dimensions of Brand Personality," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34(3), 347-356.
- Aaker, J., S. Fournier and S. A. Brasel(2004), "When Good Brand Do Bad," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31(1), 1-16.
- Boush, D. M. and B. Loken(1991), "A Process-Tracing Study of Brand Extension Evaluation," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 28(1), 16-28.
- Broniarczyk, S. M. and J. W. Alba(1994), "The Importance of the Brand in Brand Extension," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31(2), 214-228.
- Desai, K. K. and K. L. Keller(2002), "The Effects of Ingredient Branding Strategies on Host Brand Extendibility," *Journal of Marketing*, 66(1), 73-93.
- Diamantopoulos, A., G. Smith and I. Grime(2005), "The Impact of Brand Extensions on Brand Personality: Experimental Evidence," *European Journal of Marketing*, 39(1), 129-149.
- Fournier, S.(1998), "Consumers and Their Brands: Developing Relationship Theory in Consumer Research," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 24(4), 343-373.

- Kardes, F. R. and C. T. Allen(1991), "Perceived Variability and Inferences about Brand Extensions," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 18, 392-398.
- Keller, K. L.(1993), "Conceptualizing, Measuring, and Managing Consumer-Based Brand Equity," *Journal of Marketing*, 57(1), 1-22.
- Keller, K. L. and D. A. Aaker(1992), "The Effects of Sequential Introduction of Brand Extension," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 29(1), 35-50.
- Kirlinger, F. N.(1992), *Foundations of Behavioral Research*, 3rd ed., Harcourt Brace College Publishers. Orlando, FL.
- Lance, C. E.(1988), "Residual centering exploratory and confirmatory moderator analysis and decomposition of effects in path models containing interations," *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 9(9), 44-51.
- Malhotra, N. K.(1988), "Self-Concept and Product Choice: An Integrated Perspective," *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 9, 1-28.
- McAlexander, J. H., J. W. Schouten and H. F. Koeing(2002), "Building Brand Community," *Journal of Marketing*, 66(1), 38-54.
- Muthukrishnan, A. V. and B. A. Weitz(1991), "Role of Product Knowledge in Evaluation of Brand Extension," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 18, 407-413.
- Park. C. W., S. Milberg and R. Lawson(1991), "Evaluation of Brand Extensions; The Role of Feature Similarity and Brand Concept Consistency," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 18(2), 185-193.
- Park. C. W., S. Y. Jun and A. D. Shocker(1996), "Composite Branding Alliances: An Investigation of Extension and Feedback Effects," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 33(4), 453-466.
- Park, J. W. and K. H. Kim(2001), "Role of Consumer Relationships with a Brand in Brand Extensions: Some Exploratory Findings," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 28, 179-185.
- Rousseau, D., S. Sitkin, R. Burt, and C. Camerer(1998), "Not So Different after All: A Cross-Discipline View of Trust," *Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 393-404.
- Samu, S. H., S. Krishnan and R. E. Smith(1999), "Using Advertising Alliances for New Product Introduction: Interactions between Product Complementarity and Promotional Strategies," *Journal of Marketing*, 63(1), 57-74.

- Venkatesh, R. and V. Mahajan (1997), "Products with Branded Components: An Approach for Premium Pricing and Partner Selection," *Marketing Science*, 16, 146-165.
- Völckner, F. and H. Satter(2006), "Drivers of Brand Extension Success," *Journal of Marketing*, 70(2), 18-34.
- Voss, K. E., E. R. Spangenberg and B. Grohmann(2003), "Measuring the Hedonic and Utilitarian Dimensions of Consumer Attitude," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 40(3), 310-320.
- Zeithmal, V. A.(1988), "Consumer Perceptions of Price, and Value: A Means-End Model and Synthesis of Evidence," *Journal of Marketing*, 52(3), 2-22.