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ABSTRACT

Due to increasing competition and technological advances, brands that compete on product attributes alone have faced severe limitations. Therefore, as a core aspect of symbolic and emotional attributes of a brand a considerable amount of attention has been given to the concept of brand personality. It is widely accepted that brand personality not only helps to differentiate a brand within a competitive market, but also decreases vulnerability from competition.

Although the important implications of brand personality have been accepted by a wider community, there is a lack of consensus among researchers with regard to what brand personality actually is. Most studies conducted in this field have failed to provide a conceptual framework and empirical testing. Therefore, the entity of brand personality still remains an elusive concept.

The objective of this research was to establish the validity of brand personality and its influence on consumers' brand choice. To achieve this goal, the research comprised two complementary studies. The first study (Study I) aimed to achieve the above goal by validating the brand personality scale in the context of hospitality branding, namely restaurant brands. The specific objectives of the first study were 1) to assess the validity of Aaker's (1997) Brand Personality Scale (BPS) in the context of restaurant brands, 2) to identify the dimensions of restaurant brand personality and 3) to investigate the relationship between brand personality and brand image.

The first study resulted in several significant findings. The results of the study confirmed that brand personality is a valid concept and used for consumers' evaluation of restaurant brands. However, of the five brand personality dimensions suggested by Aaker (1997), only two ('sincerity' and 'excitement') were confirmed in this study. In addition, the findings of the first study revealed that the brand personality component and non-personality component of brand image are not the
same construct although there exists a certain degree of overlap between these two components.

The second study (Study II) reassessed the validity of brand personality under different conditions. The specific objectives generated for the second study were 1) to examine the causal relationship between brand personality and restaurant choice intention, 2) to investigate the influence of situational factors on the evaluation of restaurant brands and 3) to investigate the relative importance of brand personality (versus the other attributes of brand image) in choosing restaurant brands under different situations. To achieve these objectives, experimental conditions were designed based on the findings of Study I. The experimental scenarios are described using a combination of personality and non-personality attributes. Also the moderator effect of involvement on the relationship between brand personality and restaurant choice intention was investigated.

The results of Study II provided further support to the findings of Study I by empirically confirming the influence of brand personality on consumers' choice intentions across the experimental situations. However, the relative importance of brand personality (versus non-personality) on restaurant choice intention was found to be different according to the situations. The findings of the study also suggest that 'levels of involvement' have a significant positive moderator effect on the relationship between brand personality ('reliable') and restaurant choice, and have a significant negative moderator effect on the relationship between non-personality component ('value for money') and restaurant choice.

The findings of this research help to broaden our understanding of the concept of brand personality and shed insight into how brand personality operates when consumers evaluate brands. The results of both studies support the premise that brand personality does influence consumers' brand choice and thus suggests that brand personality is used for the evaluation of brands.
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CHAPTER 1
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Research

Branding has been considered as one of the most important marketing strategies for decades. Brand strategies have traditionally focused on the functional or utilitarian attributes of product or services. However, the increasing competition within markets makes it difficult for firms to differentiate their brands on the basis of functional attributes alone. Nelson Foote (Cited in Lewis, 1983, p.83), Manager of the Consumer and Public Relations Research Program for GE, states that:

"... certain characteristics of products come to be taken for granted by consumers, especially those concerned with basic functional performance or with values like safety. If these values are missing in a product, the user is extremely offended. But if they are present, the maker or seller gets no special credit or preference, because quite logically every other maker and seller is assumed to be offering equivalent values. In other words, the values that are salient in decision-making are the values that are problematic- that are important, to be sure but also those which differentiate one offering from another."
Due to technological advances, products and services are getting easy to copy based on their attributes, and have become functionally more similar to each other (Phau and Lau, 2000). Consequently, brands that compete on the product attributes alone have faced severe limitations.

Both academics and practitioners believe that it is not sufficient to understand consumers' perceptions and behaviour using functional attributes alone, and pay more attention to the aspects beyond product attributes, such as symbolic and emotional benefits (Heylen, Dawson and Sampson, 1995; Siguaw, Mattila and Austin, 1999). As a core aspect of symbolic and emotional attributes of a brand, a considerable amount of attention has been given to the concept of brand personality recently; thus application of brand personality in consumer behaviour has increased.

The face validity of brand personality has been accepted by a wider community, including practitioners (e.g. Ogilvy, 1983; Plummer, 2000) and academics (e.g. Keller, 1998; Olson and Allen, 1995; Aaker, 1996). Advocates of brand personality claim that the concept is one of the most universally mentioned features of a brand (Phau and Lau, 2000) and therefore it is believed to increase preference, usage, and emotional ties (Aaker, 1997). Brand personality is considered as an important feature of brand management, and therefore, a great deal of research has been conducted in order to assess its impact on consumer behaviour (e.g. Biel, 1993; Aaker, 1997; Karnde, Zinkhan and Lum, 1997).

The hospitality industry such as restaurants, where a number of firms that offer nearly identical services, are competing within a small space, is not an exception. Hospitality firms have more difficulties in distinguishing their brands from competitors. The intangible nature of the service offered in the hospitality industry makes it more difficult for customers to compare different brands objectively (Lewis, 1981b). According to Lewis, therefore, hospitality firms need to create a unique personality to differentiate their brands from their competitor's brands. Berry (2000) suggests that
service companies build strong brands through a conscious effort to carve out a distinctive brand personality.

However, although the importance of brand personality has been accepted by a wider community, there is a lack of consensus among researchers regarding what brand personality is (Aaker and Fournier, 1995). Moreover, throughout a large amount of the existing literature, no clear distinction has been made for the concept of brand personality from other related concepts, such as brand image and users image (Patterson, 2000). It seems likely that most studies have failed to build a rigid conceptual basis of brand personality and thus it still remains an elusive concept (Aaker, 1997; Patterson, 2000).

1.2 Objectives of the Research

The main objective of the research is to establish the validity of brand personality as a consumers’ evaluation cue. In order to achieve this goal, this research comprises two complementary studies. The first study aims to achieve the above goal by validating the brand personality scale in the context of hospitality branding, namely restaurant brands. The second study seeks to reassess the concept of brand personality under differing situations using an experimental study. Specific objectives of the two studies are as follows.

1.2.1 Objectives of the First Study

Aaker (1997) proposed the framework known as Brand Personality Scale (BPS) with five dimensions (‘sincerity’, ‘excitement’, ‘competence’, ‘sophistication’ and ‘ruggedness’) as a standard and universal way to measure brand personality. The Brand Personality Scale
has been shown to be valid in various settings (e.g. Kim, Han and Park, 2001). However, whilst the scale is deemed reliable and valid, some researchers argue that it is worth examining the scale in different settings (Venable, Rose and Gilber, 2002). In the hospitality industry, research concerning brand personality has been very limited.

Several studies have been conducted to examine the generic dimensions of brand personality. The dimensions were examined under different culture settings (e.g. Ferrandi et al, 2000; Aaker et al, 2001) and different brand contexts (e.g. Venable et al., 2002). In most studies, although a partial structure and semantic correspondence was found, the specific dimensions of Aaker’s (1997) framework were not replicated. In this sense, one of the objectives of this study is to investigate brand personality dimensions of restaurant brands.

In addition, this study aims to clarify the relationship between brand personality and brand image. Traditionally most studies in the field of brand choice have focused solely on the functional or utilitarian attributes of products or services. In contrast, most studies in the brand personality field pay little attention to the influence of functional or product related attributes, and focus solely on the impact of brand personality on consumer preference. To date, little research has integrated these two types of attributes in a single study. This study aims to compare these two different types of attributes by clarifying the relationship between brand personality and brand image.

The main objective of the first study is to examine the validity of brand personality in the evaluation of restaurant brands. The specific objectives of the study are:

i) To assess the validity and reliability of Aaker’s Brand Personality Scale (BPS) in the context of restaurant brands.

ii) To identify the dimensions of brand personality in the context of restaurant brands.

iii) To investigate the relationship between brand personality and brand image.
1.2.2 Objectives of the Second Study

The second study aims to assess the validity of brand personality under different conditions. The findings of the first study are used to create experimental conditions in which consumers have to evaluate designed sets of restaurant, for the second study. The restaurants are described as a combination of personality and non-personality attributes using a conjoint-analysis methodology. Two situational factors; (1) levels of involvement (high/low) and (2) types of involvement (high emotion/low emotion), are experimentally manipulated by varying the task instructions across the respondents. Examining these conditions serves three purposes. First, it examines the causal relationship between brand personality and restaurant choice. Secondly, it can provide insight into how situational factors influence the use of brand personality in consumers' evaluation of brands. In this light, how consumers weigh brand personality as an evaluation cue, compared to other attributes of a brand under different situations, is examined. Thirdly, the study will examine a theory based frame of brand personality that provides legitimacy to the concept of brand personality.

In summary, the main objective of the second study is to validate the concept of brand personality under different situations. The specific objectives are as follows:

iv) To examine the causal relationship between brand personality and restaurant choice intention.

v) To investigate the influence of situational factors on the evaluation of restaurant brands.

vi) To investigate the relative importance of brand personality (versus the other attributes of brand image) in choosing restaurant brands under different situations.
1.3 The Structure of the Thesis

The thesis consists of nine chapters. Figure 1.1 shows the structure of the thesis.
Figure 1.1: Structure of the Thesis
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Chapter 2 is a literature review on brand personality and its related concepts. The chapter is divided into two sections. The first briefly outlines the meaning of a brand: the various definitions of a brand from literature are introduced along with its relationship with consumer behaviour. The concept of brand equity, as an attempt to delineate the value of a brand is also reviewed. The second part deals with the concept of brand personality. Its background, antecedents, and benefits are explored. In addition, the concept of brand image and its relationship with brand personality are also discussed.

Chapter 3 is dedicated to investigating the theoretical underpinning of the concept of brand personality. The chapter starts by reviewing the concept of brand personality in the light of human personality theories. In the following section, issues surrounding the concept, such as measurement methods and generic quality of the dimensions, are critically reviewed.

Chapter 4 reviews the literature on the restaurant industry and its relationship with brand personality. The chapter starts by introducing the unique characteristics of the restaurant product in contrast to manufacturing goods. The existing brand personality and brand image literature in the field of the restaurant industry are also reviewed.

Chapter 5 addresses the methodology of the first study explaining how the research problems were identified and operationalised. For the purpose of the study, personality and non-personality variables of restaurant brands are generated in this chapter. Data analysis methods selected for this study are discussed at the end of this chapter. The findings of the first study are presented in Chapter 6.

Chapter 7 deals with the methodology of the second study. The chapter presents experimental conditions of brand personality in order to investigate consumers' evaluation of brand personality in choosing restaurant brands. Two moderator variables (levels of involvement and types of involvement) are identified and used to generate four dining situations. The study adopts a two-stage approach. First, the main effects involving the impact of personality attributes across different situations are examined. Second, the
interactive effects involving two moderator variables (levels of involvement and types of involvement) are examined. Chapter 8 presents the study’s findings, obtained from the application of the two approaches.

Finally, Chapter 9 provides an overall discussion and conclusions of the empirical outcomes obtained from the previous chapters and makes suggestions for further research in this area.
CHAPTER 2
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW:
BRAND PERSONALITY AND RELATED CONCEPTS

2.1 Introduction

What makes a firm successful is not a product, instead, it is a brand (Pitta and Katsanis, 1995). For instance, most consumers would perceive a bottle of Chanel perfume as a high quality and expensive product. But the same perfume in an unmarked bottle would probably be viewed as lower in quality, even though the fragrance was identical. The notion of brands is very pervasive in our life. Virtually almost all facets of our everyday life are surrounded by various brands. Consequently, branding is considered as one of the most important marketing strategies nowadays (Morgan and Pritchard, 1998).

Traditionally brand strategies have focused solely on the functional or utilitarian attributes of products or services. However, the increasing competition within industries has caused more difficulties in the differentiation of brands on the basis of product functional attributes alone (Sampson, 1993). Moreover, products are getting easy to copy based on product
attributes and have become functionally more similar (Phau and Lau, 2000). As a result, brands which compete on the product attributes alone have faced severe limitations. For these reasons, marketers and researchers pay more attention to the aspects beyond product attributes, such as symbolic and emotional benefits. In line with this, a considerable amount of attention has been given to the concept of brand personality for decades.

However, most brand personality studies seem to have failed to show what the concept really is or whether it actually exists. Therefore, the concept still remains elusive and vague (Aaker, 1997; Patterson, 2000).

This chapter is concerned with the concepts underpinning the research. It is dedicated to investigating the theoretical underpinning of the concept of brand personality. The chapter can be broadly divided into two parts;

The first will outline and discuss the meaning of a brand. It begins by pointing out the difference between a brand and a product followed by the introduction of the various definitions of a brand from previous literature. It further reviews the relationship between consumer behaviour and branding. The concept of brand equity, as an attempt to delineate the value of brand is also reviewed.

The second part deals with the concept of brand personality. It will briefly define the concept of brand personality, its background, antecedents, and benefits from the existing literature. The concept of brand image and its relationship with brand personality will also be discussed.

### 2.2 What is a Brand?

Consumers prefer to purchase branded products as opposed to non-branded products. Biel (1993, p.68) mentioned that “...consumers like brands because they package meaning.
They form a kind of shorthand that makes choice easier. Consequently, that is the reason firms devote a vast amount of resources to developing their brands.

2.2.1 A Product versus a Brand

Before defining a brand, it is essential to distinguish a brand from a product. A product is anything that can be offered to a market for attention, use, or consumption that might satisfy a consumer need. A brand encompasses a warranty of quality and conveys a number of different tangible and intangible attributes such as design, symbol, culture, personality and user image (Keller, 1998). Meldrum and McDonald (1995) also argue, in comparison to a product, a brand incorporates additional attributes for the user, which although intangible, are very real.

Rubinstein (1996) supports this argument by mentioning that consumers perceive branded products differently from mere products; that they are more inclined to trust the quality of brands and are prepared to pay more for the reliability that this quality and trust implies. Aaker (1996) points out that a brand not only delivers its product attributes but also carries various non-product related attributes, such as personality, emotional benefits and so on. Figure 2.1 summarises the distinction between a product and a brand.
According to Aaker (1996), a product includes characteristics such as scope, attributes, quality/value and uses, while a brand includes not only these product characteristics but also brand users, country of origin, organisational associations, brand personality, symbols, brand-customer relationships, emotional benefits and self-expressive benefits.

Similarly, Kotler, Armstrong, Saunders and Wong (1999) suggest that a brand conveys a specific set of features, benefits and services to buyers. More specifically, they argue that a brand can deliver up to four levels of meaning; attributes, benefits, values and personality.

### 2.2.2 Definitions of a Brand

There is a plethora of definitions of 'brand' in the literature, yet a comprehensive theory of brand construct is still missing (de Chernatony and Riley, 1998). The concept of branding is
not a new phenomenon. However, in the last hundred years its use has changed considerably; nowadays, it has become a very complex symbol (Kotler, Armstrong, Saunders and Wong, 1999). Therefore, if a firm treats a brand only as a name it misses the point of branding.

In the traditional view of understanding a brand, the American Marketing Association (AMA)'s definition is notable:

"A name, term, sign, symbol, or design, or a combination of them, intended to identify the goods or services of one seller or group of sellers and to differentiate them from those of competitors."

This definition derives from the concept of the brand’s logo and visual features as a basis for differentiation. Although this definition is still popular among a number of researchers (e.g. Kotler, Armstrong, Saunders and Wong, 1999), it has received its share of criticism. Researchers have criticised this definition as being too mechanical and focusing only on the company’s input activity (de Chernatony and Riley, 1998).

Understanding the absence of a clear and comprehensive definition of a brand despite a plethora of definitions, de Chernatony and Riley (1998) undertook an extensive literature review for the concept of a brand. They content analysed over one hundred sources from both trade and academic journals. As a result, they identified 12 themes of brand definition.

Table 2.1 shows 12 themes of brand definition identified by de Chernatony and Riley along with their antecedents and consequences,
### Table 2.1: Themes of Brand Definitions and Their Antecedents and Consequences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand definition</th>
<th>Antecedents</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal Instrument</strong></td>
<td>Mark of ownership. Name, logo, design, trademark.</td>
<td>Prosecute infringers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Logo</strong></td>
<td>Name, term, sign, symbol, design, Product characteristics</td>
<td>Identity, differentiate through visual identity and name. Quality assurance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Company</strong></td>
<td>Recognisable corporate name and image. Culture, people, programs of organisation define corporate personality. CEO is brand manager.</td>
<td>Evaluate over long time horizon. Product lines benefit from corporate personality. Convey consistent message to stakeholders. Differentiation: proposition, relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shorthand</strong></td>
<td>Firm stresses quality not quantity of information.</td>
<td>Rapidly recognise brand association. Facilitate information processing speed decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk Reducer</strong></td>
<td>Confidence that expectations being fulfilled.</td>
<td>Brand as a contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity System</strong></td>
<td>More than just a name. Holistic, structured with six integrated facets, including brand’s personality.</td>
<td>Clarify direction, meaning, strategic positioning. Protective barrier. Communicate essence to stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image</strong></td>
<td>Consumer centred. Image in consumers' mind is brand 'reality'.</td>
<td>Firm’s input activities managed using feedback of image to change identity. Market research important. Manage brand concept over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value System</strong></td>
<td>Consumer relevant values imbue the brand</td>
<td>Brand values match relevant consumer values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personality</strong></td>
<td>Psychological values communicated through advertising and packaging defines brand’s personality.</td>
<td>Differentiation from symbolism: human values projected. Stress added values beyond functional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship</strong></td>
<td>Brand as person has attitude to consumer</td>
<td>Recognition and respect for personality. Develop relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evolving Entity</strong></td>
<td>Change by stage of development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen from Table 2.1, 12 themes of brand definitions are suggested. They are as follows: 1) 'legal instrument' i.e. branding represents an investment and legal ownership of title, as protection against imitators; 2) 'logo' i.e. understanding a brand as a name, sign, symbol, or design, or a combination of them to differentiate one from another; 3) 'company' i.e. a brand as the corporate name for a firm; 4) 'shorthand' i.e. for consumer, brands act as a shorthand device for identifying functional and emotional characteristics of products; 5) 'risk reducer' i.e. a brand acts as a guarantee of consistent quality; 6) 'identity system' i.e. brand as a strategy and a consistent, integrated vision; 7) 'image' i.e. a brand as a perceived image in consumers' minds; 8) 'value system' i.e. consumers find value in a brand, in its heritage, in their personal experience with it etc.; 9) 'personality' i.e. a brand represents psychological values by the association with human personality characteristics; 10) 'relationship' i.e. consumers not just perceive brands, but also have interactive relationships with them; 11) 'adding value' i.e. a brand provides non-functional benefits over and beyond a product's functional characteristics; and 12) 'evolving entity' i.e. sees brands evolving through five stages from the first stage of 'unbranded commodity' to the stages of 'references', 'personality', 'icon', and 'brand as company' and finally to the stage of 'brand as policy'.

For identifying the brand construct, they analysed the definitions to find any commonalities and differences regarding the antecedent of the brand and its consequences for brand strategies. From the analysis, they found that the twelve themes of brand definitions are not entirely mutually exclusive and there exists a certain degree of overlap among the tangible and intangible aspects of the brand assumed by each definition. They concluded that a brand is a multidimensional construct including personality, image, value system, and relationship. On top of that, they also added that "the opportunities for branding are to be found in developing consumer-relevant values, and then in the use of symbols and designs to communicate these. If communicated effectively such values can become strongly held perceptions in consumers' minds and through increasing brand usage these values become respected" (de Chernatony and Riley, 1998, p.437). This view of understanding a brand is in accordance with most of modern brand management academics (e.g. Aaker, 1997; Kapferer, 1998; Keller, 1998).
2.2.3 Functions of a Brand

The issue of whether or not to brand is still very much alive (Kotler, Armstrong, Saunders and Wong, 1999). This situation generates an obvious question: why are brands important? What functions do they perform that make them so valuable? Table 2.2 gives an overview of the roles that brands play.

Table 2.2: Functions That Brands Play

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSUMERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification of source of product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment of responsibility to product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk reducer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search cost reducer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promise, bond, or pact with maker of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal of quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANUFACTURERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means of identification to simplify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handling or tracing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means of legally protecting unique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal of quality level to satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means of endowing products with unique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of competitive advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of financial returns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Keller (1998, p.7)

As shown in the table, for consumers, brands effectively perform the function of identifying the source or maker of a product and let buyers assign responsibilities as to which particular seller or manufactures should be held accountable. Brands also help consumers identify specific products, thereby assuring the consumer of a level of quality and reducing search costs. The promise or guarantee of quality is based on the appraisal that the brand is reliable, efficiently carries out its performance qualities and meets the generated expectations (Ambler, 1997). As a result, a brand provides a shorthand device or means of simplification for their product decisions.
The meaning embedded in brands can be quite profound. The relationship between a brand and the consumer can be seen as a type of bond, like between people (Fournier, 1998). Consumers offer their trust and loyalty with the implicit understanding that the brand will behave in certain ways and provide them utility through consistent product performance and appropriate pricing, promotion and distribution. To the extent that consumers realise advantages and benefits from consuming the brand, consumers are likely to continue to purchase that specific brand (Keller, 1998).

In addition, brands have status and prestige functions. This represents the feelings of admiration and prestige that the consumer may experience upon using the brand (Solomon, 1999). This indicates that brands' benefits may not be purely functional in nature. Brands can serve as symbolic devices, allowing consumers to project their own self-images.

Brands also provide a number of advantages for the firm. They help to differentiate the product from a competitor's product. Fundamentally, they serve an identification purpose to simplify product handling or tracing for the firm. A brand can also retain intellectual property rights, giving legal title to the owner. The brand can be protected through patents, registered trademarks, copyrights etc. These property rights insure that the company can safely invest in the brand and receive the benefits of a valuable asset (Keller, 1998).

Firms develop brands as a way to attract and keep customers by promoting value, image, prestige and so on. A brand then becomes a representation of satisfaction that influences a consumer to repeatedly purchase a particular company's product over competitors' products. The more favourable and powerful the positive associations are, the greater the sales potential for the product (Shaw, 1995). By creating this type of consumer preference and loyalty, the firm can build a strong market share without sacrificing its product price; which clearly has advantages since the firm does not have to cut its profit margins in order to compete with other firms. Moreover, this brand loyalty and preference provide predictability and security of demand for the firm, and create barriers of entry that make competitors difficult from entering the market. Although functional attributes of products may be easily duplicated, impressions in the minds of consumers from years of marketing activity and product experience may not be so easily reproduced. For these reasons, large
earning multiples have been paid for brands in mergers or acquisitions. For instance, Kraft was purchased for nearly $13 billion, more than 600% over its physical assets (Aaker, 1991).

2.3. Brand Equity

How does a firm measure the value of its brand? Many researchers have advocated financial approaches. For example, Kerin and Sethuraman (1998) measured the influence of a brand’s value on shareholder value. Others have advocated looking at the price premium that the brand in question has over other brands in the category. Along these same lines, Aaker (1991) contended that the value of a brand could be calculated by comparing its market share in units to its market share in dollars. If the market share in dollars exceeds the market share in units, then the brand has built value.

Overall, it is important to use multiple ways to measure the value of a brand (Davis and Smith 1998). This notion of measuring how much a brand is worth has been referred to as brand equity (Koteler et al., 1999). While different definitions and methods have been used to describe this concept, as outlined above, academics and practitioners recognise that a brand’s value, usually defined in economic terms, is of utmost importance.

Aaker (1991; 1996) suggested that the concept of brand equity consists of five assets (or liabilities) linked to a brand’s name and symbol namely brand loyalty, brand awareness, perceived quality, brand associations and other proprietary brand assets. He also added that since brand equity is intangible, firms should look at these five assets of brands in evaluating it instead of trying to judge it from the financial attributes.

Figure 2.2 shows that how those five categories of asset, which underlie brand equity and create value for both the customer and firm.
Figure 2.2: How Brand Equity Generates Values

Source: Aaker (1991, p. 270)
Figure 2.2 illustrates the five main categories of asset that constitute brand equity as well as the value incorporated for both the consumer and the firm. Brand equity generally adds or subtracts value for both customers and firms. Brand equity can help consumers interpret, process, and store huge amounts of information on brands and firms. It also can influence consumers' confidence in the purchase decision due to either past-experience or familiarity with the brand. More importantly, brand equity can enhance consumers’ satisfaction through perceived quality and brand associations.

Brand equity also has the potential to add value for the firm in a number of ways. Firstly, it can enhance marketing programs to attract new customers and retain existing ones. Secondly, it is able to enhance customer loyalty. Thirdly, brand equity usually allows higher margins by permitting premium pricing. Fourthly, it provides a platform for growth through brand extensions. Fifthly, it provides leverage in the distribution channel. Finally, brand equity assets provide a competitive advantage through strong associations that often presents a real barrier to competitors from entering the market (Aaker, 1991). Each of five assets (or liabilities) of brand equity are examined as follows.

2.3.1 Brand Loyalty

A brand’s value to a firm is largely influenced by customer loyalty. In addition, brand loyalty is a key consideration when placing a value on a brand that is to be bought or sold because highly loyal customers are expected to generate predictable sales and profits (Aaker, 1996). For instance, many brands with strong customer loyalty have been market leaders for years, despite the fact that there have been considerable changes in consumer preference, attitude and competitive activity over this period of time (Keller, 1998).

There are many different definitions of brand loyalty. Keller (1998) argues that brand loyalty is related to brand commitment but they are distinctive. According to him, brand loyalty is often measured in a behavioural sense, such as the number of repeat purchases. Yet, a customer may continually buy for reasons not related to a strong commitment to the
brand, as when brand is conveniently located or frequently promoted. Consumers may purchase a brand habitually without really thinking much about why.

In contrast, Oliver's (1997) definition of brand loyalty is closer to brand commitment than simple brand preference. He defines brand loyalty as a deeply held commitment to re-buy or re-patronise a preferred product or service consistently in the future, despite situational influences and marketing efforts having the potential to cause switching behaviour.

Although many different definitions exist, the bottom line is that loyal consumers show more favourable responses to a brand than non-loyal or switching consumers do (Grover and Srinivasan, 1992). Brand loyalty makes consumers purchase a brand routinely and resist switching to another brand. Hence, to the extent that consumers are loyal to the brand, brand equity will increase.

According to Christopher, Payne and Ballantyne (1991) customer loyalty is extremely important, as it is more expensive for a company to attract a new customer than to keep an existing one satisfied with the brand. Established customers tend to buy more and are willing to pay premium prices for a supplier that they know and trust (Pitta and Ktsanis, 1995). Satisfied customers provide brand exposure and reassurance at virtually no cost and make market entry difficult for competitors. In this sense, customer loyalty enhances brand equity.

2.3.2 Perceived Quality

Perceived quality is one of the key dimensions of brand equity. It is believed that there is a direct relationship between perceived quality and a firm's financial performance. For example, perceived quality has been shown to have a direct influence on both Return on Investment (ROI) and stock return, in studies using statistical models (Aaker, 1996).

Perceived quality is usually defined as customers' perception or subjective judgement of the overall quality or superiority of a product (or service) related to relevant alternatives, and
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with respect to its intended purpose (Zeithaml, 1988; Keller, 1988). Personal product experiences, unique needs and consumption situations may influence the consumer's subjective judgement of quality (Palmer, 1997). High perceived quality means that, through the long-term experience related to the brand, consumers recognise the differentiation and superiority of the brand. As a result, perceived quality will influence consumers’ purchase decisions and support premium pricing as well as the level of consumer loyalty.

However, such attempts at defining quality like the above have largely come from the manufacturing sector. Perceived quality of service brand is more difficult to define than product quality because of the unique characteristics of service. Kurtz and Clow (1998, p.99) argued the reason that evaluating service quality process is different from the process used in manufacturing goods as:

“Services tend to be high in experience and credence qualities while goods tend to be high in search qualities. ‘Search qualities’ are attributes that consumers can evaluate prior to purchasing a service or goods. ‘Experience qualities’ are attributes that consumers can evaluate only during or after the consumption process. ‘Credence qualities’ are attributes that consumers have difficulty evaluating even after the consumption is completed.”

To provide better understanding of quality of service, Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry (1988) suggested five dimensions of service quality. They are: tangible, reliability, responsiveness, assurance and empathy. Consumers’ belief along these dimensions often underlies perceptions of the quality of the service product, which in turn, can influence attitudes and behaviour towards a brand. However, some studies revealed that the dimensions of service quality can vary across different service industries (Carman, 1990; Yoon and Ekinci, 2003).

2.3.3 Brand Awareness

Brand awareness refers to the ability of potential customers to recognise or recall that a brand is a member of a certain product category (Aaker, 1991). The brand awareness is important because it is directly related to the strength of the resulting brand node or trace in
consumers' memory (Keller, 1998). It creates values by recognition, familiarity, commitment and consideration. Brand awareness involves a continuum ranging from an uncertain feeling that the brand is recognised, to a belief that it is the only one in the product category (Aaker, 1991).

Brand awareness consists of brand recognition and brand recall performance (Keller, 1998). The former related to consumer's ability to confirm prior exposure to the brand when given the brand as a cue. In other words, brand recognition requires that consumers can correctly discriminate the brand as having been previously seen or heard. The latter refers to the consumer's ability to retrieve the brand from memory when given the product category, the needs fulfilled by the category, or a purchase or usage situation as a cue. In short, brand recall requires consumers to correctly generate the brand from memory when given a relevant probe (Keller, 1998).

2.3.4 Brand Associations

Aaker (1991; 1996) argues that brand equity is largely supported by the associations that consumers make with a brand. Brand associations usually refer to anything linked in memory to a brand, such as product attributes, a celebrity spokesperson, a particular symbol etc. Well-established brand associations can provide a firm with competitive advantages such as providing a basis for brand extensions and preventing competitors from entering the market. Keller (1998) proposes a conceptual model of brand associations. In that model, he suggests three components; brand associations as brand attributes, brand benefits and brand attitudes.

Brand associations, which usually result in high brand awareness, are positively related to brand equity since they can be a signal of quality and commitment, and help a consumer consider the brand at the point of purchase, which leads to favourable behaviour for the brand (Yoo et al., 2000).
2.3.5 Other Proprietary Brand Assets

Other proprietary brand assets such as patents, trademarks and channel relationships will be extremely valuable if they inhibit or prevent competitors from eroding a customer base and loyalty. For instance, a trademark will protect brand equity from competitors who might want to confuse customers by using a similar name, symbol, design, or package. A patent, if strong and relevant to customer choice, can prevent direct competition. A distribution channel can also be controlled by a brand because of a history of brand performance (Aaker, 1991).

2.4 Definition of Brand Personality

Ogilvy (1983, p.14) stated that 'products, like people, have personalities, and they can make them or break them in the market place'. Much like people, many brands are assumed to have personalities, which are not solely determined by the actual physical characteristics of the product but by a host of other factors such as advertising, image of the company, users image, product origin and so on. A great deal of past research has shown that consumers see differences in personalities among different brands (e.g. Plummer, 2000; Karande et al, 1997; Siguaw et al, 1999).

However, although the concept of brand personality is familiar and accepted by both practitioners and academics, there is a lack of consensus among researchers regarding what brand personality is (Aaker & Fournier, 1995). In the literature, several models have been suggested in order to define the concept of brand personality. For instance, Kapferer (1997) believes that brand personality makes up one of the six facets of the 'Brand identity prism.' (see Figure 2.3).
As shown in Figure 2.3, brand personality is one of the elements of brand identity which represents a brand's ultimate vision and aim, along with physique, culture, relationship, reflection and self-image. For him, brand personality is the character of a brand, which is gradually built up by communicating. He believes that the easiest way of creating brand personality is to give the brand a spokesperson or a figurehead.

Plummer (2000) proposes that brand personality is one of the three primary elements of brand image, which represent symbolic meanings of a brand. He believes that there are the physical attributes, the functional characteristics or the benefits and brand personality of three elements in brand's description. He suggests that brand personality is purely the result of marketers' communication. Gordon (1996) argues brand personality is a metaphor for the emotional relationship that exists between a brand and a consumer while Patterson (2000) believes that brand personality is the consumer's emotional response to a brand through which attributes are personified.
Among many in this study, we followed Aaker’s (1997, p. 347) definition of brand personality; ‘the set of human characteristics associated with a brand,’ one of the most widely accepted definitions of brand personality.

2.4.1 Why Brand Personality

Brand strategies, traditionally, have focused on the functional or utilitarian benefits of products or services provided. In recent decades, however, increasing competition within industries has caused more difficulties in the differentiation of brands on the basis of functional attributes alone (Sampson, 1993; Siguaw et al., 1999). Products or services are getting easy to copy based on their attributes and have become functionally more similar to each other (Phau and Lau, 2000). Consequently, brands that compete on product attributes alone have faced severe limitations. For these reasons, marketers and consumers pay more and more attention to the symbolic aspect of brands rather than rational or functional attributes. Therefore, researchers generally believe that it is not sufficient to understand consumers’ behaviour by using rational attributes alone, thus it is essential to obtain access to information from symbolic aspects as well (Heylen et al, 1995; Siguaw et al, 1999). As a main part of symbolic attributes of a brand, brand personality has received a great deal of attention from researchers. Moreover, the important application of brand personality in consumer behaviour has been increasingly recognised by many researchers.

As a result, the face validity of brand personality has been accepted by a wider community, including practitioners (e.g. Ogilvy, 1983; Plummer, 2000) and academics (e.g. Keller, 1998; Olson and Allen, 1995; Aaker, 1996). Advocates of brand personality claim that the concept is one of the most universally mentioned features of a brand (Phau and Lau, 2000), and therefore it is believed to increase preference, usage, emotional ties (Aaker, 1997), trust, loyalty and decreased vulnerability to competitive marketing actions (Keller, 1998). Brand personality is also considered an important feature of brand management, and therefore a great deal of research has been conducted in order to assess its impact on consumer behaviour (e.g. Biel, 1993; Aaker, 1997; Karnde, Zinkhan, and Lum, 1997).
There is a common agreement that brand personality generates brand equity (e.g. Biel, 1993; Karande et al., 1997; Keller, 1998; Solomon, 1999). There are at least three models showing how brand personality creates brand equity: self-expression model, relationship basis model and functional benefit representation model (Aaker, 1996).

### 2.4.1.1 The self-expression model (Self-congruity theory)

Aaker (1996) argues that some brands tend to be used as vehicles to express a part of self-identity. This model is based on the theory of self congruity. The theory suggests that self concept image and product image are described through shared constructs. Therefore, there can be a degree of congruence between self concept and product concept since consumers tend to choose products that reaffirm their self-schema (Sirgy, 1982). According to Hong and Zinkhan (1994), self-schema denotes a knowledge construct, which conceptually relates to information about oneself. External stimuli compatible with self-schema would tend to be willingly accepted and retained, in comparison with those external stimuli that are not compatible with self-schema.

Therefore, because of the effects of self-schema, the self identity of a consumer should be congruent with the personality of the brand they consume. Hence a brand with a reliable personality that is congruent to the personality of the consumer can play the role of a partner or a friend that the consumer is familiar and comfortable with (Phau and Lau, 2000). For example, consumers who possess a personality that reflects excitement, will be more comfortable associating with friends who are exciting. In the same vein, brands with such a personality would also be a preferred companion. The notion of self congruity suggests that the greater degree of congruence will result in higher probability of product or brand choice. Schiffman and Kanuk (2000, p.111) support this theory by stating that:

"Consumers have a variety of enduring images of themselves. These self-images, or perceptions of self, are very closely associated with personality in that individuals tend to buy products and services and patronize retailers whose images or personalities closely correspond to their own self-images. In essence, consumers seek to depict themselves in their brand choices."
However, this intuitive premise has met with limited empirical success. Sirgy (1982) argues that the primary reason for this is the conceptualisation of a self as a unitary construct. In this light, Landon (1974) stated that self congruence may not be consistent across different product categories and situations due to different forms of self images such as actual, ideal, and social self images, involved in evaluation. Thus a person has to find a balance between these various self images. For example, the congruence may not be significant between actual self image and a brand personality, since consumers often do not want to describe themselves as they are but superimpose their ideal self images in purchase situations, when the relevant actual self image is considered as negative.

Research conducted in a restaurant revealed that customers’ ideal self image, rather than the actual self image, is found to be a more relevant concept in estimating customers’ overall attitude, satisfaction and perceived service quality (Ekinci and Riley, 2002). Hong and Zinkhan’s study also shows that compared to the actual self image, the ideal self image is found to be a better predictor of brand preference for car and shampoo products. Hence, a brand personality may not be consistently congruent with actual self image due to the fact that consumers try to find a balance between the various self images depending on product categories and situations.

Similarly, Aaker (1999) suggests that the self is a malleable construct, which includes various different types of self concepts such as good self, bad self, ideal self, possible self etc. According to her, this conceptualisation has two implications. One of the two implications is considering the self as a dynamic concept, and the other is that conflicting traits may exist in a person’s self concept. She further argues that situational cues play key roles to influence the accessibility of a specific self concept or personality traits. In other words, the notion that people act differently in different situations is influenced by situational cues. Consequently, the preference for, and use of a brand based on its personality association, will vary across usage situations.

Despite the fact that the theory is compelling and popular among a number of researchers, there have been criticisms around the theory due to the weak support from empirical studies. For instance, Shank and Langmeyer (1993) reported weak relationship between human
personality and evaluation of brand image. They further argue that there is insufficient support for using information on consumer personality as a strategic marketing tool.

However, the main contribution to the conflict around the validation of the congruity theory seems to be derived from methodological and theoretical shortcomings. Ekinci and Riley (2002) argue that many researchers in the field of self-concept rely on measurement scales that are taken directly from personality psychology field but not validated in the context of consumer research. Malhotra (1988) also identifies common faults in the self-concept research as (1) inadequate conceptualisation of self-concept, (2) poor measurement instrument, (3) weak methodology, (4) failure to take account the influence of brand and product attributes, and mediating effect of other personality variables.

2.4.1.2 The relationship basis model

People have relationships with many different types of people even though they may never aspire to have their personality or may never like their personalities (e.g. a superior in the office, lawyer, banker, etc.). If they need a solicitor, they may tend to find someone with a trustworthy, conservative and dependable personality, which reflects characteristics valued in a legal advisor, although they may think that such personalities are boring (Consider the personality of the Volvo). Aaker (1996) understands the relationship of brand personality and consumers in the same way (e.g. a brand as a friend). He further argues that brand personality is not just a customer perception to be manipulated, but rather this relationship between brand and consumer is interactive and thus the attitude and behaviour of the brand is important.

Supporting this premise, Blackstone (1993) insisted that researchers should view the relationship between consumer and brand from an interactive standpoint. He argues that a brand-consumer relationship will have an active partner at each end. The brand as well as the consumer, just like a person's relationship with another person, is deeply affected not only by who that person is, but what that person thinks of him/her. In other words, to Blackston (1993) it is not only important to measure the consumer's attitudes toward the brand, but the brand's attitudes toward the consumer.
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For instance, he found that users of a credit card had different perceptions of the card to non-users, although the two groups were virtually identical in terms of demographic and socioeconomic profiles. Users described the card as worthy, powerful, sophisticated, distinguished etc., while non-users felt intimidated by the credit card describing it as snobbish and condescending. Card users thought the card might say something like 'I can help you be the classy person you really are,' 'My job is to help you get accepted.' In contrast, non-users believed the card might say 'Are you ready for me? I'm only saying it to protect you from spending more than you can afford,' 'You know what the conditions are. If you don't like them, go get a different card' (Blackston, 1993, pp. 119-120).

Fournier (1998) argues that consumer and brand can also have strong emotional attachments. Like Blackstone, she sees brand and consumer relationship as active and live just like relationships between people. Her concept was inspired by the Act frequency theory (Buss and Craik, 1983), which suggests that key indicators of a person's personality can be revealed by repeated observation of trait-relevant behaviour. Fournier understands all marketing activities and brand management decisions including the everyday execution of marketing plans and tactics as behaviour enacted on the part of the brand that triggers attitudinal, cognitive and behavioural responses on the part of the consumer. This exercise allows consumers to elevate the status a brand from that of a passive object in one-sided marketing transaction to that of an active relationship partner.

Through idiographic analysis research, Fournier addresses the strong relationship between customer and brand that is likely to generate strong emotional ties and feelings (e.g. love, affection, passion etc.), which are much greater than the simple notion of brand preference. Customers in strong relationships with brands often show very strong emotional attachments towards the brands and consider them as irreplaceable and inseparable from their life.

Fournier (1998) suggests six dimensions of brand relationship quality, which were modified from the seven dimensions in her previous study. These dimensions are associated with strong relationships between people and suggest how brand and consumer relations should
be conceived, measured and managed. The six dimensions and their examples are as follows:

(1) Love and Passion: This quality is the core of all strong relationship. Intense emotional bonds, such as between partners and the inability to tolerate separation, reflect the love and passion that exist. In relationships where customers develop passionate links to brands, substitutes generate discomfort;
   - No other brand can quite take the place of this brand.
   - I would be very upset if I could not find this brand.

(2) Self-connection: This relationship reflects the degree to which the brand delivers on important identity concerns, tasks, or themes, thereby expressing a significant aspect of self;
   - The brand’s and my self-image are similar.
   - The brand reminds me of who I am.

(3) Interdependence: Strong brand relationship is determined by a degree of interdependence enjoining consumer and brand;
   - This brand plays an important role in my life.
   - I feel like something’s missing when I have not used the brand in a while.

(4) Commitment: High levels of commitment are common across strong brand relationships. There is also a desire to improve or maintain the quality of the relationship over time, and guilt is felt when it is compromised;
   - I feel very loyal to this brand.
   - I will stay with this brand through good times and bad.

(5) Intimacy: A deep understanding and belief about a brand. The consumer will achieve intimacy by knowing details about the brand and its use;
   - I know a lot about this brand.
   - I know a lot about the company that makes this brand.
(6) Brand partner quality: brand partner quality represents the consumer’s evaluation of the brand’s performance in its partnership role. In other words, this dimension reflects the evaluation by the consumer of the brand’s attitude towards him/her

- I know this brand really appreciates me.
- This brand treats me like a valued customer.

In summary, a brand can be treated as an active, contributing partner in the dyadic relationship that exists between a consumer and the brand. Therefore, the behaviours of both the consumer and the brand can be deeply influenced by each other’s personality just like relationships between humans.

2.4.1.3 The functional benefit representation model

The self congruity theory and the relationship model provide contexts in which brand personality can be the basis for a brand strategy and a link to the customer. Brand personality can also be a vehicle for representing and cueing functional benefits and attributes of brands (Aaker, 1996). For instance, the personalities of Nike such as outdoorsy, rugged and adventurous, suggest that Nike athletic shoes are higher quality and more durable than competitors. A rugged, macho, freedom-seeking personality of the Harley-Davison suggests that the product is powerful and liberating. Hence, it could be suggested that the functional attributes of brands would be much less convincing without the personality behind them. He further states that symbols and country (or region) associations of a brand, which can create and cue the brand personality, can enhance the ability of brand personality to reinforce functional attributes of the brand (e.g. The Michelin man, The Energizer rabbit, and Jack Daniel’s Tennessee background).

The above three models; self expression, the relationship basis, and the functional benefit representation, show how brand personality creates brand equity. However, although the three models provide plausible explanations on how brand personality works, to date, little study has succeeded in providing clear empirical support for these models. Moreover, the basic conceptual questions of brand personality, such as when and how brands are
personified in consumers' evaluation of the brands, are largely unanswered (Aaker and Fournier, 1995).

2.4.2 How Brand Personality Developed

According to Aaker (1996, p.145), 'just as the perceived personality of a person is affected by nearly everything associated with that person — including his or her neighbourhood, friends, activities, clothes and manner of interacting, personality of a brand is affected by a plethora of factors around the brand.'

The antecedents of brand personality can be grouped into three categories; 1) product related characteristics, 2) non-product related characteristics (Aaker, 1996) and 3) personal factors (Phau and Lau, 2000; 2001). Product related characteristics include the attributes, the packaging, the product category and the price. Non-product related attributes include symbols, country of origin, sponsorships, ad style, age, corporate image and so on. Some researchers believe that personal factors such as personality and socio-demographic profiles of the perceiver, also influence creation a brand personality (Dobni and Zinkhan, 1990; Phau and Lau, 2000; 2001). Figure 2.4 summarises various sources of brand personality.
Figure 2.4: Various Antecedents of Brand Personality

Figure 2.4 shows three primary elements of various brand personality antecedents: product related factors; non-product related factors; personal factors. The details of each source are as follows.

2.4.2.1 Product related factors

Aaker (1996) believes that product related factors of a brand can be primary drivers of a brand personality. Examples of product related characteristics are as follows:

*Packaging*

Burnett and Moriarty (1998, p.55) states that a firm 'cannot not communicate'. In other words, everything a company does tells consumers about the company. Therefore,
companies would be wise to make sure their packaging conveys the desired personality. Keller (1987) revealed packaging of a product influenced brand recall. In this view, the components of packaging, such as brand name, colour, shape, attributes, logo and so on, may affect the perceived personality of the brand. For example, the white box with black splotches packaging of Gateway computer provides a down-to-earth personality for the firm (Aaker, 1996).

**Price**

Consumers often use price as a signal for product quality, particularly if quality is difficult to evaluate, there is a wide range of prices in the product category, or the products within the category vary greatly in quality (Zeithaml, 1988). Similarly, price may influence the perceived personality of a brand. For example, a high-price brand such as Gucci may be considered stylish, wealthy and perhaps snobbish (Aaker, 1996).

**Attributes**

Product attributes often affect the brand personality. Unlike price, the product attributes of a brand are intrinsic in nature. These intrinsic cues cannot be changed without actually changing the physical characteristics of the product (Jacoby, Olson and Haddock, 1971). For instance, if a brand contains lower fat than any other brand, the brand personality might be described as being slender, athletic and light just because of its low fat. Like this, although sometimes difficult to evaluate, intrinsic attributes can influence the consumer perceptions of a brand's personality significantly.

**Product Category**

According to the categorisation theory, consumers categorise objects in an effort to simplify decisions. Using a categorisation schema, the most typical category members often influence consumer expectations and evaluations of a category (Sujan, 1985). Product class often influences the formation of brand personality (Batra, Lehmann, and Singh, 1993; Aaker, 1996). 4WD cars like Land Rover and Jeep, for example, might tend to
be described as adventurous, rugged, and outdoorsy. In the same vein, fast food restaurants such as McDonald’s and Burger King may be perceived to be popular, informal, and simple while upscale restaurants are considered to have sophisticated and formal personalities.

2.4.2.2. Non-product related factors

Non-product related characteristics that can also affect brand personality include symbols of brand, country of origin, sponsorships, advertising style, age, cooperate image, users and CEO image and celebrity endorsers.

*Symbol*

As previously mentioned, a symbol can create and cue brand personality. Aaker (1996) argues that a symbol can be an effective and powerful influence on brand personality since it can have very strong associations with the brand. For example, the Marlboro man, the Energizer rabbit and the Michelin man all help to create and reinforce personalities of their brands.

*Country of Origin*

Country of origin is often considered as a crucial cue for consumer choice behaviour. It can also be used as a signal of quality (Solomon, 1999). Many consumers positively associate France with wine and perfume, and Italy with designer clothes, shoes and sports cars (Schiffman and Kanuk, 2000). A Brand’s country of origin is believed to have influence on the perceived personality of the brand. German cars, for instance, tend to have reliable and competent personalities due to the reputation of German engineering.

*Sponsorships*

According to Aaker (1996), activities, such as events sponsored by the brand, may affect its personality. For example, Swatch tries to reinforce its offbeat and youthful personality with
sponsorship of events, such as the freestyle ski world cup, international breakdancing championship and street painting (Aaker, 1996).

However, a sponsorship event and the sponsoring brand need to be semantically related in order to enhance customer recall and brand personality (Johar and Pham, 1999). In other words, a successful sponsorship may be based on the brand's personality being congruent with the event. There are several examples of unsuccessful Olympic sponsorships. These sponsorships failed because the brands failed to develop a link between the brand and the event (Crimmins and Horn, 1996).

*Advertising*

It has been claimed that a brand's advertising style has influence on its personality (Batra, Lehmann and Singh, 1993; Aaker, 1996). According to Olson and Allen (1995), consumers infer the personality of a brand through the behaviour of the brand. They further argue that brand behaviour can be portrayed in narrative advertising in many ways, such as animation of the brand itself (e.g. Duracell battery) or symbols (e.g. Michelin man) and association with spokesperson (e.g. Michael Jordan with Nike).

There are various components that work together to give an advertisement certain styles (e.g. celebrity endorser, brand's name, logo, symbol, pictorial elements etc.). Using a component or mixture of components, marketers can create ads that build and strengthen their desired brand personalities.

*Age*

Age refers to how long a brand has been on the market. Aaker (1996) argues that a brand's age may impact upon how consumers perceive the brand. Thus, newer entrant brands tend to have younger brand personalities than older brands. For instance, consumers may view IBM as more mature or experienced because of its fairly long tenure. In contrast, consumers may have viewed Apple computers as more youthful and modern in the nineties, because it was relatively new to the market (Aaker, 1996).
Corporate Image

Biel (1993) suggests that the image of the provider of products and services, or corporate image can affect the perceptions of the brand. He further argues that the relative contribution of corporate image on brand personality varies across product categories and brands. Philip Morris, for example, plays hardly any role in forming the brand image of Marlboro.

Users Image

The notion that we are what we have and consume is not uncommon (Belk, 1988; Schiffman and Kanuk, 2000). Indeed, products communicate cultural meanings (McCracken, 1986). Users image is usually defined as ‘consumer beliefs based on experience, observation and marketing activity, about who uses the brand, expressed in demographic and lifestyle terms’ (Patterson, 2000, p.419). This users image is likely to be important to brand personality since typical users of a particular brand provide a reference point for group membership and aspirations (Biel, 1993).

According to Aaker (1996), the perceptions of users image can be created in two ways: the consumer perceptions of the images of people in ads using the brand; and consumer perceptions of people they think use the brand. Regardless of the method, he believed that in order to understand a brand’s personality, it is first necessary to understand the consumer perceptions of the brand’s users.

Image of CEO or Owner

The image or personality of a firm’s CEO or owner could be a potentially important brand personality antecedent (Aaker, 1996). For example, the personality of a visible CEO such as Virgin Group’s Richard Branson (e.g. adventurous, exciting, rugged etc.) can transfer to the brand.
Celebrity Endorsers

Firms often use celebrities to endorse their products. Marketers hope that the personality of the celebrity serves as a favourable cue, thereby influencing the consumer to project the celebrity’s personalities onto the brand and form a favourable attitude towards the brand. Using Michael Jordan as endorser, Nike wanted consumers to consider the Nike brand more professional, active and hi-tech.

2.4.2.3. Personal factors

Many marketers have believed that brand personality is created by how marketers and advertisers intend to project it and can be selected, created and manipulated (in both product related and non-product related ways) by the marketers over time (e.g. Levy, 1959; Plummer, 2000; Restall and Gordon, 1993). Biel (1993) however, argues that this is not always the case and could be a dangerous assumption in understanding consumers’ perception of a brand. He further states that personal factors, such as personality and socio-demographic profiles of the consumer, can affect consumers’ perception of a brand. In this light, Dobni and Zinkhan (1990, p.117) assert that brand personality is ‘a function of the interaction between perceiver and product stimulus.’ That means that consumers have, in part, a role in influencing perceived brand personality.

Personality of the Perceiver

There is a suggestion that consumers have a part to play in influencing how a brand personality is perceived. This is in contrast to other research and propositions which suggest that brand personality is created by how marketers and advertisers intend to project it (e.g. Levy, 1959; Plummer, 2000; Restall and Gordon, 1993). Phau and Lau (2001) revealed that brand personality of a preferred brand for consumers can be influenced by their own personality. This is based on the fact that as consumers build trusting relationships with their preferred brand they will reinforce positive attitudes such as their preferred personalities, onto the brand’s personality (de Chernatony and Riley, 1997).
As consumers interact with their preferred brand, they not only participate actively in receiving the personality that the brand projects; they also transmit and create a personality for the brand (Phau and Lau, 2000; 2001).

**Socio-Demographic Profiles of the Perceiver**

Consumers' buying behaviour and perception of products is considered to differ depending on their socio-demographic backgrounds, such as age, gender, income and education levels (Kotler, Armstrong, Saunders and Wong; 1999; Solomon, 1999). Moreover, it is argued that people from different socio-demographic profiles may have different perceptions of brand personality (Aaker, 1996).

Consumers of different ages may use different attributes in evaluating a brand or product choice due to their changing financial situations and typical product interests. For example, many younger consumers tend to be variety prone and price sensitive caused by their financial weakness, and thus exhibit little brand loyalty (Phau and Lau, 2000).

Fisk (1961-62) addresses socio-demographic characteristics such as age, education, income, occupation and marital status, as influencing consumers' perception and evaluation of products. However, among these characteristics, he further argues age and education appear to be major determinants in the formation of consumers' perceptions.

Studies related to gender issues support the assumption that the perception of a brand is different between males and females. Males and females differ in the source of information they use, their information processing, and the way they form judgements (Sternthal, 1986). The preceding discussions support the idea that the socio-demographic background of a consumer may influence the perceived personalities of a brand.
2.4.3 Dimensions of Brand Personality

The Big Five model of human personality reduces the large number of adjectives describing human personalities to only five latent dimensions (Aaker, 1997). The Big Five Model is a trait theory of personality, and emerged in research that examined the language of personality, within the framework of the psycholexical approach (Caprara et al., 2001).

Traits theorists suggest that the more optimal way to understand personality is to examine the organisation of traits within an individual. As traits are labelled as the internal individual characteristics that remain consistent across time and situations and, psychologists are interested in determining patterns of traits organised (taxonomised) within an individual. To achieve that they endeavour to classify descriptive adjectives used in everyday language (the lexical approach) (Feshbach, Weiner and Bohart, 1996).

By scanning thousands of personality attributes in many different languages, studies in personality psychology found terms denoting stable characteristics of human personality, which have been referred as the most frequently used, the least ambiguous, and the most useful for describing human personality. Factor analyses, based on these studies, revealed that most adjectives describing human personalities can be grouped into one of the five broad personality dimensions; the so-called Big Five personality factors (Caprara et al., 2001). The Big Five Dimensions are summarised in Table 2.3.
While a consensus has emerged among personality psychologists around the Big Five model as a reference structure for the assessment and description of human personality, several brand management researchers have tried to apply this model to marketing settings (e.g. Caprara and Babaranelli, 1996; Caprara et al., 2001). However, the results of applying the Big Five model in the context of brands gained very limited empirical success.

In their study, Caprara and his colleagues (2001) examined 12 market brands to determine to what extent, in a consumer setting, the Big Five model can fit as a metaphor to describe...
enduring characteristics of brands. More than 1,500 subjects evaluated their own personalities and three selected brands using the Big Five dimensions (40 adjectives; 8 for each dimension). The exploratory factor analyses revealed that the five factor structure is not replicated when describing brands. In addition, they argue that the descriptors of human personality may convey different meanings when attributed to brands. Consequently, they concluded that while it may be possible to describe brand personality with only a few factors, it is unlikely that the same factors used to describe human personality are suitable for the description of brands. In this light, Aaker (1997) asserted that although the conceptualisation of brand and human personality may be similar, the two constructs vary in their antecedents as well as the distinct roles they serve.

Inspired by the Big Five model, Aaker (1997) suggested that the dimensions of brand personality can be defined by extending those of human personality to that of brands. She proposed a framework, which can be used as a standard, universal way to categorise brand personality attributes. Aaker employed a rigorous set of procedures to develop and evaluate the brand personality dimensions. From the 309 personality traits generated by assembling a list of traits used to describe and measure the human personality in psychology and marketing studies, she conducted multiple studies employing various brands from a wide range of product and service categories. As a result, she identified five underlying dimensions of brand personality just like the case of the Big Five in human personality. These dimensions were labelled; Competence, Sincerity, Excitement, Sophistication and Ruggedness.

The five dimensions were again factor analysed individually in order to find facets that can accurately represent each dimension. The result of the five individual factor analyses was a total of 15 facets. Sincerity and excitement dimensions were found to have four facets each. The Competence dimension was found to have three, while the sophistication and ruggedness dimensions each had two facets. Figure 2.5 shows the brand personality framework, which includes the five dimensions and 15 facets.
As shown in Figure 2.5, the sincerity is represented by such facets as down-to-earth, honest, wholesome and cheerful. The excitement dimension includes such facets as daring, spirited, imaginative and up-to-date. The competence is typified by three facets, namely reliable, intelligent and successful. The sophistication dimension consists of two facets; upper class and charming. Finally, the ruggedness dimension is represented by outdoorsy and tough of two facets.

It could be argued that three of Aaker’s (1997) brand personality dimensions; sincerity, excitement and competence, are similar to human personality dimensions presented in the Big Five model. Both sincerity and agreeableness dimensions share the idea of acceptance. Excitement and extroversion both encapsulate sociability, energy and activity. Conscientiousness and competence both connote the idea of responsibility, dependability and security (Aaker, 1997, p.353).

However, two dimensions; sophistication and ruggedness, are different from any of the Big Five factors. This pattern may suggest that brand personality dimensions influence consumer preference or attitude in different ways and for different reasons. Consequently, her research supports the view of Caprara et al.(2001), which asserts that human personality
may serve for construing a brand personality, but only to a certain extent, and therefore the Big Five model needs to be revised and adapted when applied to products or brands.

Aaker (1997) argues that the five dimensions of brand personality are generic across product categories. Several studies have been conducted in order to examine the specific dimensions of brand personality in different settings. The issues around the generic quality of brand personality dimensions will be delineated in Chapter 3.

2.5 Relationship between Brand Image and Band Personality

The concept of brand image as well as brand personality has been widely accepted by both academics (e.g. Martineauk, 1958; Keller, 1998) and practitioners (e.g. Ogilvy, 1983; Plummer, 2000) as a key to creating brand equity. A large multi-country study conducted by BBDO Worldwide (1988) has also found that consumers tend to feel more differences between brands that use image-based positioning than those that use function-based positioning.

Despite the wide recognition of these concepts, there is less agreement on the understanding of their relationship, due to poor conceptual development and limited empirical and theoretical underpinnings. Therefore, it is not very difficult to find studies which fail to show the distinction between brand image and brand personality. In many studies, these concepts have tended to be used interchangeably (e.g. Gartner and Levy, 1955; Martineau, 1958; Hendon and Williams, 1985; Griffiths, 1992). Patterson (2000) also shows that the degree of overlap is considerable between these terms. The following passages highlight instances in which researchers have managed to equate the concepts brand personality and brand image:
"The analogy implies that brands, like people, can have an image or personality ..........If we accept this analogy, then we must eventually ask 'What brand image or personality yields the greatest buyer motivation?'" (Smothiers, 1993, p.97).

"...it is remarkable how important brand image is in the choice process ........ Successful brands are those which create this image or personality" (Doyle, 1989, p.77-8).

The following sections will explore the relationship between brand personality and brand image.

2.5.1 The Concept of Brand Image

Boulding (1956) argues that people react not in response to what is true, but to what they believe to be true and this is evaluated by using subjective values and knowledge. The human brain is able to handle only a certain number of complex stimuli, and therefore it simplifies stimuli and extracts only a few salient meanings. In other words, these simplified images are used to summarise a vast complexity of values and meanings. The images of brands held by consumers do not necessarily correspond to reality. Rather, consumers develop subjective images of various brands through a large number of information sources (Ehrenberg and Pyatt, 1971).

Most researchers agree that brand image is the overall perception of the brand (e.g. Echtner and Ritchie, 1991; Assael, 1992; Restall and Gordon, 1993; Baloglu and Brinberg, 1997; Keller, 1998). However, there are a number of different views on how to define brand image. These can be categorised into two broad perspectives; one is to understand brand image as a holistic perception, and the other is to see it as a composition of functional and symbolic attributes.
2.5.1.1 The holistic approach

Individuals tend to group stimuli so that they form a unified picture or impression. According to ‘Gestalt psychology’, people, in their perceptual process, tend to organise numerous stimuli into groups and perceive them as unified wholes, rather than perceive various stimuli as separate and discrete sensations (Solomon, 1999). In line with this view, Dichter (1985, p.75) states that the human psychological response is based less on specific facts than on total impression and defined image as “It describes not individual traits or qualities, but the total impression an entity makes on the minds of other”. In brand image literature, a considerable number of researchers support the idea that brand image is a holistic or total impression of brand and its associations (Martineau, 1957; Park, Jaworski, and MacInnis, 1986; Gordon, 1996).

2.5.1.2 The functional and emotional approach

There are two distinctive rational and emotional schools of thought that explain human needs and motivations (Bhat and Reddy, 1998). According to the first model, consumers are rational and try to have the greatest utility (e.g. price, or miles per litre) in choosing or consuming goods and services (Schiffman and Kanuk, 2000). In arriving at this decision, consumers usually go through a variety of cognitive processes such as gathering information, judging the importance of each available attribute, and finally using judgement rules to select an optimal brand (Solomon, 1999). A number of researchers however, argue that the rational model is appropriate only for goods which consumers value for their utilitarian benefits (Bhat and Reddy, 1998), and that it can not explain the motivation for consuming products that satisfy emotional needs (Hirschman and Holbrook, 1982).

The rational model, for example, cannot explain excitement, fantasy, fun and emotions associated with certain purchases or possessions. This type of consumption, based on the individual’s emotion and symbolic product benefits, is called emotional (Schiffman and Kanuk, 2000) or hedonic consumption (Solomon, 1999). Thus, in contrast to the rational school of thought, the emotional school advocates that consumers’ motives are emotional
and this proposition has been supported by a number of conceptual (e.g. Mittal, 1983) as well as empirical studies (e.g. Johar and Sirgy, 1991).

The existence of different types of motivation or needs suggests that in brand choice, consumers' needs could be either functional or symbolic in nature and brands could be consumed to fulfil either of these two types of needs. In other words, a brand with a functional image can be consumed by consumers with the functional need and a brand with a particular symbolic image assumed to be consumed by consumers with the particular emotional needs.

In relation to the above arguments, an image of a brand can be separated into two different parts which aim to fulfil consumers' rational and emotional needs. The former is known as functional attributes and the latter is known as symbolic attributes (Bhat and Reddy, 1998). *Functional attributes* indicate *practical and utilitarian benefits related to products' function and can be explained by rationality* while *symbolic attributes* represent *emotional benefits such as self-expression and prestige and are likely to be non-product related images*. These two attributes are viewed as a function of the whole and help to build a holistic image of brand (Schiffman and Kanuk, 2000).

It is further argued that weighting of the two types of image varies across different brands (Park, Jaworski, and MacInnis, 1986). While some brands are seen either functional or symbolic dominated, Bhat and Reddy (1998) show that some strong brands, such as Nike, could have both functional and symbolic attributes.

2.5.2 Relationship Between Brand Personality and Brand Image

There has been little attempt to define the relationship of these two concepts in detail (Dobni and Zinkhan, 1990). In much of the marketing literature, these terms are typically used interchangeably (e.g. Hendon and Williams, 1985; Griffiths, 1992; Smothers, 1993) and considered as similar concepts (e.g. Hendon and Williams, 1985; Dobni and Zinkhan, 1990).
In extant literature, there are two broad views in understanding the relationship between brand image and brand personality. The first view is that brand personification recasts brand image into a human-like character (Schiffman and Kanuk, 2000). Many consumers express their feelings and perceptions about products and brands in terms of their association with known personalities. In other words, brand personality is a kind of image that describes brand by using human characteristic terms.

The second and more widely accepted view is to consider a brand image as a more encompassing term, including not only brand personality but also other attributes and benefits that the user associates with the brand. Karande, Zinkhan and Lum (1997) argue that brand personality is a component of a brand image that consists of the human side of that brand. Batra, Lehmann and Singh (1993, p.84) support this idea, stating that 'when we speak of a brand's personality, we mean the way in which a consumer perceives the brand on dimensions that typically capture a person's personality'. In other words, they understand brand personality as not being the whole perception of a brand, but as a part which particularly relates to human personalities. In line with this view, Plummer (2000) argues that brand personality is one of the three primary components of brand image, along with physical attributes/elements and functional attributes. According to him, brand personality consists of merely symbolic meanings (not functional) and is purely the result of communications. Similarly, Mader, Huber and Herrmann (2000) and Thakor and Kohli (1998) argue that brand personality is a crucial part of brand image and can be conceived as a key to the symbolic quality of a product.

Heylen, Dawson and Sampson (1995) suggest a model of brand image, which is composed of personality and identity. Figure 2.6 shows the model of brand image and consumer needs.
As shown in Figure 2.6, Heylen et al. suggest that brand personality is part of brand image along with brand identity, which relates to consumer’s emotional needs. Brand personality is “an emotional rather than a rational basis ….. the implicit, internal features that are experienced by the primal, subconscious brain” while brand identity is “the explicit, external features that are observed by the rational”. Brand image consists of these two concepts; brand identity and personality (Heylen et al, 1995, p.59).

If we accept the notion that brand image is composed of functional and symbolic types of attributes, one may simply substitute functional and emotional attributes for Heylen et al.’s brand identity and personality respectively. In other words, brand identity (in Heylen et al’s definition) is nothing but a different name for the functional attributes of brand image. Likewise, they regard brand personality as identical to the symbolic attributes of brand image.
Heylen and his colleagues argue that brand personality consists solely of symbolic meanings of brand image. Although symbolic attributes of brand image are considered as a key determinant of brand personality (Mader, Huber and Herrmann, 2000; Thakor and Kohli, 1998; Plummer, 2000), there is some evidence that shows functional attributes of brand image could also be part of brand personality. Firstly, Aaker (1997) suggested five generic brand personality dimensions (competence, sincerity, excitement, sophistication and ruggedness). Among these five dimensions, the competence dimension includes traits such as those related to functional attributes of the brand image. For instance, reliable, efficient and technical traits represent practical and utilitarian benefits of products and are directly related to functional aspects of the product.

Secondly, Fournier (1998) reveals that relationships between consumers and brands are very similar to those between people. People have relationships with many different types of people. Some of their relationships could be solely function oriented (i.e. derived from functional needs rather than emotional needs) (e.g. relationships with lawyer, banker and a superior in the company etc.). Since those relationships are function oriented, people may try to use functional cues (compare to symbolic cues) in their evaluations. In other words, people try to find a person with personalities such as those related to functional attributes (e.g. reliable, intelligent, efficient etc.). In the same vein, a consumer and a brand could have a similar relationship, which is largely based on function oriented personalities (e.g. ‘Volvo’ personality such as safety).

Thirdly, there is plethora of strong brands with a blend of functional and symbolic personalities (Lannon, 1993). In the UK, brands such as Oxo, Persil and Andrex are not self expressive in the same symbolic self-expressive sense as Rolex, Gucci and Chanel. They are valued because they are believed to be reliable, hard working and safe, as well as genuine, sincere and honest.

The comparison of Harley-Davison and Honda could be a good example of this argument. The owner of a Harley-Davison motorcycle is more concerned with symbolic and self-expressive benefits while the Honda motorcycle owner focuses on functional benefits (Aaker, 1996). In other words, the personality of Harley-Davison (outdoorsy, rugged,
genuine, spirited, masculine, tough etc.) largely comes from symbolic attributes of brand image, whereas Honda's personality (efficient, technical, intelligent, reliable etc.) is largely derived from functional attributes. As illustrated previously, a brand can also have personalities that come from both symbolic and functional attributes. Macintosh computers not only has symbolically attributed personalities such as cool, exciting, young, lively and imaginative but also has functionally attributed personalities such as technical, reliable and intelligent.

From the preceding discussion, it can be inferred that brand personality is based largely (but not completely) on symbolic attributes of brand image. Functional attributes of brand image could be part of brand personality. In other words, brand personality can satisfy consumers’ functional needs as well as emotional needs. However, all functional and symbolic attributes of brand image cannot be the personality of a brand. For instance, some functional (e.g. convenient, tasty) and symbolic (e.g. luxury, exclusive) attributes do not exhibit any human characteristics. Therefore, those attributes are part of brand image but not associated with human characteristics.

To conclude, it can be assumed that brand image consists of brand personality and the other attributes which are not associated with human personalities (i.e. non-personality attributes of brand image). Brand personality is largely based on symbolic attributes of brand image (but not completely) while the non-personality component is largely based on functional attributes of brand image. Figure 2.7 depicts the relationship between brand image and brand personality.
As shown in Figure 2.7, brand personality is part of brand image, which is associated with human characteristics as opposed to non-personality attributes of brand image. In other words, brand personality can be defined as a part of brand image, which can be expressed by human personality traits.

2.6 Summary

Consumers prefer to purchase a brand not a product. A product is anything that can be offered to a market for use or consumption that might satisfy consumer need, while a brand encompasses a warranty of quality and conveys a number of different tangible and intangible attributes, such as design, symbol, culture, personality and user image (Keller, 1998). In this sense, a number of researchers agree that a brand is a multidimensional construct (e.g. Aaker, 1991; de Chernatony and Riley, 1998).
The preceding discussions represent attempts to describe and summarise the crucial importance of a brand. Although preliminary research on brands has often focused primarily on tangible products, the concept has increasingly been applied to the marketing of other areas, such as ideas, organisations and services. Recent research has also addressed the perceptions of brands from a brand personality perspective. This important stream of research provides a precise means of measuring the perceptions of a brand, a method of differentiation a brand from its competitors, and a common denominator for marketing brands across market segments and subcultures (Aaker, 1997).

However, although the importance of brand personality has been accepted by a wider community, there has been lack of distinction between brand image and brand personality. In many studies, these two concepts have tended to be used interchangeably (e.g. Doyle, 1989; Smother, 1993). However, it is generally believed that brand personality is part of brand image, which can be expressed by human characteristics.
CHAPTER 3
CHAPTER THREE

LITERATURE REVIEW:
CONCEPTUALISATION OF BRAND PERSONALITY

3.1 Introduction

A considerable amount of attention has been given to the idea of brand personality for decades. It has been recognised as having important marketing implications (e.g. Aaker and Fournier, 1995; Karnoe, Zinkhan and Lum, 1997; Keller, 1998; Solomon, 1999) and is considered as a key determinant of brand equity (e.g. Biel, 1993; Aaker, 1996).

However, most brand personality studies seem to have failed to show what it really is. Aaker and Fournier (1995, p.391) state that:

“...at the conceptual level, there is still some ambiguity over what a brand personality is. How should it be defined and conceptualized? How (or when) is it different from band image and/or user imagery? The answers to these questions have important implications ...... in understanding the larger questions of why brand personality is important and how brand personality works”.
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This chapter is dedicated to investigating the theoretical underpinning of the concept of brand personality. It begins by reviewing the concept of brand personality in the light of personality theories in psychology. The theory of anthropomorphism and the nature of human personality will be introduced and compared with the concept of brand personality in order to legitimise the concept. The next stage of this chapter deals with the measurements of brand personality. Aaker's brand personality scale (BPS), one of the most popular measurements of brand personality, will be introduced along with other quantitative and qualitative measurements of brand personality.

3.2 Can a Brand have a Personality?

In his famous book 'Building Strong Brands,' Aaker (1996, p.142) states that:

"The brand personality concept has considerable face validity (brand strategists and researchers are comfortable with it). Respondents in qualitative and quantitative studies are routinely asked to profile the personalities of brands. Their responses come easily and generally are interpretable and consistent across people."

Although the face validity of brand personality has been accepted by a wider community including practitioners (e.g. Ogilvy, 1983; Plummer, 2000) and academics (e.g. Aaker, 1996; Keller, 1998), the theoretical underpinning of the concept is very limited due to the poor conceptual development and limited empirical support (Olson and Allen, 1995). A considerable amount of attention has been given to the concept of brand personality. However, little study has succeeded in providing the conceptual basis of the concept and thus it still remains elusive and vague (Aaker and Fournier, 1995).

To provide a rigid framework and give legitimacy to the concept of brand personality, the basic question of 'how inanimate brands can have human personality characteristics' should be answered first. The following sections try to find the answer from the views of anthropology and human personality psychology.
3.2.1 The Theory of Anthropomorphism

Initial evidence that gives legitimacy to the concept of brand personality may be found from the pervasive notion of anthropomorphism. Fournier (1998) suggests that personalisation of brands is a form of anthropomorphism. She refers to studies on animism that claim that humans anthropomorphise objects in order to facilitate interactions with the nonmaterial world.

Theories on anthropomorphism may give clues in understanding how and why people endow human personality qualities onto inanimate brands, since they explain projections of human qualities onto non-human beings, such as gods, animals and even inanimate objects (Boyer, 1996).

Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary (Woolf, 1977) defines anthropomorphism as 'attribution of human characteristics to nonhuman things or events'. The notion of anthropomorphism is pervasive in culture, religion and daily life (Boyer, 1996; Barrett and Keil, 1996; Guthrie, 1997). For instance, people who treat their car, computer or dog as a friend or a member of family can be found easily in everyday life.

It has been generally believed that anthropomorphism has appeared with the first anatomically modern humans (Mithen and Boyer, 1996). The first conclusive evidence of anthropomorphic thinking comes with the appearance of art in Europe as long as 30,000 years ago (Marshack, 1990). The functional utility of anthropomorphism has been demonstrated by several researchers (e.g. Blurton-Jones and Konnoer, 1976; Douglas, 1990). They argue that by attributing animals with human-like minds, some cultures are able to make as accurate predictions of animal behaviour as Western scientists can, by drawing on their knowledge of behavioural ecology.

Then why is anthropomorphism so natural? Guthrie (1997) suggests two plausible explanations; the familiarity and comfort theses. According to the familiarity theory, people use themselves as models of the world because they have good knowledge of
themselves. In other words, people employ their self-schema as a source of labels and concepts to interpret the outside world. The comfort thesis, in contrast, refers not to cognitive but to emotional motives. It suggests that human beings are not comfortable with what is non-human, and thus persons try to reassure it with what is human. According to him, humans are ignorant or uncertain about major factors influencing their fate and find this unsettling. “These unknown causes, then, become the constant object of our hope and fear; and while the passions are kept in perpetual alarm by an anxious expectation of the events, the imaginations equally employed in forming ideas of those powers, on which we have so entire a dependence” (Guthrie, 1997, p.54). These emotional needs, along with cognitive ones motivate humans to form human-like models to understand and mitigate events.

Boyer (1996) has a quite different view from Guthrie's. Unlike the common idea that anthropomorphism is based on intuitive ontology, he sees it as counter-intuitive. He suggests that anthropomorphism thinking is pervasive in human culture because it exhibits sufficient counter-intuitive assumptions (i.e. it is against human intuition that makes humans to distinguish human and non-human) to make it ‘attention-grabbing’ while it also has an ‘intuitive background’ to have inferential potential. In other words, it is easy to grasp because it goes against intuitive ontology.

Although the notion of anthropomorphism has been invasive in human culture throughout human history, undoubtedly there is a lack of parallelism in applying anthropomorphism to an inanimate object. Though people may believe that a dog knows he is trusted and loved, few people would suggest that a car could actually feel insulted when they shout loathsome remarks at it upon discovering defects. Gallup, Marino and Eddy (1997) argue that most anthropomorphism to inanimate objects merely represents the use of descriptive terms in order to conveniently convey information about them. Like a car, a brand is not a vital entity. In fact, it does not even have any objective existence. It is merely a collection of perceptions held in the minds of the people. Then, how could this inanimate brand act, think and feel?
A further understanding of the role of brand personality is gained by exploring the relationships that consumers have with brands. Fournier, in her pioneering 1998 JCR paper, used idiographic analysis to show how the conditions for interpersonal relationships can be transferred to describe the relationships between consumers and brand. She argues that a brand behaves through all marketing activities and brand management decisions, and it takes an active and contributing role in its relationship with customers as a reciprocating partner.

In line with this view, Blackston (1993, p.113) defines the relationship between consumers and brands as "the interaction between consumers' attitudes toward the brand and the brand's 'attitudes' toward the consumer". He further suggests that a brand and consumers should be considered as co-equivalent parts of a single system, which is similar to the relationship between two people. These ideas may allow the application of anthropomorphism in understanding the concept of brand personality. The next area that deserves attention comes from the perception of personality.

3.2.2 The Nature of Human Personality

To study brand personality, one must identify which meanings refer to personality. In every day life, repeatedly, we evaluate the people we meet. We make subjective assessments of their behaviour. To do so, we note their manners; we listen to what they have to say and watch what they do in different situations. People use this information to make a subjective judgement of the personality of the person concerned. This process elicits descriptions of personality traits such as attractive, boring, intelligent, generous and so on. This process seems fairly simple. However, to the contrary, the field of personality is enormously complex and diverse. It comprises a number of perspectives, and has been studied by psychologists from many different angles. A great number of different definitions for the concept of personality reflect this state of affairs (Hogan, Johnson and Briggs, 1997).
It is an almost impossible task to cover all the theories of personality to illustrate the diversity of personality theory in this review. Rather, the widely accepted concepts of personality will be introduced to illuminate the nature of personality theory and its association with brand personality.

3.2.2.1 The idiographic and nomothetic approaches

There are two fundamental approaches to the study of personality. One is idiographic and the other is nomothetic (McKenna, 2000). The idiographic approach/research deals with the whole person as a unit of study and the uniqueness of each unit. In other words, this approach holds the belief that the individual is not just a collection of separate traits but is a well-integrated unique organism. The approach tries to capture the essence of total personality, but it is often criticised because it does not lend itself easily to scientific measurement.

In contrast to the idiographic research, the nomothetic approach is the isolation of one or more of the variables of personality. The approach suggests that the relationships between traits and behaviour can be generic in any sample and thus the results of a study can be repeated and generalised in other samples of people at other times.

Lazarus (1971) points out the weakness of both approaches. According to him, the idiographic approach is too global and does not possess valued scientific features, while the nomothetic approach can cause distortions when component parts are studied in isolation and a failure to consider the variety of life’s circumstances.

Here, for the purpose of the study, we followed the nomothetic approach of personality study. In nomothetic personality psychology literature, four elements that play significant role in perception of human personality are identified. They are behaviour, interaction with the environment, consistency and distinctiveness.
3.2.2.2 Behaviour

Cattel (1950) defines personality as whatever it is that allows us to predict what a person will do in a specific situation. He adds that personality traits are the elements out of which the structure of personality is formed. According to him, personality traits are mental structures inferred from behaviour and which predispose the individual to behave with consistency from one time to another. People cannot observe traits, they can only observe behavioural and physical cues and then summarise their impressions in words, which purport to describe personality traits (Eiser, 1980). For example, we cannot observe arrogance, we can only observe people behaving in ways, which we choose to label arrogant. In this sense, it can be said that the perceivers are active and take on a constructive role, attempting to interpret and integrate the information they receive. This may be illustrated by a simple example: someone can have an image of a statue, but would anyone assume a statue to have a personality?

How do people use information about others' behaviour as a basis for inferring personality? Jones and Davis (1965) suggest the theory of 'correspondent inference'. The theory is concerned with how we decide, on the basis of others' overt actions, that they possess specific personality traits that remain fairly stable over time.

However, Buss and Craik (1983) criticised Jones and Davis's theory by stating that 'correspondent inference' theory presents judges with a single act (rather than accumulated behaviour) of the target person. In other words, they believe that in 'correspondent inference' theory, a disposition is being rather directly reflected in behaviour without consideration of frequency in the length of period.

Buss and Craik (1983) suggest the 'act frequency approach' which holds the idea that a single act is an inadequate basis for inferring personality traits. They believe that act trends over a period of observations are a more appropriate basis of inferring personality traits and neither the intensity nor the consequences of a single act offer a strong or sensible foundation for dispositional inferences.
From this point of view, the statement ‘John is generous’ means that over a period of observation, he has shown a high frequency of generous acts, relative to a norm for that category of acts. Acts within a given category may seem dissimilar but they are still to be manifestations of a given disposition. Buss and Craik (1983) suggest a ‘multiple-act composite index’, which is based on the frequency tally for the period of observation, as a fundamental measure of an individual’s disposition. These multiple-act indices, or act trends, operationalised as multiple-act composite indices, are a fundamental form of personality data.

3.2.2.3 Interaction with environment: It evolves and changes

Allport (1937) defined personality as ‘the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his unique adjustments to his environment’. In his definition, the word ‘dynamic’ indicates that personality constantly changes and evolves (Phares, 1991). Hampson (1982) points out that it may be closer the truth to consider personality as continually evolving and changing. In line with these views, although there are a number of different approaches in understanding this notion, most personality researchers agree that personality develops and functions in a dynamic, continuous, and reciprocal process of interactions with its environment (e.g. Pervin and John, 1997; McKenna, 2000).

Although a toy can move with the press of a button, it is still not considered to possess a personality (but it still has an image). We are all familiar with the idea that people tend to change after a long period of time. In other words, people change, though in most cases not significantly in a short period, by frequent and lengthy interaction with environment such as other people, culture and so on. A toy does act but it does not interact with its environment, therefore, it can neither be changed nor evolve. It therefore, may be assumed that interaction with the environment is one of the preconditions of personality.
3.2.2.4 Consistency (stability)

Although personality is considered to be changing and evolving over time through interaction with the environment, another property of many definitions of personality is consistency or stability (Allport, 1937; Cattel, 1950; Hampson, 1982) - It needs to be noted that consistency here refers to consistency of personality not consistency of behaviour.

There is good evidence of the longitudinal stability of personality traits over periods of time (Pervin, 1996). A study related to the five-factor model of personality revealed that personality changes little after the age of 30 in most people:

“In the course of thirty years, most adults will have undergone radical changes in their life structures. They may have married, divorced, remarried. They have probably moved their residence several times....And yet, most will not have changed appreciably in their standing on any of the five dimensions.”

(Pervin, 1996, p.87)

They characterise the consistency of personality as, in most case, unchanging, fixed, and 'set like plaster'. Pervin (1996), however, points out that such statements must be considered with a certain degree of caution. He argues; first, they are only considering personality of people above the age of 30. Secondly, they are restricting observations to personality defined by the five-factor model. Thirdly, they are defining stability by using a median correlation of .6 on five factors, which, if altered, can give sufficient room for change in the pattern, organisation, or configuration of personality.

Therefore, even though, personality typically does not change, this is not to say that it is perfectly stable or cannot change. There may be factors hindering change that, if altered, would provide for greater change (Pervin, 1996). Accepting this notion, the consistency or stability of personality nevertheless is impressive. Pervin (1996, p.87) explains the reason as “probably of greater importance, however, is the tendency for people to lock themselves into life situations and to define themselves in certain terms once they have
reached a certain age". In other words, people select and shape their environments in order to reinforce their traits. For instance, a person once perceived as extroverted is more likely to behave in ways that confirm that trait.

Again, it is not assumed that personality is entirely consistent, but rather it is assumed that it can, to a limited extent, undergo changes. Such a view allows for the possibility of long-term personality growth and changes over the life-span and short-term fluctuations in personality day to day (Hampson, 1982).

### 3.2.2.5 Distinctiveness

Another prominent property of personality is distinctiveness (Phares, 1991). Personalities show individual differences (Shiffman and Kanuk, 2000). Since the inner characteristics that constitute an individual’s personality are unique factors, no two individuals are exactly alike. Of course, many individuals may be alike and similar in terms of a single personality trait, but not in terms of others. Phares (1991) points out three reasons; first, people all learn but they learn different things and in differing degrees. Secondly, each people thinks but they are often very different thoughts. Thirdly, people all react in differing ways to the same stimuli.

### 3.2.3 Does a Brand Display the Same Characteristics of Human Personality?

In the preceding discussions, the four natures of human personality were introduced; namely behaviour, interaction with the environment (evolve and change), consistency and distinctiveness. In this section, it will be shown how brand can have these four natures of personality, in order to provide the theoretical underpinning of the concept of brand personality.
3.2.3.1 Behaviour enacted by brands

It was shown that behaviour is one of the properties of personality. Then, can a brand act? As previously mentioned, a brand behaves through marketing activities. Olson and Allen (1995) suggest that consumers draw inferences from behaviour enacted by the brand, and thus attributions of brand personality traits are based largely on observations of those behaviours. They argue that brand behaviour can be portrayed in narrative advertising in several different ways. First, brand behaviour can be shown by the brand itself. In this case, the brand itself is animated. For instance, Raid can strides into a room and kill bugs by itself and M & M chocolates are walking in a pair and talking to each other. Secondly, a brand symbol can be animated. The Michelin man and the Energizer rabbit are good examples of this approach. Thirdly, the brand may be associated with a spokesperson such as the association of Virgin group with Richard Branson and Microsoft with Bill Gates.

Although Olson and Allen (1995) provide very fruitful insights into brand personality, there are still limitations in generalising the idea since it is hardly acceptable that brand personalities are only perceived through such advertisements. Fournier (1998) proposes a broader source of behaviour enacted by brands. She argues that all marketing mix activities and brand management decisions (including the everyday execution of marketing plans and tactics) can be considered as behaviour enacted on the part of the brand. Through repeated observations, these behavioural acts are accumulated and translated into trait language and the trait inferences then form the basis for the evaluation of brand personality. Table 3.1 shows the influence of brand behaviours onto perceived personality.
Table 3.1: Brand Behaviour and Perceived Brand Personality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BRAND BEHAVIOUR</th>
<th>PERSONALITY TRAITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequent changes in position, product forms, symbols, advertising etc.</td>
<td>Flighty, schizophrenic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent deals and coupons</td>
<td>Cheap, uncultured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertises extensively</td>
<td>Outgoing, popular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong customer service, easy-to-use package, etc.</td>
<td>Approachable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity of characters, packaging</td>
<td>Familiar, comfortable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High price, exclusive distribution, advertises in upscale magazines</td>
<td>Snobbish, sophisticated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly advertising, endorsers</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association with cultural events, PBS</td>
<td>Culturally aware</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Aaker (1996, p.166)

As shown in Table 3.1, the behaviour enacted by brands, affects perceived brand personality just like a person’s behaviour affects others’ perceptions of his or her personality.

3.2.3.2 Brands’ interaction with environment

In the same way humans change through interaction with environments, brands change in order to catch up changing environment; customer tastes and company cultures evolve, technology advances and competitors enter and leave the market.

Most successful brands have tried to evolve in order to cope with continuously changing market environment while still being true to their long established heritage. By ignoring fundamental changes in the market and potential technological breakthroughs, many
brands have become vulnerable and some have disappeared from the market (Aaker, 1991; 1996).

A brand can evolve in many different ways. A symbol can be changed to keep the brand updated. Betty Crocker, the General Mills symbol, could be a good example. Betty Crocker has changed seven times since it first appeared in 1936, to become compatible with current attributes and fashions. One interesting point is that all changes to the Betty Crocker symbol were carefully designed to fall below the 'just noticeable difference' (j.n.d.) in order not to lose the ready recognition of the symbol that has been built over a long period of time. (Schiffman and Kanuk, 2000)

Brand names can also change to reflect the brand's evolved concepts. Kentucky Fried Chicken, for instance, decided to shorten its name to KFC to avoid the association with fried food in order to cope with the public's increasing concern about health. The name General Electric was associated with electricity and was considered relatively old-fashioned and narrow. To de-emphasise it, General Electric shortened its name to GE. The new GE name is considered modern, high-tech and broader in scope (Aaker, 1996). In addition, brands can also evolve by changing slogans, introducing new products, adding new users imagery and so on.

Fournier (1998) sees brands as active and live objects similar to people. The relationship between brands and consumers is considered as interactive as between persons. She suggests that all marketing activities and brand management decisions (including the everyday execution of marketing plans and tactics) can be seen as behaviour enacted on the part of the brand.

3.2.3.3 Consistency of brand personality

Most successful brands have remarkable histories of consistent core attributes or personality (Aaker, 1991). Ivory has kept their core personality 'purity' since 1881, with the slogan 'It floats'. Marlboro has also shown consistency in its core concept for a very
long time. Since the Marlboro man was introduced in the 1950s, it has kept its independent, outdoorsy, rugged and masculine personality. There is a host of other examples such as Volvo (reliable, safe), Mercedes (elegance), Levi’s (rugged, outdoorsy), Amex (upper scale, sophisticated) etc.

This is not to say that a brand should not be changed. As previously shown, a brand evolves in order to cope with its environment. For example, GE (General Electric) has changed its slogan, campaign, and logo several times since 1916. However, it has maintained its single and core idea of the brand - ‘better living from electricity/technology’ - that provides a strong and consistent personality of the brand and a basis for a relationship with the customer for a long time period. Aaker (1996) also argues that if the marketing activities support a consistent positioning strategy over time, the brand tends to have a stronger personality and be more successful. To the contrary, if there was no consistency in core concepts, the personality of the brand would be muddied.

3.2.3.4 Distinctiveness of brand personality

Just like human personality shows individual differences, brand personality distinguishes brands. Both practitioners (e.g. Ogilvy, 1983; Plummer, 2000) and academics (e.g. Aaker, 1997; Siguaw, Austin and Mattila, 1999) agree that brand personality differentiates a brand from other brands in a product category. Karande, Zinkhan and Lum (1997) argue that the distinction made by brand personality provides a critical advantage to the brand especially in a competitive or mature market.

The preceding discussions showed how key elements of human personality can be distinguished in brand personality. It appears that personalities are characterised by their ability to enact behaviour, their ability to change and adapt in interaction with the environment, their consistency in displaying particular attributes or behaviours and their distinctiveness.
Based on this, it can be inferred that for each of these factors, the more a brand displays the characteristics, the more the brand will be perceived as a personality, that is, the more consumers will use personality terms when they describe and evaluate brands.

3.2.4 Relationship between Consumers and Brands

Fournier (1998) argues that consumers and brands are able to have strong emotional attachments. She sees brand and consumer relationships as active and live, just as between persons. Her concept is inspired by the act frequency theory (Buss and Craik, 1983), which suggests that key indicator of a person’s personality can be revealed by a repeated observation of trait-relevant behaviour. Fournier understands all marketing activities and brand management decisions (including the everyday execution of marketing plans and tactics) as behaviours enacted on the part of the brand.

Fournier suggests three propositions: first, brands can and do serve as viable relationship partners; secondly, consumer and brand relationship are valid at the level of lived experience; thirdly, consumers and brand relationships can be specified in many ways. To qualify these propositions, she adopts four conditions from interpersonal relationship research. They are: relationships involve reciprocal exchange between active and interdependent relationship partners; relationships are purposive, involving at their core the provision of meanings to the persons who engage them; relationships are multiplex phenomena; relationships are process phenomena.

Fournier (1998) addresses that a strong relationship between a customer and a brand is likely to generate strong emotional ties and feelings, which are much greater than simple notion of brand preference. Customers in strong relationships with brands often exhibit very strong emotional attachments and consider them as irreplaceable and inseparable from their life. She argues that high levels of commitment, intimacy and durable relationship bonds are also common across strong brand relationships.
3.2.4.1 A brand as extended self

"Indeed consumers appear to have little trouble assigning personality qualities to all sort of inanimate products, from personal care products to more mundane, functional ones" (Solomon, 1999, p.172).

As Solomon mentioned, the notion of brand personality (i.e. projection of humanlike characteristics onto brands) has been pervasive in our everyday life (Aaker, 1997). Furthermore, many researchers agree that brand personality is a key to understanding the symbolic importance of consumption in our lives; contrary to the traditional view of function-oriented consumption (e.g. Heylen, et al, 1995; Siguaw et al., 1999). This line of thought may support Fournier's (1998) view that consumers can build emotional relationships with brands, just like relationship between persons, since consumers treat brands using humanlike characteristics that may evoke similar feelings they have towards people.

Through his research on possessions and the extended self, Belk (1988) supports the possibility of the existence of emotional ties between consumers and products and the use of brand personality in evaluating brands. Although his research concentrates on the relationship between possessions and consumers, he argues that this kind of relationship can be expanded to intangible services as well.

The notion that we are what we have and consume is not new (Tuan, 1980; Belk, 1988; Schiffman and Kanuk, 2000). It seems an inescapable fact of modern life that we learn, define and remind ourselves of who we are by our possessions. In other words, possessions are an important component of the possessor's sense of self. Thus, the notion of we are what we have is perhaps the most basic and important fact in consumer behaviour (Belk, 1988).

A number of studies support the preceding point of view. Prelinger (1959) tested James's (1890) hypothesis that possessions are viewed as parts of self. He had eight conceptual categories with 20 items in each. Subjects sorted the 160 items (8 × 20) onto a four
position (zero to three) continuum of not-self to self. The result in descending order was as follows: (1) body parts, (2) psychological or intraorganismic processes, (3) Personal identifying characteristics and attributes, (4) possessions and productions, (5) abstract ideas, (6) other people, (7) objects within the close physical environment, (8) distant physical environment. Although Prelinger included some autonomic bodily productions (e.g. perspiration), the results still support the premise that possessions are regarded as part of self (Belk, 1988).

Belk (1987; 1988) also examined a number of different concepts such as places, public monuments, experiences, time, motion picture, objects and people, in terms of extended self. The results revealed that, of these categories, people, places, experiences and objects seemed to be seen as the clearest part of extended self.

Further evidence that people consider objects as part of self may be found in the diminished sense of self when possessions are unintentionally lost or stolen by theft or casualty. Rosenblatt, Walsh and Jackson (1976) suggest that burglary victims show a similar process of grief and mourning to how one might grieve and mourn the death of a loved one who had been a part of one’s life. More evidence of the role of possessions in sense of self is found in anthropological studies. Beaglehole (1932) suggests the link between possessions and self by showing the way possessions are treated ritually after death.

Sartre (1943) explains three primary ways through which we learn to regard an object as a part of self. The first way is controlling an object for our own personal use. For instance, a person’s clothing, housing and automobiles can be seen as a ‘second skin’ (Belk, 1988) in which others may see them. These objects really become parts of the extended self.

Sartre also argues that appropriate intangible or nonownable objects can be part of extended self by overcoming, conquering, or mastering them. This argument provides an explanation of how intangible services and public property or events become viewed as possessions and thereby contribute to sense of self (Belk, 1988).
The second way, through which we consider an object as a component of self, is creating it. The idea that we make things a part of self by creating appears to be a universal human belief (Belk, 1988). Csikszentmihalyi and Rochberg-Halton (1981) provide plausible psychological explanation in suggesting that people invest 'psychic energy' in an object to which they have directed their efforts, time and attention. This energy and its products are regarded as part of self because they have grown or emerged from the self. Since the development of financial payment for labour, buying an object has become another type of investing in self. Thus purchasing goods or choosing a brand is merely another form of creating the object (Sartre, 1943).

The third way in which objects become part of self is by knowing them. For example, household furnishings may become part of us, because, through the knowing that comes with habituation, they become part of our familiar interior landscapes. In this sense, brands could be a big part of our self since it is not an exaggeration that we are surrounded by a plethora of brands in our life. Indeed, we are living in a rich 'brandscape' (Biel, 1993, p.67). We start a day with brands and finish it with brands. For instance, a person awakes to the sound of a Sony electronic alarm and like thousands of other individuals, drinks Maxwell coffee and drives his Ford to work. In this way, an ordinary person comes into contact with thousands of brands everyday. We are habituated to brands.

### 3.3. Measurements of Brand Personality

In spite of the importance of brand personality, only limited attention has been given to the development of a reliable and valid measurement scale. In many studies of brand personality, researchers have tended to use scales which are ad hoc or adopted directly from the human personality field, but are not validated in the context of brands (Aaker, 1997). Moreover, there has been confusion between the measurement of brand image and
personality in many studies (e.g. McDougall and Fry, 1974-1975; Karande et al., 1997).

This section will delineate the various measurement scales used for measuring brand personality. At the end of this section, the Brand Personality Scale (BPS), the most popular measurement scale of brand personality, will be introduced in detail.

Although there have been a number of different techniques used to measure brand personality, the measurement of brand personality can be divided into two broad categories; qualitative and quantitative methods.

### 3.3.1 Qualitative Methods for Measuring Brand Personality

While many researchers have not agreed on the most appropriate technique for measuring consumers' perception of a brand, some researchers suggest the qualitative method as a superior and more relevant technique (e.g. Plummer, 2000; Day, 1989; Hussey and Duncombe, 1998). The advocates of qualitative methods argue that the semantic differential scale, a popular quantitative method of measuring brand concepts, tends to involve a forced-choice measure and may not include important attributes (McDougall and Fry, 1974-1975). In other words, they believe that the structured model of quantitative methods may encourage subjects to respond to characteristics that do not necessarily comprise their perceptions, and do not include the attributes they have of the brand being studied. Therefore, they suggest that a more appropriate measurement could be achieved by the use of unstructured qualitative methods (McDougall and Fry, 1974-1975).

Qualitative methods can be divided into direct methods (e.g. open ended questions) and indirect methods (e.g. photo sorts, free association, story completion, personification etc.). Many researchers believe that the indirect method is more appropriate in eliciting consumers' true feelings towards a brand, since respondents may have difficulty responding to direct open-ended questions on how they feel about a brand (Day, 1989).
In this line, the projective technique which broadly refers to all indirect methods of eliciting thoughts and feelings, has become one of the most popular methods for measuring consumers' perception of a brand including brand image and brand personality (e.g. Plummer, 2000; Sampson, 1993; Heylen et al., 1995). Projective techniques usually involve presenting subjects with ambiguous stimuli, to which they may respond as they wish. The theoretical background of the technique is that since the stimuli presented are ambiguous and do not require a specific response, the subject tends to project his or her personality onto the stimuli (Day, 1989).

In qualitative research, this technique encourages subjects to project their perception and feelings onto some other object or person and thus make the subjects feel freer in expressing their true perceptions and feelings. Therefore, a researcher can overcome several barriers to communication, such as unawareness of underlying motivations, unwillingness to disclose certain feelings and rationalisations etc (Day, 1989).

There are a number of different projective techniques in measuring the personality of a brand. To find out personalities of brands, for example, Plummer (2000) gave respondents lists of 29 different animals, 25 activities, 17 fabrics, 35 occupations, 20 nationalities and 21 magazines, and then asked the respondents to create symbols for each brand. He found that respondents had little problem in conducting this procedure. For Oil of Olay, for instance, he found that the animal was mink, the country was France, the occupation was secretary, the fabric was silk, the activity was swimming and the magazine was Vouge (Plummer, 2000, p. 30). Using these symbols he induced brand personality profiles of the brands studied.

The followings are the examples of the projective techniques used in measuring brand personality.

- Creating a fantasy situation: This approach requires that respondents imagine a scenario. Respondents, for example, might be asked to imagine that they at a ten
year class reunion of various brands of shampoo. They could be asked to describe how the brands talked, acted and so on (Day, 1989).

- **Personification of a brand**: This method involves that subjects create a personality for an inanimate brand. Researchers might ask subjects that if X brand were a person, how would you describe the person or they, more specifically, ask respondents to pick a popular spokesperson for the brand such as celebrities, politicians, athletics, etc (Day, 1989).

- **Cartoon, story completion**: This fairly common projective method employs incomplete stimuli. In this approach, subjects are often asked to complete a cartoon dialogue, a sentence or a story. According to Day (1989), these techniques are especially useful to elicit consumers' negative perceptions towards a brand.

However, although, these qualitative techniques have been lauded for allowing the contents of brand personality and brand image to be uncovered by permitting feelings to emerge, they have been criticised for many shortcomings. McDougall and Fry (1974-1975) point out that qualitative methods requires more verbal skills from the respondents and greater interpretive skills in analysis. In this line, Dobni and Zinkhan (1990) also argue that qualitative methods have limitations in data handling and the statistical response of responses. Therefore, these qualitative methods are often dropped in the latter stages of research since marketers and researchers look for more quantitative ways to examine and detect differences among competing brands (Aaker and Fournier, 1995).

### 3.3.2 Quantitative Methods for Measuring Brand Personality

The most commonly used quantitative method for measuring brand personality is the semantic differential scale (Malhotra, 1981; Karande, Zinkhan and Lum, 1997). The semantic differential scale consists of bipolar adjectives (e.g. simple/complex, rugged/delicate) separated by a scale, often five or seven. The major advantages of this
scale include ease in data handling and administration, provision of quantifiable data, minimal verbal skill require and relative high reliability (McDougall and Fry, 1974-1975; Malhotra, 1981).

As an example, Karande, Zinkhan and Lum (1997) measured the brand personality of three automobile brands using semantic differential scales developed by Malhotra (1981). Malhotra’s scale is based on fifteen semantic differential items which were selected from the initial lists of 27 items, using seven-point response format (Malhotra, 1981). These scale items include; modest/ vain, colourless/ colourful, complex/ simple, orthodox/ liberal, formal/ informal, youthful/ mature, rational/ emotional, organized/ unorganized, contemporary/ non-contemporary, pleasant/ unpleasant, thrifty/ indulgent, dominating/ submissive, uncomfortable/ comfortable, excitable/ calm and rugged/ delicate. In that research, Karande, Zinkhan and Lum (1997) found that the scale was reliable and valid in showing different personalities of different automobile brands. They also cross checked the results from the scale and the responses from the open-ended questions and found that they are significantly related.

However, the scales using semantic differential scales for measuring brand personality have been criticised for a number of reasons. First, most brand personality scales developed in this way tends to be ad-hoc in nature (i.e. they have been often developed for the purposes of a specific study) (McDougall and Fry, 1974; Aaker, 1997). Therefore, important attributes could be missing from such scales and irrelevant traits could be included, which casts doubt on the scales’ reliability and validity. Secondly, the use of semantic differential scales, which involve the choice of words with opposite meanings, is often arbitrary and sometimes inaccurate (Briggs, 1992; Aaker, 1995). Thirdly, some of the scales developed are based on the human personality field and thus have not been validated in the context of brands (Aaker, 1997). Although some dimensions of human personality are similar to those of brands, others are not. As a result, the validity of such brand personality scales is often questionable. Indeed, in their study using the Big Five model of human personality, Caprara et al.(2001) assert that human personality may
serve for construing a brand personality, but only to a certain extent; therefore the human personality model needs to be revised and adapted when applied to products or brands.

### 3.3.2.1 The Brand Personality Scale (BPS)

The Big Five model of human personality reduces the large number of adjectives describing human personalities into only five latent dimensions. Inspired by this, Aaker (1997) found that dimensions of brand personality can be defined by extending those of human personality to that of brands (see Chapter 2 for details). Using those dimensions of brand personality, she developed a framework intended to capture the generic dimensions of brand personality. Aaker proposed the framework as a standard, universal way to measure brand personality.

A rigid set of procedures were employed to develop and evaluate the scale. From the initial lists of 309 personality attributes, which were generated by a list of traits used in human personality psychology and marketing studies, she conducted multiple studies employing 37 brands from a wide range of product and service categories. Finally, she identified five underlying dimensions of brand personality. These were labelled as competence, sincerity, excitement, sophistication and ruggedness. At the next stage, these five dimensions were again factor analysed individually, to find facets which can accurately represent each dimension. The result of the five individual factor analyses was a total of 15 facets. In the final stage, she selected 42 traits which best represent the 15 facets in order to provide a reliable scale. Using those 42 identified traits, she developed the brand personality scale (BPS), which can be used to measure brand personality across product categories. Figure 3.1 depicts Aaker's 5 dimensions, 15 facets and 42 traits of brand personality.
Figure 3.1: The Brand Personality Model

The Brand Personality Scale (BPS) employs a five point scale ranging from ‘1’ (not at all descriptive) to ‘5’ (extremely descriptive). Respondents are asked to rate the extent to which the 42 personality traits describe a specific brand (Aaker, 1997).

The BPS has been shown to be valid and reliable in various settings. For example, in a study measuring personality of mobile phone brands in Korea, Kim et al., (2001) confirmed the five dimensions and suggested that the BPS is a valid and reliable instrument.

Source: Adapted from Aaker, (1997, p. 352-354)
3.3.2.2 The generic quality of brand personality dimensions

Aaker (1997) argues that the five dimensions of the scale are generic and can be used to measure brand personality across product categories. Several studies have been conducted in order to examine the generic quality of brand personality dimensions. Most of these studies, however, were conducted in terms of cross-culture settings rather than different brand contexts.

Ferrandi, Florence and Falcy (2000) examined the dimensions of brand personality in France. Using an exploratory approach, they found five dimensions of brand personality; sincerity, dynamism, femininity, robustness and conviviality. Although there was a partial structure and semantic correspondence with Aaker's dimensions, the same dimensions were not replicated. Similarly, Aaker, Benet-Martinez and Garolera (2001) assessed Japanese and Spanish brand personality structures. The brand personality found among Japanese were: excitement, competence, peacefulness, sincerity and sophistication, while the specific dimensions found among Spanish consumers were: excitement, sincerity, sophistication, peacefulness and passion. Like the case of Ferrandi et al., relative consistency in the specific set of brand personality dimensions was found, but the specific dimensions of Aaker's (1997) were not exactly replicated. As a result, Aaker et al. (2001) concluded that the dimensions of brand personality may vary across different cultures.

Venable et al. (2002) examined the dimensions of brand personality in different brand contexts, namely non-profit organisations. They found a five factor solution: effective/competent, sophistication, ruggedness, nurturance and excitement. Again, a five dimensional structure was found but the original five dimensions were not retained.

In a study of brand personality using the Big Five model, Caprara et al. (2001) found that the same personality traits located under different factors when comparing different brands. They argue that this phenomenon is similar to 'concept-scale interaction' in the semantic differential approach. Concept-scale interaction refers to the notion that the meaning and relationship of adjectives vary depending on the concept to which the
adjective refers and is based on the fact that adjectives may have different degrees of relevance in different contexts (Caprara et al., 2001). They describe this phenomenon as 'brand-adjective interaction' and explain that personality traits may convey different meanings when used to describe different brands (Caprara et al., 2001, p.391). In other words, the same personality traits may imply different meanings and locate under different factors when describing different brands. These preceding discussions suggest that the dimensions of brand personality may not be consistent across different cultures and brand settings and thus may need to be revised when applied to different settings such as hospitality brands.

3.4 Summary

This chapter dealt with the underpinning concept of brand personality. The theory of anthropomorphism provided the psychological and anthropological backgrounds of the concept (i.e. why people use human characteristics to inanimate objects). It discussed how key elements of human personality can be distinguished in brand personalities. It appears that personalities are characterised by their ability to enact behaviour, their ability to change and adapt in interaction with the environment, their consistency in displaying particular attributes or behaviour and their distinctiveness.

Accordingly, the author suggests that for each of these factors, the more a brand displays the characteristic, the more the brand will be perceived as a personality, that is, the more consumers will use personality terms when they describe and evaluate brands.

In the following part of the chapter, various types of brand personality measurements were shown and their advantages and disadvantages were discussed. Finally, the chapter concluded by introducing the Brand Personality Scale (BPS), the most popular measurement of brand personality, developed by Aaker, (1997).
Scale (BPS), which consists of 5 dimensions, 15 facets and 42 traits, has been found to be reliable and valid in various settings. However, the generic quality of brand personality dimensions has been questioned when applied to different contexts. It appears to be that the dimensions of brand personality may differ across different culture and brand settings.
CHAPTER 4
CHAPTER FOUR

LITERATURE REVIEW: BRAND PERSONALITY IN THE RESTAURANT INDUSTRY

4.1 Introduction

The hospitality product has a number of unique characteristics compared to the manufacture goods, such as intangibility, perishability, heterogeneity and inseparability. In the hospitality industry, it is believed that creating clearly defined brand personality has important implications in brand management (Lewis, 1981b; Berry, 2000). Despite growing interests in brand personality in the hospitality industry, however, remarkably few studies have been conducted in this field.
The purpose of this chapter is to review the existing literature on the restaurant industry and its relationship with brand personality. At the outset of this chapter, the characteristics of service products are addressed in contrast to manufacturing goods, followed by the introduction of the restaurant industry and the unique characteristics of the restaurant product. The classifications of restaurant products are presented and discussed. In the following part, the unique characteristics of hospitality branding are explored. Then, literature in the field of restaurant choice attributes is reviewed, to identify brand image attributes of restaurant brands. Finally, brand personality studies in the context of restaurant branding are examined.

4.2 The Restaurant Industry

4.2.1 Services and Goods

Since the restaurant product is part of the service industry, it is essential to distinguish services from goods before illustrating the characteristics of restaurant product.

"A service is an activity or series of activities of more or less intangible nature that normally, but not necessarily, take place in interactions between the customer and service employees and/or physical resources or goods and/or systems of the service provider, which are provided as solutions to customer problems" (Gronroos, 1990, p.27).

Services are very difficult to define and to classify. This is due to the fact that the distinction between goods and services is not always clear (Hoffman and Bateson, 1997) and because services themselves vary from one to another (Lewis and Chambers, 2000). Although Hoffman and Bateson (1997, p.5) explained the distinction between services and goods as ‘goods can be defined as objects, devices, or things; whereas services can be defined as deeds, efforts, or performances’, they argue that there are only a few services that do not include goods elements and vice versa.
The major differentiation of services from goods is the notion of intangibility (Lewis and Chambers, 2000). Therefore, we can assume that 'pure goods' means that the customer obtains benefit only from the item itself without any added value from service; on the other hand, 'pure service' implies that there is no tangible element to the service which the customer receives. In reality, however, most services contain some goods element and vice versa. For instance, airlines provide food and drinks as a part of their transportation service and hotels offer rooms, which are fairly tangible, along with their services. Similarly, manufacturers provide services such as delivery, maintenance and training programmes along with their products. As such, it is very difficult to provide an example of a pure good or a pure service.

Hoffman and Bateson (1997) suggested 'the scale of market entities' which display a range of products based on their tangibility. Figure 4.1 shows the scale of market entities.

Figure 4.1: Scale of Market Entities

Source: Hoffman and Bateson (1997, p.7)
According to the scale of market entities, pure goods are tangible dominant, while pure services are intangible dominant. Firms such as fast food restaurants, which contain both a goods and service component, fall in the middle of the scale. Companies that manufacture goods and pay no attention to intangible elements (service) of their offering are overlooking a vital component of their business.

4.2.1.1 Characteristics of services

There are a number of differences between services and goods. Four of these characteristics of services are those identified in the majority of the literature: intangibility, perishability, heterogeneity and inseparability.

Intangibility

Intangibility is the primary source from which the other three characteristics emerge (Hoffman and Bateson, 1997). This means that services cannot be displayed, so they cannot be seen, felt, heard, tasted or smelled before they are purchased (Kotler, Bowen and Makens, 1999). In the case of goods, buyers can evaluate items before the actual purchase, for the purchase of a car, for example, a buyer can examine in detail the colour, features and even test-drive it to see its performance. In contrast, restaurant customers have nothing but the promise of quality food and warm service; they usually cannot try the food before actual purchase.

Moreover, Lewis and Chambers (2000) mentioned that services are experienced rather than possessed. Thus, after the purchasing of products, customers have nothing but experience to remember and to talk about.

Perishability

Perishability refers to the traits that services cannot be stored (Hoffman and Bateson, 1997). Unlike goods which can be stored and sold at a later time, services that are not sold
when they become available cannot be sold at a later date. For example, a producer of televisions who is unable to sell all his output in the current period can carry forward stocks to sell in a subsequent one. In contrast, hotel rooms that are not sold that evening cannot be stored and sold at a later date. This perishability factor causes many difficulties to service firms when demand fluctuates (Palmer, 1994; Hoffman, 1997; Kotler, Bowen and Makens, 1999).

Inseparability

Inseparability in services means that services are produced and consumed at the same time and cannot be separated from their providers (Kotler, Bowen, and Makens, 1999). Goods are produced then sold and later consumed. On the other hand, services are first sold, then produced and consumed at the same time and usually in the same place. Lewis and Chambers (2000) named this characteristic as ‘simultaneity of production and consumption’ and mentioned that in the case of services the buyer must be present to experience (consume) the service provided (produced) by the seller. Thus, production and consumption occur simultaneously. These interactions between sellers and buyers often result in interpersonal relationships that may supersede the service itself.

Heterogeneity

Every service performance is unique to each customer and service producer. Simply because human beings are not machines, a service to one customer is not exactly the same as the service to the next (Gronroos, 1990).

Kotler, Bowen and Makens (1999) explained these characteristics as follows. First, services are produced and consumed simultaneously, which limits quality control. Secondly, fluctuating demand makes it difficult to deliver consistent products during periods of peak demand. Thirdly, the high degree of contact between the service provider and the guest means that product consistency depends on the service provider’s skills and
performance at the time of the exchange. For example, a guest can receive excellent service one day and mediocre service from the same person the next day.

4.2.2 The Restaurant Business

The term ‘restaurant’ covers a broad range of food service operations. The word originally comes from the French word ‘restaurant’ meaning ‘restorers of energy’ (Powers, 1995). Nowadays, in a broad way, “any public place that specializes in the sale of prepared food for consumption on or off premise” can be described as a restaurant (Powers, 1995, p.28).

Standard Industrial Classifications (SIC) were designed to classify the UK industries. They were first employed in 1948 to provide uniform statistical records of industrial growth and activity. According to SIC, the hotel and catering industry is defined as “establishments providing meals, light refreshments, drink or accommodation” (Jones, 1988, p.14). Table 4.1 shows the classification and the category under which the different kinds of hospitality operations are grouped.
Table 4.1: Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) for the Hotel and Catering Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIC activity</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6611</td>
<td>Eating places providing food for consumption on the premises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6612</td>
<td>Take away food shops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6620</td>
<td>Public houses and bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6630</td>
<td>Night clubs and licensed clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6640</td>
<td>Canteens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Contractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6650</td>
<td>Hotel trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6670</td>
<td>Other tourism and short-stay accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Camping and caravans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. holiday camps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Jones (1988, p.14)

Since the last modification of the SIC was made in 1980, it obviously does not reflect the rapid changes in the way people are served and the services are offered. Therefore, the classification has been criticised in that it does not adequately cover the whole industry as it stands today (Davis and Lockwood, 1994). Davis and Stone (1991) give a better perspective of the different outlets in the hotel and catering industry, as shown in Figure 4.2.
Figure 4.2: Classification of the Hotel and Catering Industry

Hotel and catering outlets

1. COMMERCIAL
   (Public or private ownership)
   (catering main or secondary activity)

   (i) Restricted Market
   a. Transport catering
   b. Transport catering
   c. Some institutional and employee catering

   (ii) General Market

   a. Hotels
   b. Restaurants and snack bars
   c. Fast food and take-away
   d. Pubs

2. SUBSIDIZED OR WELFARE

   A. Institutional Catering
   a. School
   b. University and colleges
   c. Hospitals
   d. The services

   B. Employee Catering
   a. Prisons

Source: Davis and Stone (1991, p.4).

As shown in Figure 4.2, the hotel and catering industry can be divided into two sectors; commercial and subsidised. The main distinction between the two sectors is the way they operate their service delivery system. The commercial sector refers to those outlets where profit is the main raison for running the business, oriented towards two important markets; restricted and general markets. The restaurant business is categorised under the general market in the commercial sector.

The restaurant business plays an important role in society, since eating out is now a part of most consumers' lives. According to the National Restaurant Association (NRA), the restaurant business is the third largest of all businesses in the United States. One of every three meals eaten in the US is eaten away from home, constituting 42 percentage of total food expenditure. Americans dine out about 200 times a year, or about 4 times a week (Walker, 2004; Lundberg, 1994).
In the UK, although the economy was hampered by the recession in the early 1990s, the size of foodservice market has increased steadily. In 2002, approximately £25 billion was spent on eating-out; representing 34% of the total food sales in the UK (British Hospitality Association, 2003). Growth in the number of foodservice outlets has also increased. Table 4.2 shows the number restaurant enterprises register for VAT between 1994 and 2000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Enterprises</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>43,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>42,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>42,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>43,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>44,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>45,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>45,875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Key Note (2000, p.14)

As shown in Table 4.2, in 2000, 45,875 enterprises were registered for VAT in the UK, an increase of 1.7% on 1998. The market has been buoyant in recent years, with increases in the consumer spending and outlet numbers. This trend has encouraged new entrants and world leading restaurant chains to expand in the UK. Several factors have contributed to this growth. They are: 1) increases in disposable income, 2) growing demand for convenience foods, 3) changing demographics and life style such as more single households and working women, 4) increases in leisure times, 5) increased tourism and 6) more restaurant choices (Key Note, 2000).

These trends in growth seem to last for a while into the future. The British Hospitality Association (2003) reports very promising prospects for the future of the UK foodservice industry. Figure 4.3 represents the growth trends in the UK foodservice market until 2036.
As shown in Figure 4.3, it is estimated that the foodservice (eating out) market in the UK will reach approximately £37.5 billion, representing 50% of the total food market some time after the year 2035.

In this research, restaurants were defined as; “eating places supplying meals or food for consumption on the premises.” (Key Note, 2000, p.2) This rather narrow definition of restaurants does not include home delivery outlets and some fast food outlets. According to Lockwood (1994), however, the delivery of food and beverage service is composed of different ‘ingredients’ from restaurants. He argues the eating experience is basically a service activity rather than a product; although it has both product and service elements. Following this logic, the focus of this research is on the dining market rather than the eating marketing, which also includes off-premise operations such as take-away and delivery outlets.
4.2.3 Classification of Restaurants

There is a great variety of restaurants from an upscale premium restaurant in a city to a small café in the countryside. The restaurant sector covers both single outlets and chains of eating establishments located in high streets, shopping malls, out of town locations, transport terminals and roadside locations. Nowadays, the market is becoming increasingly segmented with key sectors being theme restaurants, pub restaurants, roadside restaurants, premium outlets and so on. Although there is not a single classification rule for restaurant sectors, restaurants are usually classified by 1) menu items offered and quality of food, 2) menu prices, 3) service, and 4) ambiance (Lundberg, 1994, p.220). For instance, service, in particular, may include table service, counter service, self-service, and take-away service and so on.

Powers (1995) classifies various types of restaurants in terms of their price level and the meal experience that is provided as shown in Figure 4.4
The meal experience includes the services and amenities provided but it also includes factors such as the time available, the importance of convenience, the degree to which the meal is utilitarian (Powers, 1995).

In the UK, Key Note (Key Note, 2000) market report classified restaurant into nine categories using the factors such as menu items and services provided, price and ambiance. They are:

- Premium Restaurants
- Casual Dining Restaurants
- Themed Restaurants
- Pizza & Pasta Restaurants
- Burger Restaurants
- Steak Houses
• Pub Restaurants
• Roadside Restaurants
• Ethnic Restaurants

Although the above classifications give some clues to understanding different restaurant sectors, it is becoming difficult to define a single type of restaurant establishment which exactly fall into one category (Knowles, 1994). For example, whereas major operations such as McDonalds or Burger King are relatively easily identifiable as burger restaurants or QSRs, there are thousands of restaurants from other categories offering burger products. Therefore, the distinction between categories of restaurant products is not always clear.

4.2.4 Characteristics of the Restaurant Product

As a service industry, the restaurant product also has the four characteristics of services; intangibility, perishability, heterogeneity and inseparability.

As Lockwood (1994) pointed out, restaurants provide intangible services as well as tangible products for customers. The tangible part consists of the physical elements such as food and beverage products, facilitating goods (table, china, glass, cutlery) and even the pricing and marketing strategy, while the intangible part is composed of the standard of service quality and the image and reputation of the restaurant. According to Lewis (1981b) the more tangible a product, the easier it is to evaluate whereas for an intangible weighted product, the opposite is true. He further argues that the tangible part of a hospitality product tends to have a short-term cognitive and effective impact, whereas services have a more enduring effect. However the intangible components of a service product are perceived subjectively and therefore difficult to define and measure.

Lockwood (1994) introduces two levels of categorisation of restaurant product on the basis of a framework: ‘the characteristics of experience’ and ‘the nature of contact’. Figure 4.5 represents the quality characteristics matrix of the restaurant product.
**Figure 4.5: The Quality Characteristics Matrix: Restaurant product**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of experiences</th>
<th>Tangible</th>
<th>Intangible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The food and beverage product</td>
<td></td>
<td>Atmosphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating goods: cutlery, china, glass and etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information: menu, black board.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Comfort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Script</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrective action</td>
<td>Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Lockwood (1994, p.174)

In the first level, both product and service are tangible. If it is a product, the tangibility is relatively obvious; such as food, cutlery and so on. If it is a service, then the tangible part refers to actions, speed, or the process of corrective action. On the second level (intangible), both service and product contain a higher level of abstraction. For instance, a tangible product may be used to form an atmosphere, aesthetics and feelings at the intangible level, whereas a service may correspond to friendliness, care or assurance. While this sort of framework emphasises two levels of abstraction, the definition of two criteria, the characteristics of experience and the nature of contact, is rather ambiguous in this matrix.

Like other hospitality products such as hotels and airlines, restaurant products are perishable. A restaurant has a fixed number of tables available for sale on any given day and it is the task of management to create demand for these tables. If a table is not used one day, the day is lost forever, and the restaurant cannot put it into the inventory to sell it.
the next day. For customers, an anniversary or birthday dinner only has value at a specific
time, and they cannot postpone the occasion to the following day.

Heterogeneity is one of the characteristics of a restaurant product. Manuals may well
describe exactly what every employee in a large restaurant is supposed to do in any given
situation, but they can never predict what individuals with various backgrounds,
orientations and personalities will actually do in a given situation (Lewis and Chambers,
2000). For example, the service received at the same restaurant may be significantly
different depending on the employees and the visiting time (e.g. peak and off-peak). Even
the service conducted by the same employee can vary significantly.

When the services are provided by restaurants, both the providers and customers must be
in the same place and at the same time and even the customers are actively involved in part
of the service delivery process. For instance, in most restaurants, the entire process (food
preparation, service delivery, food consumption etc.) is experienced on the premise.

Apart from the characteristics of a service, the restaurant product also has a number of
unique characteristics. Medlik and Airey (1978, p.74) defined several characteristics of the
restaurant product. They are; 1) the goods sold are usually consumed on the premises, 2) the
buyer is able to determine the quantity of the goods purchased in a retail shop, but in a
restaurant the caterer determines the quantity (i.e. portion size), 3) the caterer also
determines quality as in most cases the customer orders the meal without seeing it before
the order is placed, 4) the caterer is a producer of material as well as a retailer of goods,
and 5) the caterer’s mode of operation is different from the retailer (e.g. cycle of operation
from receipt of raw materials to the sale of the finished product is short, and stocks are
relatively small).

Lockwood (1994) identified unique characteristics of restaurant operation. These are as
follows:
The cost of the structure

The appropriate setting for a restaurant may imply a spacious area for the delivery of the service including kitchen, store area and sometimes parking area. This high cost represents a substantial investment in premises for the restaurateur. The business could be highly risky and in some conditions it is not worth the investment of time and money.

The unpredictability

The levels of demand could vary over time. Demand may be influenced by new products in the market, changes in the consumption trend (e.g. vegetarian, imported items), as well as changes in nature affecting the weather and the raw products (e.g. foot and mouth disease). The patterns of consumption fluctuate and therefore it makes it difficult to have an accurate estimation of the real demand.

The short cycle of production

The length of the food production cycle is short. Some raw materials are bought early morning and they have to be consumed by early afternoon. This does not allow staff to make things in advance, before the rush hour. At the same time, the production is influenced by time pressures, and errors cannot easily be corrected.

4.3 Branding in the Restaurant Industry

As discussed in Chapter 2, the brand concept has been well established in marketing since the first brands in a modern marketing sense developed a century ago (Aaker, 1991). However, most discussions of brands are related to physical products (e.g. consumer packed goods). An awareness of the importance of creating service brands has emerged only during the last 10 years (Gronroos, 2000).
Gronroos (2000) believes that service brands are crucially different from goods brands in at least two ways: service as processes and customer involving.

First, because services are perceived in processes in which the customer usually participates, this service process undoubtedly creates a distinction between the service of one provider and that of another. Although other attributes of brand such as, names, terms, signs and so on may also contribute to the brand, the service process (or service production process) has to be at the heart of service brands because it is there that the most profound impression on the customer’s view of the service is created.

Secondly, he argues that in developing physical goods brands, marketers usually use planned marketing communication efforts to develop a distinct brand, and the customer is expected to form an image of the brand that corresponds to the intended brand. This was possible for physical goods because the consumption of goods is ‘outcome consumption’, the consumer does not become involved in the production process, and therefore, the physical goods form a stable base for brand development through planned marketing communication efforts.

However, in the case of service brands, the situation is different. “The importance of customer increases dramatically in brand developing process because a service as a process is a much less standardised base for branding”. Moreover, the customer actually participates in that process, which is the basis for brand development (Gronroos, 2000, p.286).

Apart from the above characteristics, branding in services has another special meaning. According to Berry (2000), branding plays a special role in service firms since strong brands increase customers’ trust of the invisible purchase. More specifically, strong brands help customers to better visualise and understand an intangible product. They reduce customers’ perceived risk in buying services, which are difficult to evaluate prior to purchase. Therefore, brand development is crucial in services, given the inherent difficulty in differentiating products that lack physical differences (Zeithaml, 1981).
4.3.1 Restaurant Brand Image

According to Yuille and Catchpole (1977), image is formed as the result of a sensory process where a person's feelings, ideas and experience with an organisation are retrieved and transformed into mental images. Salient attributes are used to reconstruct image during the customers' evaluation of an image. Therefore, image is the result of an aggregate process by which customers compare and contrast various attributes of brands on important attributes (LeBlanc and Nguyen, 1996).

In a competitive market, the image of a brand is considered as one of the crucial factors that influence consumers' choice behaviour (Chen and Hsu, 2000). However, in the area of hospitality and tourism research, most image studies are related to tourist destination image (e.g. Chen and Hsu, 2000; Baloglu and Brinberg, 1997; Echtner and Ritchie, 1993; 1991; Gartner and Hunt, 1987) and remarkably little has been written on brand image in the context of hospitality brands. There is even less research on identifying brand attributes related to the image of restaurant brands.

Due to the nature of hospitality products, the image studies in the hospitality industry are challenging. Customers often need to evaluate image based on an intangible product, and in many cases must resort to environmental cues and experiences with service personnel (LeBlanc and Nguyen, 1996). Moreover, the nature of inseparability of the hospitality product makes an interactive process of service delivery as a key element affecting the customer's evaluation of the quality of services received and as such can affect customer perceptions of image (LeBlanc and Nguyen, 1996; Babakus and Boller, 1992; Bateson and Hoffman, 1989).

The service marketing literature gives some insight on the factors that have the potential to influence consumers' evaluations of hospitality products. Environmental factors of a service product are crucial when communicating the firm's purpose and image to customers (Bitner, 1992), and could exert a strong effect on employee performance and the quality of service encountered (Baker, 1987). The behaviour of service personnel while
delivering service could also determine the level and quality of services offered by the firm and exert a strong influence on customer satisfaction and overall perception (or image) of service provided (Bitner, Booms and Tetreault, 1990). Indeed, through the SERVQUAL model, Parasuraman et al (1985) indicated that the performance of employees is one of the key factors determining perceived service quality.

Another key objective in the hospitality industry is to provide services in a timely manner to ensure that customers do not have to wait needlessly for service. In line with this, LeBlanc and Nguyen (1996) report that waiting for service could have negative effects on service evaluation and company image.

4.3.1.1 Components of restaurant brand image

With regard to the attributes of brand image, remarkably little research has been conducted in the context of restaurant brands. Most studies conducted on restaurant attributes have focused on consumer choice rather than brand image. Therefore, in this review, brief explanations of existing restaurant studies will be reviewed first in order to delineate what restaurant attributes are mentioned and how they were generated.

Lewis (1981a) suggested five attributes of restaurant; food quality, menu variety, price, atmosphere and convenience factors. These attributes are based on a contents analysis of 270 restaurant advertisements. He further argues that although the importance of those attributes varied according to the type of restaurant, food quality was found to be the most important attribute influencing restaurant selection by consumers. Similarly, June and Smith (1987) suggested five restaurant attributes; namely price, atmosphere, service, quality and liquor licence. However, in the research, they did not discuss how the attributes had been generated.

Filiatrault and Ritchie (1988) identified five restaurant attributes. The selection of the attributes, which consumers evaluate when choosing among restaurants, was made using inputs from a convenience sample of 35 restaurant managers. Freely elicited responses
were subsequently presented to the same group of managers who were then requested to rank those attributes according to their perceived importance to the customer. Following this procedure, the list of attributes was discussed in a group interview session with consumers to ensure relevance and understanding. From the procedures, the identified attributes are: type of cuisine, price, quality of service, ambiance and quality of food.

Auty (1992) also identified ten attributes of restaurant. From a pilot questionnaire (n=40) conducted in a northern English city (Lancaster), a variety of choice factors in the restaurant decision process were collected and then collapsed into ten categories: food type; food quality; value for money; image and atmosphere; location; speed of service; recommended; new experience; opening hours; and facilities for children. Among these categories, Auty concluded that food type and food quality are the most frequently cited choice variables for dining out in restaurants, regardless of occasion.

To find factors that respondents perceived to be important in their choice of restaurant, Clark and Wood (1999) asked respondents (n=31) to rate ten pre-selected aspects of restaurants on a five-point scale. From the results, they found the five most commonly included attributes in respondents' rankings. They are: range of food, quality of food, price of food, atmosphere and speed of service. Similarly, Koo, Tao and Yeung (1999) suggested 9 restaurant attributes. Knutson (2000) and MacLaurin and MacLaurin (2000) considered 13 attributes of quick service restaurant (QSR) and 9 attributes of theme restaurant respectively. Table 4.3 summarises the restaurant attributes cited in the literature.
As shown in Table 4.3, restaurant attributes mentioned by the researcher were marked with dots (•) to find salient attributes of restaurants. It should be noted that some of the studies had focused on specific types of restaurant, and thus not all attributes generated from those studies are applicable to general restaurants. Therefore, those attributes are categorised as 'others'. For example, MacLaurin and MacLaurin (2000) conducted research on the
perceptions of theme restaurants. Among the attributes identified, two attributes; theme
custom and product merchandise, are only applicable to the theme restaurant sector.
Therefore, those attributes are categorised as 'others'.

From the attributes of restaurants, salient attributes (i.e. high frequency in here) can be
considered as image attributes of restaurant brands since only salient attributes are used to
reconstruct consumers’ image (Yuille and Catchpole, 1977). In other words, the more
frequently cited attributes, the more plausible it can be to consider them as the brand image
attributes. This method of determining image attributes has been supported by several
researchers (e.g. Fisk, 1961; James, Durand and Dreves, 1976). James et al. (1976, p.25)
state that “We shall define store image as a set of attitudes based upon evaluation of those
store attributes deemed important by consumers”. From this definition, one could easily
substitute ‘store’ to ‘brand’.

The logic behind this perspective is that the human brain is able to handle only a certain
number of complex stimuli; therefore it simplifies stimuli and accepts only a few salient
meanings. In other words, these simplified images are used to summarise a vast
complexity of values and meanings (Boulding, 1956). Therefore, it is crucial to include
only salient or important attributes in generating image attributes (James, Durand and
Dreves, 1976).

From the review of restaurant image attributes, it is worth noting that the majority of
attributes identified (with possible exception of ‘emotional atmosphere’) are clearly non-
personality and function oriented attributes, and no personality or symbolic attributes are
included in most studies. This result may indicate that most studies in the field of
restaurants have solely focused on the function oriented part of brand image and thus
failed to provide the whole picture of restaurant brand image.
4.3.2 Brand Personality in the Restaurant Industry

The increasing competition within industries makes it difficult for firms to differentiate brands on the basis of functional attributes alone. Furthermore, due to technology advances, a product or service is getting easier to copy based on their attributes and have become functionally more similar to each other (Phau and Lau, 2000). In the case of automobile products, for instance, consumers were asked to rate the importance of such automobile attributes as: comfort, economy, power, appearance and safety. The safety attribute often becomes the most important feature. Responding to these research findings, it would be natural for firms to stress safety in their promotional efforts. However, this kind of strategy was often found not to be successful, since consumers do not see various makers of cars as differing widely with respect to safety. In other words, safety is not a determinant attribute in the actual purchase decision (Lewis, 1983).

As a result, symbolic benefits are increasingly becoming a basis for a brand’s positioning and differentiation (Siguaw et al., 1999). Brand personality, therefore, as a crucial part of symbolic attributes of a brand, has received a great deal of attention from researchers. It is generally believed that in order to build a successful brand in a competitive market, firms should create meaningful and distinctive brand personalities in the minds of customers (Siguaw et al., 1999).

The hospitality industry, where a number of firms that offer nearly identical services are competing within a small area, is not an exception. Since service offerings are easily duplicated, firms have more difficulty in distinguishing their brands from many similar services. Moreover, the intangible nature of service offered in the hospitality industry makes it more difficult for consumers to compare different brands objectively (Lewis, 1981b). Therefore, many hospitality firms have difficulties in finding the right marketing strategy for their brands. For example, for years the strategies of the Quick Service Restaurants (QSR) in the US have focused solely on price. This focus resulted in endless price wars that have weakened customer loyalty and decreased revenues (Siguaw et al., 1999).
To become a successful brand in the hospitality industry, Lewis (1981b) argues that it is essential to differentiate the brand from the product class. In order to distinguish the brand, he further states that firms need to build unique consumer perception of the brand. In other words, hospitality brands need to create unique personalities to differentiate the brands from their competitors. Berry (2000) also suggests that service companies build strong brands through branding distinctiveness and emotional connections with customers, and these branding distinctiveness and emotional connections with customers can be achieved by a conscious effort to carve out a distinctive brand personality.

As a result, recently several restaurant brands have based their communication efforts on the premise of building unique brand personalities to avoid vicious price wars in their competitive market. For example, Wendy’s restaurant has built its personality around its founder, Dave Thomas, who has come to represent the loveable but clumsy guy in search of good fast food. Similarly, McDonald’s has created fun and cheerful personalities, as typified by Ronald McDonald and other cartoonish characters (Siguaw et al., 1999).

4.3.2.1 Measurement of brand personality in the restaurant industry

Although creating a clearly defined brand personality has important implications in brand management in the hospitality industry (Lewis, 1981b; Berry, 2000) and the restaurant industry spends billions of dollars each year to build and maintain brand image (Boone, 1997), there has been little research directed towards determining restaurant brand personalities.

One rare exception is Siguaw et al.’s (1999) study measuring restaurant brand personalities. It adopted Aaker’s Brand Personality Scale (BPS) to identify key points of differentiation between brands within and across classes of restaurant brand. Three categories of a restaurant brand, quick service, casual dining and upscale were selected and within each category, three restaurant brands were chosen. Respondents were asked to rate each using Aaker’s 42-item, five-dimension brand personality scale for each of the nine restaurants. From the study, Siguaw et al. (1999) concluded that brand personality is an effective
means by which to differentiate one restaurant brand from another. However, they also found that most restaurant brands do not effectively use brand personality as a means of brand differentiation, and much improvement is needed.

Even if their study provided fruitful insight into restaurant brand personality, the study was not involved in either validating the scale or determining the dimensions of brand personality in the context of restaurant brands. Although Aaker's scale is deemed reliable and valid in many contexts (e.g. Ferrandi et al., 2000; Kim et al., 2001; Aaker et al., 2001), some researchers argue that it is worth examining the scale before applying it to different settings (Venable, Rose and Gilbert, 2002). Therefore, the validity of Aaker's scale may need to be assessed in the context of restaurant brands.

4.4 Summary

The restaurant product has a number of unique characteristics. As part of the service industry, it has the four characteristics of services (intangibility, perishability, heterogeneity and inseparability). In addition, the restaurant product has a number of unique characteristics of its own. For example, Medlik and Airey (1978, p.74) introduced several characteristics of the restaurant product; 1) the goods sold are usually consumed on the premises, 2) a restaurant the caterer determines the quantity, 3) the caterer also determines quality, as in most cases the customer orders the meal without seeing it before the order is placed, 4) the caterer is a producer of material as well as a retailer of goods and 5) the caterer’s mode of operation is different from the retailer.

Although there is not a single classification rule for restaurant sectors, restaurants are usually classified by menu items offered and quality of food, menu prices, service type and ambiance (Lundberg, 1994). However, it is becoming more and more difficult to define a
single type of restaurant establishment which falls exactly into one category due to the diversity of food offered in modern restaurants.

The review of restaurant image attributes reveals that the majority of attributes identified are clearly non-personality and function oriented attributes. This result may indicate that most studies in the field of restaurants were not involved in identifying the personality component of brand image, and therefore failed to provide the whole picture of restaurant brand image.

In terms of brand personality, only limited studies have been conducted in the field of the restaurant product. Moreover, to date no study has examined validity of either brand personality dimensions or brand personality scale in the context of restaurant brands.
CHAPTER 5
CHAPTER FIVE

STUDY I: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY I -
AN EXAMINATION OF THE BRAND PERSONALITY
SCALE IN THE RESTAURANT INDUSTRY

5.1 Introduction

The objective of this research is to establish the validity of brand personality in the restaurant industry. To do that, this research adopts two complementary studies. This chapter deals with the methodology of the first study (Study I) which aims to achieve the above goal by validating the brand personality scale in the context of restaurant brands. The results of this study will also help to design the experimental conditions for the next study (Study II). Figure 5.1 represents the research process for the Study I & II.
Chapter 5 & 6

Study I: An Examination of the Brand Personality Scale

Study Design I (Chapter 5.2-3, p.117)

Generation of Personality Variables (Chapter 5.4.1 p. 124)

Generation of Non-Personality Variables (Chapter 5.4.2 p. 126)

Selection of Main Analysis Methods: Factor Analysis & Linear Multiple Regression (Chapter 5.5, p.133)

Analysis of the Data & Findings (Chapter 6)

Study II: An Experimental Study of Brand Personality Importance

Study Design II

Selection of Main Analysis Methods: Conjoint Analysis & Linear Multiple Regression

Generation of Assessment Conditions

Analysis of the Data & Findings

Conclusions & Suggestions
The first study (Study I) involves the examination of the brand personality scale in the context of restaurant brands. The objectives of the study are as follows: 1) The dimensions of brand personality in restaurant brands will be investigated; 2) the validity and reliability of the brand personality scale will be examined in the context of restaurant brands; 3) the relationship of brand personality and non-personality attributes as well as their relationship with brand image will be investigated.

Study II (Chapter 7 & 8) deals with the assessment of brand personality in consumers' evaluation of restaurant brands. The experimental conditions of Study II will be based on the results of the first study. It aims to find out when and why consumers use human personality in their evaluation of a brand. Especially, it will investigate the conditions under which consumers use personality cues (versus non-personality cues) to evaluate a brand. In the final stage, the results of both methodologies will help to provide legitimacy to the concept of brand personality by introducing a rigid theoretical and empirical framework of brand personality.

As shown in Figure 5.1, this chapter addresses the methodology of Study I explaining how the research problems of the first study are identified and operationalised. Research design, which concerns research background and objectives will be introduced in the first part, then the sampling and the questionnaire design process will be illustrated. For the purpose of this study, personality and non-personality variables need to be generated. The second part of the chapter will illustrate the generation process of both, personality and non-personality variables. It also demonstrates the analysis of the pilot study, which shows how the final questionnaire was generated. Various data analysis methods selected for this study, such as factor analysis and linear multiple regression will be demonstrated at the end of this chapter. The analysis and findings of Study I will be introduced in Chapter 6.
5.2 Objectives of Study I

This is an exploratory study which aims to build a conceptual framework for the concept of brand personality and to help design experimental conditions for further study. This type of process is particularly necessary for the research of brand personality due to the lack of conceptual basis in the existing literature. The present study tries to examine the legitimacy of the brand personality concept by assessing the validity and the reliability of the brand personality scale using restaurant brands. The results of this study will also be used to design the experimental conditions for the second study (Study II).

The study aims to 1) examine the validity of the brand personality scale, 2) assess the dimensions of brand personality in the restaurant brands, 3) investigate the relationship of personality and non-personality attributes of brand image as well as the relationship between brand personality and brand image.

Validity of the Brand Personality Scale. The Big Five Model of human personality reduces the large number of human personality characteristics into five latent dimensions. Inspired by this, Aaker (1997) proposed a framework known as the Brand Personality Scale (BPS) as a standard and universal way to measure brand personality. The Brand Personality Scale has been shown to be valid and reliable in various settings. For example, Kim et al. (2001) suggested that the scale is valid and reliable to measure mobile phone brands. However, although the scale is deemed reliable and valid, it may be worth examining the scale in different settings (Venable, Rose, and Gilber, 2002). Moreover, there is a very limited amount of research concerning brand personality in the hospitality industry. Therefore, one of the objectives of the present study is to assess the validity and reliability of Aaker's brand personality scale in the context of the hospitality industry namely restaurant brands.

Dimensions of brand personality. Several studies have been conducted in order to examine the specific dimensions of brand personality. The specific dimensions of brand
personality were examined under different culture settings (e.g. Ferrandi et al., 2000; Aaker et al, 2001) and different brand contexts (e.g. Venable et al., 2002). In most studies, although a partial structure and semantic correspondence was found, the specific dimensions of Aaker's (1997) study were not entirely replicated.

In addition, Caparara et al, (2001) found that the same personality traits could be located under different dimensions when comparing different brands. They describe this phenomenon as 'brand-adjective interaction' and explain that personality traits may convey different meanings when used to describe different brands (Caprara et al., 2001, p.391). In other words, the same personality traits may imply different meanings and locate under different dimensions when describing different brands. Inspired by the preceding discussions, it is assumed that the dimensions of restaurant brand personality may differ from those of others.

The relationship of personality and non-personality attributes of brand image. Although the important application of brand personality in consumer behaviour has been increasingly recognised, it seems obvious that the other part of brand image, which is not associated with human characteristics, is still used as an important cue determining consumer choice. One specific non-personality attribute of restaurants could be a determinant cue of choosing a restaurant. For example, one may choose a restaurant based on one individual attribute such as; convenient location, tasty food, convenience of parking, availability of non-smoking area and licence for serving alcohol, regardless of having any brand personalities. Then it seems obvious that consumers use both personality and non-personality attributes in their evaluation of a brand. However, traditionally most studies in the field of consumer choice have focused solely on the functional and utilitarian attributes of products or services. To the contrary, most studies in the brand personality field paid little attention to the influence of functional or product related attributes whilst focusing on the impact of brand personality on consumer preference (Aaker, 1995). Little study has integrated both concepts in a single study of consumer choice. If this is the case, the relationship between personality and non personality attributes of brand image should be clarified, since the condition of their
relationship is closely related to some basic conceptual propositions such as 'do non-product related attributes (e.g. symbolic attributes) and product related attributes (e.g. functional attributes) represent different constructs?', 'is brand personality really part of brand image?' and 'when consumers use personality cues (versus other functional and utilitarian cues)' in their evaluation of brands.

The main objective of this study is to examine the validity of brand personality in the evaluation of restaurant brands. The specific objectives of this study are to:

- assess the validity and reliability of Aaker's Brand Personality Scale (BPS) in the context of restaurant brands
- identify the dimensions of brand personality in the context of restaurant brands
- examine the relationship between personality and non-personality components of brand image
- investigate the relationship between brand personality and brand image

5.3 Sampling Design

Once the researcher has specified the problem and developed a research design and data collection instrument, the next step is to select an appropriate sample from which the information will be collected (Churchill, 1999). The sampling procedure has an important implication in the process of identifying, developing and understanding marketing constructs that need to be examined (Hair et al., 2000). Indeed, if data is not collected
from the people that can provide the correct information to answer the research questions, the study outcome will be useless.

Churchill (1999) suggests a six-step procedure that researchers can follow when drawing up a sample of a population. The figure 5.2 exhibits the six-step procedure recommended by Churchill.

*Figure 5.2: The Sampling Procedures*

1. **Step 1** Define the Population
2. **Step 2** Identify the Sampling Frame
3. **Step 3** Select a Sampling Procedure
4. **Step 4** Determine the Sample Size
5. **Step 5** Select the Sample Elements
6. **Step 6** Collect the Data From the Designated Elements

*Source: Churchill (1999, p.498)*
Figure 5.2 outlines a useful six-step procedure for sampling. According to Churchill (1999), it is first necessary to define the population of the study on which the researcher wishes to make an inference. Secondly, a sampling frame needs to be identified. A sampling frame is the listing of the elements from which the actual sample will be selected. The third step of selecting a sample procedure is closely related to the identification of the sampling frame since the choice of sampling method depends largely on what the researcher can develop for a sampling frame. The next step requires the sample size to be determined. Step 5 indicates that the researcher needs to choose the elements that will be included in the study. Finally, the researcher needs to collect the right data from the designated respondents.

Following the above six steps is not a simple task. As Churchill (1999) argues, a great number of things can go wrong with this task. Hair et al. (2000) suggest critical factors in selecting an appropriate sampling designing. They state that an appropriate sampling design should incorporate the seven factors outlined in Table 5.1.
Table 5.1: Critical Factors in Selecting an Appropriate Sampling Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection Factors</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Objectives</td>
<td>Do the research objectives call for the use of qualitative or quantitative research design?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Accuracy</td>
<td>Does the research call for making predictions or inferences about the defined target population or only preliminary insights?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Resources</td>
<td>Are there tight budget constraints with respect to both dollars and manpower that can be allocated to the research project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>How quickly does the research project have to be completed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance Knowledge of The Target Population</td>
<td>Are there complete lists of the defined target population elements? How easy or difficult is it to generate the required sampling frame of prospective respondents?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of the Research</td>
<td>Is the research going be international, national, regional, or local?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Statistical Analysis Needs</td>
<td>To what extent are accurate statistical projections required and/or testing of hypothesized differences in the data structures?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hair et al. (2000, p. 357)

The sampling method adopted for the present study was derived from the above two suggestions. First, the seven critical factors (as in Table 5.1) were incorporated into the present study and secondly, the considerations were reflected in applying the present study to the six-step procedures of sampling in Figure 5.2, in order to decide the appropriate sampling methods and size. This procedure was complimented by considering the theoretical components, sampling issues and advantages and disadvantages of the various sampling methods (Hair et al., 2000). The specific sampling method adopted in the present study is delineated in the following section.
5.3.1 Sampling Method

Sampling techniques can be divided into two broad categories of probability and nonprobability samples. Probability samples are distinguished by the fact that the elements in the population have some known probability of being included in the sample (Sekaran, 2000). Therefore, one can calculate the probability that a given element of a population will be included in a probability sample because the final sample elements are selected objectively for a specific process. Probability sampling is usually used when the representativeness of the sample is of importance in the interest of wider generalisability (Churchill, 1999). Probability sampling includes simple random sampling, systematic sampling, stratified random sampling, proportionate and disproportionate stratified random sampling, cluster sampling, area sampling and double sampling (Churchill, 1999; Sekaran, 2000).

In non-probability sampling, there is no way of estimating the probability that any element will be included in the sample, because non-probability sampling involves personal judgement somewhere in the selection. In other words, with non-probability sampling, the selection of sampling units is based on intuitive judgement and therefore potential sampling error cannot be accurately determined (Churchill, 1999). Some of the non-probability sampling designs are more dependable than others and could offer some important leads to useful information with regard to the population (Sekaran, 2000). The non-probability sampling technique includes convenience samples, judgment samples and quota samples.

In this study, the population was set as native English speakers who visit restaurants regularly (at least once every six months) in order to provide face validity to the study. The non-probability convenience sampling method was adopted for three reasons. First, the exploratory nature of the present study; secondly, the unavailability of the sampling frame; and thirdly, limited time and resources available. Indeed, Churchill (1999) and Hair et al. (2000) state that non-probability convenience sampling is commonly used in
the exploratory nature or early stages of research, that is, for construct and scale measurement development which cope with the present study’s objectives.

5.4 Questionnaire Design: Study I

The design of the questionnaire involved refining and selecting attributes of two components of brand image: personality and non-personality attributes of restaurant brand image.

5.4.1 Selection of Personality Attributes

Aaker (1997) suggested five generic dimensions, which are competence, sincerity, excitement, sophistication and ruggedness. She confirmed these dimensions with multiple studies employing brands from a wide range of product and service category. In addition, she developed the Brand Personality Scale (BPS), which can be used to measure brand personality across product categories using 42 traits. To identify the traits that most reliably represent the five dimensions, she factor analysed the five dimensions individually. The result of the five individual factor analyses produced a total of 15 facets: sincerity and excitement each had four facets, competence had three and sophistication and ruggedness each had two. At the next stage, along with 15 facets, 37 additional traits were added to the scale by examining correlations within facets (see Chapter 3 for details).

Aaker’s (1997) Brand Personality Scale (BPS) is used to measure brand personality in various settings including restaurants (e.g. Siguaw, Mattila and Austin, 1999). The BPS has been shown to be valid and reliable in various settings (e.g. Aaker et al., 2001; Kim et al., 2001)
In this study, Aaker’s Brand Personality Scale (Aaker, 1997) will be used to measure restaurant brand personality. However, the present study adopts the 15 facets of brand personality rather than the whole 42 traits of brand personality for a number of reasons. First, the 15 facets of brand personality were directly identified from the factor analyses of the five dimensions (i.e. the adopted 15 facets of brand personality are direct subsets of each dimension). Therefore, those facets should more strongly represent the five dimensions of brand personality compared to other traits, which are subsets of the facets and thus improve internal validity of the scale. Secondly, using 15 facets of the BPS rather than 42 traits can help us to shorten length of the questionnaire considerably. This can help to reduce fatigue and boredom in subjects.

Although the BPS was developed as a generic model that can be used across different types of brands, it was rather too focused on the consumer goods setting from the start. Therefore, the BPS traits may be limited in the sense that they might not fully reflect the unique characteristics associated with restaurant brands. In this sense an exploratory survey was conducted to identify additional restaurant brand personality attributes. From the results of the preliminary study, seven additional personality traits were added to the questionnaire.

The study involving 42 British respondents (60% male, 40% female) in order to identify restaurant brand personality traits from 148 traits identified (see Appendix A for the list of the traits used) in the literature was conducted in September 2001. The respondents were asked to decide whether the traits were appropriate for describing a restaurant brand. Nine different categories of restaurant were used for the survey which is the same as in this study. The criterion for the selection of restaurant personality attributes was that they were chosen by at least 70% of the samples. Finally, seven traits were identified and added to the traits pool. They are active, comfortable, popular, sociable, modern, colourful and sensitive. Table 5.2 shows the list of personality traits adopted in this study.
As shown in Table 5.2, 15 facets of brand personality (Aaker, 1997) and 7 restaurant traits were identified as personality attributes. Therefore, a total of 22 personality attributes were used for this study.

5.4.2 Selection of Non-Personality Attributes

In the literature review, it has been assumed that brand personality is part of brand image which is associated with human personality characteristics. If this is the case, brand image can be divided into two components; personality attributes, and the other attributes of brand image that are not associated with human characteristics. To identify non-personality attributes of brand image and compare them with personality attributes, brand image attributes which are not associated with human characteristics had to be generated.

To do that, restaurant image attributes identified in the literature survey were used (for details see Chapter 4). From the attributes identified, those attributes closely related to personality attributes were excluded at first (e.g. emotional atmosphere) and then, from the remaining attributes, those attributes deemed salient were selected as non-personality...

In addition to the attributes identified, a personnel contact dimension was added, since behaviour of service personnel while delivering the service may have crucial influence on the overall image of a hospitality firm (LeBlanc and Nguyen, 1996). Lastly, in order to cope with personality attributes identified, some abstract concepts (e.g. quality of food, physical atmosphere price etc.) were broken into more detailed traits. From the procedure, 18 non-personality attributes were generated. Table 5.3 represents non-personality attributes generated for the study.

Table 5.3: Non-Personality Attributes Generated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Personality Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nutritious food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speedy service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neat appearing employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well mannered staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenient location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visually appealing interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good value for money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient portion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasty food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of menu choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good facilities for children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visually appealing facilities,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenient car park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenient opening hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expensive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3 shows 18 non-personality attributes of restaurant brand image identified from the literature. As a result, a total of 40 attributes (22 personality and 18 non-personality attributes) were generated and used in this study.
5.4.3 Questionnaire Layout

The questionnaire consists of five parts. In the first, respondents were given a list of restaurant brands. Table 5.4 shows a list of restaurant brands included in the questionnaire.

Table 5.4: List of Restaurant Brands Included in the Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restaurant Brands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angus Steak House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonalds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richoux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beefeater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfunkels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nandos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow River Café</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bella Pasta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pizza Express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetherspoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Rock Café</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pizza Hut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burger King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGI Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Café Uno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Chef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rat &amp; Parrot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty one major restaurant brands in the UK were identified from the Key Note Restaurant market report, which were derived from nine categories (premium, casual dining, themed, pizza & pasta, burger, steak house, pub, roadside and ethnic) (Key Note, 2000). Before commencing the questionnaire, respondents were asked to choose a restaurant brand they are familiar with from the list of brands.

The second part of the questionnaire starts with trigger questions. These questions are designed to revitalise the memories associated with the restaurant. In addition, the section also includes questions designed to assess the degree of familiarity between a brand and a respondent. Familiarity was assessed by two questions, ‘how long have you known this restaurant outlet?’ (duration of the relationship) and ‘on average, how often have you visited this restaurant outlet over the last 6 months?’ (frequency of visiting) on a five point scale.
The third part of the questionnaire deals with measuring the perception of the brand. A total of 40 attributes (22 personality attributes and 18 non-personality attributes) are used to measure respondents' perception of the restaurant brands. Respondents were clearly given guidelines as to how to respond to the questions. The scale employs a 5-point bipolar numeric scale in accordance with Aaker’s study (1997). Figure 5.3 exhibits a sample of questions and direction from Section 2.

**Figure 5.3: Direction and Sample Questions Extracted from Section 2**

Directions: The following attributes and traits are about perception of restaurants. Please rate how descriptive the following attributes or traits provided are for the restaurant you chose from (1) to (5). Rating “1” means an attribute or trait is not at all descriptive and “5” means very descriptive for the restaurant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Restaurant</th>
<th>not at all descriptive</th>
<th>very descriptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is down-to-earth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offers nutritious food</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is popular</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is outdoorsy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offers speedy service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is daring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is spirited</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has well-mannered staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is charming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is tough</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents are asked to rate their responses on 40 variables using a five-point bipolar numeric scale, where ‘1’ = not at all descriptive and ‘5’ = very descriptive since this study tries to qualify attributes, rather than measuring the brand personality of restaurant.
brands (Aaker, 1997). Both personality and non-personality attributes were randomly distributed in order to avoid order bias.

The fourth part involves questions measuring respondents’ overall impressions and behavioural intentions. These external scales will provide the criterion-related validity to the scales applied. Specifically, first two questions are designed to assess ‘concurrent validity’ while last two questions are intended to assess ‘predictive validity’ of the scales. Figure 5.4 shows questions in Section 3.

**Figure 5.4: Questions in Section 3**

Directions: We would like to know about your overall perception of this restaurant. From the following scales, tick (☑) the number that best represents how you feel about this restaurant.

Q1. Overall, how would you describe the quality of this restaurant?

very poor 1 □  2 □  3 □  4 □  5 □  excellent

Q2. Overall, how would you describe your feeling about this restaurant?

very dissatisfied 1 □  2 □  3 □  4 □  5 □  very satisfied

Q3. How likely is it that you would return to this restaurant in the next 4 months?

extremely unlikely 1 □  2 □  3 □  4 □  5 □  extremely likely

Q4. How likely is it that you would recommend this restaurant to your friends?

extremely unlikely 1 □  2 □  3 □  4 □  5 □  extremely likely
As shown in Figure 5.4, Section 3 consists of four questions. The first two questions measure respondents' overall impressions while the questions 3 and 4 measure behavioural intentions. In Q1, respondents rate the perceived quality of the restaurant selected from “1” (very poor) to “5” (excellent). Question 2 is concerned with overall satisfaction of the restaurant. Respondents answer their feelings about the restaurant from “1” (very dissatisfied) to “5” (very satisfied). Question 3 and 4 are about respondents' intention to revisit and recommend the restaurant. Respondents are asked to rate their intentions from “1” (extremely unlikely) to “5” (extremely likely). A five point scale was adopted in order to cope with the scale in Section 2 which followed Aaker's brand personality scale (Aaker, 1997).

The last part was designed to obtain respondents' socio-demographic profiles. Subjects were asked to provide their gender, age, nationality, occupation and education level. This section is designed to investigate the socio-demographical influence on the perception of restaurant brands, since these characteristics have been suggested as important factors that affect consumers' perception and behaviour (Solomon, 1999).

5.4.4 Pilot Study

It is crucial to begin the fieldwork by conducting a pilot study to help the researcher to identify and eliminate possible problems before the main survey.

The pilot study was conducted in May 2002. Ten people from different backgrounds were randomly selected for the pilot study (3 students, 3 ordinary people and 4 academics). The focus of the pilot study was to find directions and questions which were difficult to understand. The piloting procedure revealed that there were some drawbacks in understanding the context of some questions, although most of the respondents found no comprehension problems.
Most respondents gave comments on Section 2. Respondents commented that some adjectives were not appropriate to describe restaurant brands. A few adjectives such as *wholesome, tough, sociable, intelligent*, etc. were mentioned as not appropriate words describing restaurant brands, and therefore those questions were left unanswered in many cases.

In section 1, there were comments about the number of restaurant options. A respondent commented that there were too many restaurant brands they needed to select from. He also mentioned that there was some inconsistency in questions’ wording. For example, the words, tick, mark and circle were used for selecting options which, he thinks, may confuse respondents. Another respondent mentioned that options for the purpose of visiting do not cover most situations and rather concentrated on some special occasions (e.g. routine lunch and business lunch). He also commented that ‘Conran’ restaurants are being managed under different names; therefore the name ‘Conran’ may cause confusion or might not be recognisable by respondents.

One respondent commented that the question on the educational background may not cover all different occasions (especially someone who does not hold any GCSE’s). As a result, the questionnaire was modified to some extent. In section 2, there were minor changes in the wording of the directions in order to encourage subjects to answer all the questions provided and reduce the proportion of unanswered questions. However, adjectives mentioned from comments (e.g. *wholesome, tough* and *intelligent*), which are the original facets of the BPS, were not modified for the purpose of this survey.

Secondly, in section 1, the word ‘tick’ was replaced with ‘mark (X)’ in order to provide consistency and avoid possible confusion. The restaurant brand ‘Conran’ was excluded from the list of restaurants in order to avoid respondents’ confusion. In selecting options for question 4, ‘routine lunch/dinner’ and ‘business lunch/dinner’ were substituted for ‘routine lunch’ and ‘business lunch’ in order to cover more occasions.
In section 4, the option 'none' was added in the question about educational background to cover a respondent who does not hold any GCSE's. The final form of questionnaire is presented in Appendix B.

5.5 Research Methodology

It is important to make sure that the instrument developed measures the particular concept that was set out to be measured accurately. Therefore reliability and validity have been of particular concern to researchers for a long time. Reliability is the extent to which a measuring instrument delivers consistent and stable results in measurement. Validity is about whether an instrument measures what it is supposed to measure (Sekaran, 2000; Chisnall, 1997). The various forms of reliability and validity are shown in figure 5.5
Reliability is concerned with stability and consistency of measurement. Two assessments of stability are test-retest reliability and parallel-form reliability. The former is obtained by repeating the same measure under identical conditions. The latter is concerned with the correlation of responses in two comparable sets of measures. Consistency can be observed by examining the correlation of the items and the subsets of items in the measuring instrument. This can be obtained by inter-item reliability and split-half reliability (Sekaran, 2000).

However, reliability is a necessary, but not sufficient condition for a good measurement. Validity ensures the ability of an instrument to measure what it is supposed to measure (Webb, 1999; Chisnall, 1997). There are many ways of estimating the validity of measurements. Table 5.5 explains the types of validity.
### Table 5.5: Types of Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Validity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content validity</td>
<td>Does the measure adequately measure the concept?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face validity</td>
<td>Do 'experts' validate that the instrument measures what its name suggests it measures?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion-related validity</strong></td>
<td>Does the measure differentiate in a manner that helps to predict a criterion variable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent validity</td>
<td>Does the measure differentiate in a manner that helps to predict a criterion variable currently?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictive validity</td>
<td>Does the measure differentiate individuals in a manner as to help predict a future criterion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construct validity</strong></td>
<td>Does the instrument tap the concept as theorised?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergent validity</td>
<td>Do two instruments measuring the concept correlate highly?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discriminant validity</td>
<td>Does the measure have a low correlation with a variable That is supposed to be unrelated to this variable?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Sekaran (2000, p. 209)

Content validity is also known as face validity and the representativeness or sampling adequacy of the content of a measuring instrument (Kerlinger, 1992). The purpose of content validation is to assess whether the items adequately represent a performance domain or construct of specific interest (Crocker and Algina, 1986). This form of validity subjectively assesses the correspondence between the individual items and the concept through ratings by expert judges and pre-tests (Hair et al., 1998).

In this study, content validity of the instrument is provided using various methods including literature review, preliminary study, pilot study and sampling methods.

Criterion-related validity is established when the measure differentiates individuals on a criterion it is expected to predict (Sekran, 2000). This validity can be supported by two
different validities; predictive and concurrent validity. Concurrent validity is the extent to which one measure of a variable can predict a criterion variable currently. Predictive validity is the extent to which an individual's future level on some variable can be predicted by his or performance on a current measurement (Tull and Hawkins, 1990).

It is advised to use an instrument that is external to the measuring instrument itself, to estimate some behaviour (Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994). Therefore, this study adopted four external scales measuring overall impressions and behavioural intentions in order to provide criterion related validity to the scale applied. Two scales for measuring overall impressions (i.e. overall quality and overall satisfaction) will be used to provide the concurrent validity, while the other two scales for measuring behavioural intentions (i.e. intention of revisiting and intention of recommending) will be used to support the predictive validity.

Construct validity is the most complex form of validity. It refers to 'how well the results obtained from the use of the measure fit the theories around which the test is designed.' (Sekaran, 2000, p.208). Construct validity is established by assessing convergent and discriminant validity. Convergent validity is supported when the scores obtained by two different instruments measuring the same concept are highly correlated, while discriminant validity is established when two instruments measuring the different concepts are not highly correlated (Sekaran, 2000). Factor analysis, which will be used in this study, is one of the most widely used approaches in establishing construct validity (Crocker and Algina, 1986; Sekaran, 2000).

5.5.1 Methods of Data Analysis

To gain meaningful information from the study, the collected data needs to be analysed and interpreted very carefully. For the exploratory nature of this study, several quantitative analysis techniques were employed, which ranged from simple descriptive statistics to more complex techniques of ANOVA, linear regression and factor analysis.
5.5.1.1 ANOVA

ANOVA is an enormously useful statistical procedure that is very widely used in social science research (Brace et al., 2000). Like the t-test, ANOVA is used in order to compare the scores of different groups or conditions. The popularity of this procedure is based on two important characteristics. Firstly, unlike the t-test, ANOVA allows researchers to handle data that has designs involving more than two conditions. Secondly, ANOVA also allows researchers to investigate the effect of more than one independent variable. However, it should be noted that ANOVA can only tell researchers whether the scores significantly vary across different conditions. It can not tell them precisely which pairs of conditions are significantly different (Pallant, 2001).

To interpret the results of ANOVA, the meaning of the F-ratio and p-value needs to be delineated. The F-ratio is the ratio of the variance due to manipulation of the factor, divided by the variance due to error. If the error variance is small compared to the variance due to the independent variable, then the F-ratio will be greater than 1. On the other hand, if the effect of the independent variable is small and/or the error variance is large then the F-ratio will be less than 1. Therefore, it could be said that the effect of the independent variable is definitely not significant if the F-ratio is less than 1. The p-value in ANOVA represents the probability of getting the F-ratio by chance alone. The p-value needs to be less than 0.05 for the F-ratio to be regarded as significant. (Brace et al., 2000).

In this study, in order to investigate the influence of respondents’ demographic profile and restaurant categories on the perception of restaurant brand, one-way between subjects ANOVA will be conducted. Here, ‘One-way’ means that there is only one independent variable in each test (e.g. age, gender, restaurant category etc.) and ‘between subjects’ indicates that each subject can choose only one level of independent variable.

5.5.1.2 Factor analysis

The analysis was originally developed to explore and discover the main constructs or dimensions in a data matrix (Kline, 1997). In other words, factor analysis is a statistical
approach that is used to analyse interrelationships among a set of variables and to explain these variables in terms of their common underlying factors (dimensions). With factor analysis, the researcher can first identify the separate factors of the structure and then determine the extent to which each variable is explained by each factor (Hair, Anderson, Tatham and Black, 1998). Once these factors (or dimensions) and the explanation of each variable are determined, the two primary uses for factor analysis; summarisation and data reduction, can be achieved (Hair, et al., 1998).

There are two main approaches to factor analysis – exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. Exploratory factor analysis is often used in the early stages of research to explore the inter-relationship among a set of variables. Confirmatory factor analysis, on the other hand, is a more complex and sophisticated set of techniques in order to confirm (or test) specific hypotheses or theories concerning the structure underlying a set of variables (Pallant, 2001). In here, for the purpose of the study, exploratory factor analysis will be adopted and confirmatory analysis will not be used.

Before proceeding to factor analysis, a researcher has to assess the appropriateness of factor analysis through Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy, Bartlett's test of sphericity and the measure of sampling adequacy (MSA). KMO measure of sampling adequacy needs to be examined to assess the factorability of the data. The KMO index ranges from 0 to 1, with .6 suggested as the minimum value for a good factor analysis (Pallant, 2001). The Bartlett test of sphericity is a statistical test that assesses the statistical probability that the correlation matrix has significant correlations among at least some of the variables (Hair et al., 1998). The Bartlett’s test of sphericity should be significant (p<.05) for the factor analysis to be considered appropriate (Pallant, 2001).

Another measure to quantify the degree of inter-correlations among the variables and the appropriateness of factor analysis, is the measure of sampling adequacy (MSA). This index ranges from 0 to 1, reaching 1 when each variable is perfectly predicted without error by the other variables. Hair et al. (1998) suggests the following guidelines for
interpretation of MSA: .80 or above, meritorious; .70 or above, middling; .60 or above, mediocre; .50 or above, miserable; and below .50, unacceptable.

The stage of factor extraction involves determining the smallest number of factors that can be used to best represent the inter-relations among the set of variables (Pallant, 2001). There are a number of different approaches that can be used to extract the underlying factors from a data matrix. Among many, principal component analysis, the most commonly used approach, was employed for the present study in accordance with Aaker’s (1997) previous study.

Determining the number of factors, which best represent the underlying relationship among the variables, is generally believed to be up to the researcher. This process involves balancing two conflicting needs: to find a simple solution with the smallest number of factors; and to explain as much the variance as possible. There is a variety of techniques that can be used to assist in the decision concerning the number of factors to retain. However, an exact quantitative basis for deciding the number of factors to extract has not yet been developed (Hair et al., 1998). Therefore, in practice, most researchers seldom use a single criterion in determining how many factors to extract. Rather, they examine and compare a number of different factor solutions extracted from different techniques to arrive at the best presentation of the data (Hair et al., 1998). The followings are the techniques to be used in the present study to determine the number of factors to retain:

Latent root criterion: This technique is one of the most commonly used techniques to determine the number of factors. This technique is also known as the eigenvalue rule since only factors with an eigenvalue of 1.0 or more are considered significant and retained for further investigation (Pallant, 2001). The eigenvalue of a factor represents the amount of the total variance explained by that factor. The rationale for the latent root criterion is that any individual factor should account for the variance of at least a single variable if it is to be retained for interpretation (Hair et al., 1998). Latent root criterion
has been criticised however, as resulting in the retention of too many (or too few) factors in some situations.

**Percentage of variance:** The percentage of variance criterion is an approach based on achieving a specified cumulative percentage of total variance extracted by successive factors. Although there is no absolute threshold for extracting the number of factors, in social science, a solution that accounts 60% of the total variance (sometimes even less) is generally accepted (Hair et al., 1998).

**Scree test:** The last approach that can be used to determine the number of factors extracted is the scree test. This technique is derived by plotting each of the factors and examining the plot to find a point at which the shape of the curve changes direction and begins to straighten out. All the factors above the curve when it first begins to become a horizontal line are retained for further analysis (Pallant, 2001). As a rule of thumb, the scree test results in one or two more factor solution than does the latent root criterion (Hair et al., 1998).

Once the number of factors has been decided, the next stage is to try to interpret them. To assist in this process the factors are rotated, since unrotated factor solution will rarely provide information that offers the most adequate interpretation of the variables (Hair et al., 1998). This process does not change the underlying solution, but rather it presents the pattern of loadings in a way that is easier to interpret. There are two main approaches to rotation, resulting in either orthogonal (i.e. uncorrelated) or oblique (i.e. correlated) factor solutions. According to Tabachnick and Fidel (1996), orthogonal rotation results in solutions that are easier to interpret and to report, however they do require the researcher to assume that the underlying constructs are not correlated. Oblique approaches allow for the factors to be correlated, however they are more complicated to interpret and to report. In the present study, Varimax (orthogonal) rotational technique is adopted in order to comply with Aaker's study (1998).

Factor loading refers to the correlation between each factor retained and each of the original variables. Each factor loading is a measure of the importance of the variable in
measuring each factor. Factor loadings can vary between +1 to −1. The factor loading will be high if a variable is closely associated with a factor and vice versa. In examining factors, a decision must be made regarding which factor loadings are worth considering (or significant). There are several different ways of determining the significance of factor loading, such as using the practical significant, assessing statistical significant and using the number of variables. Hair et al. (1998) suggested guidelines for identifying significant factor loadings based on sample size by assessing statistical significance. Table 5.6 shows Hair et al.’s guideline based on sample size.

Table 5.6: Guidelines for Identifying Significant Factor Loadings Based on Sample size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Sample Size Needed for Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.30</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.35</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.40</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.45</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.55</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.60</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.65</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.70</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.75</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hair et al. (1998, p.112)

In the present study, this guideline is employed for identifying significant factor loadings. Therefore, considering the sample size of the study which is 152, 0.45 is set as an acceptable factor loading and cut off value for this study.

5.5.1.3 Linear multiple regression

Multiple regression is a statistical technique that is based on correlation but allows a more sophisticated exploration of the interrelationship among a set of variables (Pallant, 2001). This technique allows a researcher to predict someone’s score on one variable on the basis of their scores on several other variables (Brace et al., 2000). In other words,
multiple regression is a statistical technique that can be used to analyse the linear relationship between a single dependent variable and multiple independent variables. The objective of multiple analysis is to predict the value of a single dependent variable by using the independent variables with known values (Hair et al., 1998). This process provides information about the model as a whole (all independent variables) and the relative contribution of each of the independent variables that make up the model.

There are a number of different types of multiple regression analysis such as standard multiple regression, moderated regression analysis (MRA), stepwise multiple regression and etc. For the purpose of this study, standard multiple regression, which is the most commonly used type of multiple regression, is employed (MRA will be used for Study II). In standard multiple regression, all the independent variables are entered into the equation simultaneously. Each independent variable is evaluated in terms of its predictive power, over that offered by all the other independent variables (Pallant, 2001).

One of the key issues in linear regression is the assessment of multicollinearity, which describes a situation where an independent variable is related (r =.8 and above) to one or more of the other independent variables in the model (Pallant, 2001). The influence of multicollinearity can be substantial and should be assessed before proceeding to the analysis.

R square (R²) is the square of a measure correlation between the observed value and the predicted value and indicates the proportion of the variance in the criterion variable which is accounted for by the model. Therefore, the larger the R² value, the more of the behaviour of the dependent variable is associated with the independent variable that is being used to predict it. However, although R square provides an indication of the explanatory power of the model, it does not indicate the level of significance. The F-ratio provides a measure of this significance. A larger F-ratio indicates that the model has more explained by variance. The p-value needs to be less than 0.05 for the F-ratio to be regarded as significant (Brace et al., 2000).
The beta ($\beta$) value is a measure of how strongly each independent variable influences the dependent variable. It allows researchers to directly compare independent variables to determine which independent variable has the most influence on the dependent variable. The beta ($\beta$) value is considered to be significant when the p-value is less than 0.05.

In this study, linear multiple regression analysis will be used to support criterion-related validity of scales by examining concurrent and predictive validity of the scale.

### 5.6 Summary

The objective of this research is to provide the validity of brand personality. To achieve this aim, two complementary studies were adopted. This chapter discussed the methodology of the first study (Study I) of the research. The first study aims to provide legitimacy to the concept of brand personality by validating the brand personality scale. This chapter started with discussion on the study objectives, along with brief explanations of their theoretical backgrounds. The specific objectives of the study were to examine validity of the brand personality scale in the context of restaurant brands and to investigate the relationship between personality and non-personality components of brand image.

To examine these conditions, the present study employed 40 restaurant attributes (22 personality attributes and 18 non-personality attributes). Twenty two personality attributes were selected which were derived from 15 facets of brand personality (Aaker, 1997) and 7 restaurant traits identified from the preliminary study. Eighteen non-personality attributes were generated from the literature survey.

The designed questionnaire consists of five parts. In the first part, respondents were given a list of 20 restaurant brands and asked to choose one brand they are familiar with. The
second part was designed to assess the degree of familiarity between brands and respondents.

The third part of the questionnaire deals with measuring the perception of the brand. Forty identified attributes were used to measure respondents' perception of the restaurant brands. The next part of the questionnaire involved questions measuring respondents' overall impressions and behavioural intentions, which will be used to provide the criterion-related validity to the scales applied. The last part of the questionnaire was designed to obtain respondents' socio-demographic profiles.

The last part of the chapter outlined the analysis methods employed for Study I. Among various data analysis methods, factor analysis and linear multiple regression were adopted as main analysis techniques for Study I.
6.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the findings of Study I, which can be grouped into four parts. The first part delineates the process of the data analysis. The second section profiles respondents' socio-demographic characteristics and restaurant visit behaviour. The third part presents the reliability and the validity of Aaker's Brand Personality Scale in the context of restaurant brands. The fourth section of this chapter deals with an examination of the non-personality attributes component of brand image. The last section investigates the relationship between personality and non-personality components of restaurant brand image and provides the validity and reliability of the brand image scale.
6.2 The Process of the Data Analysis

The main objectives of the study were to 1) examine the validity of the brand personality scale, 2) identify the dimensions of brand personality and 3) investigate the relationship between personality and non-personality attributes of brand image (as well as the relationship between brand personality and brand image). To achieve these goals, four separate exploratory factor analyses were performed. The figure 6.1 summarises the process of the analysis.
STUDY I: An Examination of the Brand Personality Scale

- Examination of the Dimensions of Brand Personality
  *(Chapter 6.4, p.154)*
- The Modified Brand Personality Scale
  *(Chapter 6.5, p.158)*
- The Construct and Criterion-Related Validity of the Scale
- The Reliability of the Scale

- The Non-Personality Scale
  *(Chapter 6.6, p.166)*
- The Construct and Criterion-Related Validity of the Scale
- The Reliability of the Scale

- The Brand Image Scale
  *(Chapter 6.7, p.173)*
- The Construct and Criterion-Related Validity of the Scale
- The Reliability of the Scale
- Further Investigation of the Relationship between Brand Personality and Non-Personality Attributes
  *(Chapter 6.8, p.180)*
Figure 6.1 summarises the process of the data analysis. Firstly, the 15 facets of brand personality were subjected to the analysis in order to examine the generic quality of Aaker's (1997) five brand personality dimensions. Secondly, the validated attributes from the first analysis and 7 restaurant brand personality attributes identified from the preliminary study were factor analysed to find a scale in the context of restaurant brands. Thirdly, 18 non-personality attributes were factor analysed to find possible emerging dimensions. Lastly, all personality and non-personality variables confirmed from the previous analyses were subjected to the analysis to develop the brand image scale and investigate the relationship between personality and non-personality attributes.

In addition, linear multiple regression tests were conducted to investigate the relationship between the scales and the global measure of overall impressions and behavioural intentions. At the same time, these regression analyses establish the criterion validity of the applied scales.

Lastly, the Pearson correlation matrix is used to provide better understanding between personality attributes and non-personality attributes, as well as the relationship between brand image and brand personality.

### 6.3 Profiles of the Respondents

The field survey was conducted in England in June and July 2002. The questionnaires were randomly distributed in various places including an international airport, a university and offices. The population of the survey was regular visitors of the sample restaurants (at least more than once over the last six months). In order to provide face validity, all samples were native English speakers. Two hundred and thirty questionnaires were distributed and 176 questionnaires were collected, and from these collected questionnaires, 6 questionnaires were excluded due to missing data. Another 18 non-native English respondents were excluded from the data. Therefore, a total of 152 valid questionnaires were collected. The Socio-demographic profiles and restaurant visiting occasions of the respondents are as follows.
Gender: Figure 6.2 shows the gender distribution of the sample

**Figure 6.2:** Gender of the Respondents (n=152)

From the 152 respondents, 88 respondents identified themselves as female and they represent 58% of the total, while 64 males make up the rest 42%.

**Age group:** Five age groups were used for this study. Figure 6.3 represents the distribution of age groups according to these age groups.

**Figure 6.3:** Age Group of the Respondents (n = 152)

In terms of age group, 18% of the respondents were between 16-24 years of age, 27% were between 25-34, 18% were between 35-44, 18% were between 45-55 and 16% were between 65 and over.
55-64 years old. Only four respondents representing 3% of the total identified themselves as 65 and over. The 25-34 group was found to be the largest age group.

**Nationality:** Nationality of the respondents was classified into six groups although they are all from English speaking countries. Figure 6.4 represents nationality of the respondents.

*Figure 6.4: Nationality of the Respondents (n = 152)*

As mentioned previously, all of the respondents were native English speakers to increase face validity of the study. Among them, 87% of the subjects identified themselves as British, while Americans, Canadians and Australians represent 9%, 1% and 2% of the total sample respectively. Two percent of the respondents are from other English speaking countries, such as New Zealand.

**Education Level:** Figure 6.5 depicts the educational backgrounds of the subjects
The educational level category revealed that the majority of the samples had relatively high educational backgrounds as 57% of the sample held undergraduate or postgraduate degrees. Around 5% of the subjects responded that they held other types of educational qualifications.

**Restaurant Category:** The restaurant brands used in this study can be classified into nine categories according to the Key Note restaurant market report (2000): ethnic; roadside; steak house; casual dining; pub; theme; pizza & pasta; burger; premium. However, the premium restaurant sector was excluded from the study since no subject chose this restaurant category. Figure 6.6 shows restaurant categories selected in the study.
From 147 subjects, more than 65% of the respondents selected pizza & pasta, burger and pub restaurants while roadside and steak restaurants were chosen by only 4% and 3% of the respondents respectively.

**Purpose of the Visit:** Figure 6.7 represents respondents’ purpose of the visit for the restaurants they chose.

This figure reveals that the majority of the respondents visited the restaurants in terms of leisure purposes. Only 1% of the samples chose their purpose of the visit as a business meal.
Forty three percent of the sample visited the restaurant for the purpose of routine lunch and evening meal, while 24% and 11% of the respondents specified their purpose of the visit as celebrating an event and family meal respectively. 20% of the samples chose the 'other' option from the questionnaire.

6.4 Examination of the Dimensions of Aaker’s Brand Personality Scale

An exploratory factor analysis was performed in order to confirm Aaker’s five dimensions of brand personality in restaurant brands. The analysis, at the same time, can provide the construct validity of the scale (Churchill, 1979).

The same factor method (i.e. principal component analysis and varimax rotation) used by Aaker (1997) was preferred in order to eliminate potential method difference. 0.45 is set as a cut-off value for the significance of loading in this study. This is based on the statistical guidelines for a sample size of between 150 and 200 as suggested by Hair et al. (1998).

To assess the reliability of the scale, Cronbach’s Alpha was employed. Alpha provides the degree of inter-item consistency which indicates that the items that make up the scale are measuring the same underlying construct (Brace et al., 2000).

6.4.1 Validity and Reliability of Aaker’s Brand Personality Scale

At first, only 15 facets of brand personality were subjected to the analysis in order to confirm the five dimensions of brand personality suggested by Aaker (1997).

At the initial stage, Bartlett’s test of sphericity (a statistical test for the presence of correlations among the variables) and the KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin) measure of sampling adequacy were measured to assess the factorability of the data. KMO value at .830 exceeds the
minimum value which is .6 (Pallant, 2001; Hair et al. 1998). The Bartlett’s test of sphericity was also found significant (p<.0005) (Hair et al., 1998). Another measure to quantify the degree of intercorrelations among the variables and the appropriateness of factor analysis is the measure of sampling adequacy (MSA). The MSA result also revealed that all the 15 variables exceeded the threshold value. Therefore, the scale met the fundamental requirement for the factor analysis.

The final result of the principal component analysis with a varimax rotation suggested a three factor solution. Table 6.1 summarises the outcomes of the factor analysis.

Table 6.1: The Result of Factor Analysis for the 15 Brand Personality Facets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Communalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>Communalities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excitement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirited</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daring</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up-to-date</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sincerity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td></td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td></td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesome</td>
<td></td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sophistication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charming</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td></td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Variance</td>
<td>44.79</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>Total: 67.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax rotation Item loading less than .40 omitted.
As shown in Table 6.1, the result of the factor analysis supports a three factor solution. The retained factors were supported by the following criteria: a) meaningfulness of each factors retained, b) all variables loaded significantly on each factor, c) high amount of variance (%) explained by the three factors (67%), c) all variables show relatively high communalities, d) consistency with Aaker’s original dimensions.

This study produced three factors rather than five. These three factors retained are very similar to Aaker’s ‘excitement,’ ‘sincerity’ and ‘sophistication’ dimensions. The first factor includes all four facets of ‘excitement’ dimensions. Similarly, two out of three variables comprising the second factor are from the ‘sincerity’ dimension. The last factor contains all two facets of ‘sophistication’ dimension. Therefore, those factors are named ‘excitement,’ ‘sincerity’ and ‘sophistication’ respectively.

To assess the reliability of the scale, the internal consistency of the scale was assessed by using Cronbach’s alpha statistic. Table 6.2 shows the reliability of the three factors retained.
Table 6.2: Reliability of the Factors Retained (n=152)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.D.</th>
<th>Item to total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha (α)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excitement</td>
<td>Up to date</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spirited</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daring</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wholesome</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophistication</td>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charming</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper class</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 6.2, all ‘excitement,’ ‘sincerity’ and ‘sophistication’ dimensions have good internal consistency with Cronbach alpha coefficients of .82, .76 and .74 respectively. These alpha values exceed the minimum recommended threshold of alpha score (> .70). Therefore, all three dimensions are deemed reliable (Churchill, 1979). Item to total correlation coefficients for the scale were also found sufficient and ranged from .48 to .68 for ‘excitement,’ .51 to .66 for ‘sincerity’ and .54 to .57 for ‘sophistication’. Therefore, there was no need to eliminate any item to improve the reliability of the scale.

As a result, this study confirmed three dimensions of brand personality as opposed to five dimensions as suggested by Aaker (1997). This result indicates that Aaker’s five dimensions can not be replicated in this specific application. Of the five dimensions, only ‘excitement,’
‘sincerity’ and ‘sophistication’ were found valid and reliable. The other two dimensions; ‘competence’ and ‘ruggedness’ were not confirmed in this study.

6.5 The Modified Brand Personality Scale

One of the objectives of the present study is to assess the validity of the brand personality concept in the context of restaurant brands. To provide the validity to the concept, the development of a valid and reliable scale is necessary (Churchill, 1979).

In order to develop a valid and reliable brand personality scale in restaurant brands, 11 facets of brand personality validated in the previous analysis and 7 restaurant personality attributes identified in the preliminary study (For details see Chapter 6) were subjected to analysis.

6.5.1 Construct Validity of the Modified Brand Personality Scale

Firstly, another principal component factor analysis with a varimax rotation was conducted on the 18 variables to identify the dimensions and provide the construct validity of the scale.

At an initial stage, the underlying statistical assumptions for the application of the analysis were tested. The KMO measure of sample adequacy (.849) and Bartlett’s test of sphericity (p<.0005) were found sufficient for the application of factor analysis (Tabachnick and Fidell, 1996). In the examination of MSA, no variable falls in the unacceptable range (<.50) and most variables show fairly low partial correlations to each other (Hair et al., 1998).

The initial outcomes of eigenvalue and scree plot suggested a three factor solution. However, the rotated component matrix revealed that two variables were similarly highly loaded on more than one factor. ‘Up to date’ variable loaded on factor 1 and 3 (.48 and .46 respectively). Similarly, ‘social’ attribute was found to be loaded highly on factor 1 and 2 (.47 and .49
respectively). Therefore, those two variables were deleted and analysis was repeated to find a rigid and clear factor solution. Table 6.3 shows the outcome of the analysis.

**Table 6.3: The Result of Factor Analysis for the Modified Brand Personality Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
<th>Communalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excitement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirited</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daring</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charming</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper class</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sincerity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesome</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active*</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Popularity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colourful*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigenvalue 6.00 1.98 1.39

% of Variance 37.50 12.36 8.66 Total: 58.51

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax rotation.
Item loading less than .40 omitted.
*: restaurant brand personality attributes added from this study.
The outcome of the factor analysis suggested a three factor solution representing 58% of the total variance. The retained three factors were supported by the following criteria: 1) all variables retained significantly loaded on one factor; b) sufficient eigenvalue for each retained factors and relatively low value of the fourth factor (.98); c) meaningfulness of dimensions; d) shape of the scree plot begins to straighten out after the third factor, e) reasonable amount of variance (%) explained by the three factors. Therefore, these findings provide the construct validity of the modified brand personality scale with three dimensions (Churchill, 1979).

The first two factors were labelled ‘excitement’ and ‘sincerity’, since these two factors are closely related to those dimensions of Aaker’s and most variables seem to imply the value of those words. The third factor which represents popular aspects of restaurant personalities was named ‘popularity’. This factor consists of three restaurant personality attributes (colourful; modern; popular) identified from the preliminary study. Interestingly, all items that comprised the ‘sophistication’ factor in the previous analysis were merged into the ‘excitement’ dimension and not found as an independent dimension in this analysis. This result may support Caprara el al.’s (2001, p.391) notion of ‘brand-adjective interaction’ that explains that personality traits may convey different meanings when used to describe different brands.

6.5.2 Criterion Related Validity of the Scale

As the next stage, regression analyses were conducted to establish the criterion validity of the scale and investigate the relationship of the modified brand personality scale and the external measure of overall impressions (i.e. perceived quality and satisfaction) and behavioural intentions (i.e. intention to return and recommend).

Criterion validity involves concurrent and predictive validity of the scale. In this study, concurrent validity is examined by comparing the scale applied and overall impressions, while predictive validity is assessed by using behavioural intentions.
The three dimensions of the scale as derived from the factor analysis were considered as independent variables and each of the external measures was regarded as a dependent variable. Table 6.4 summarises the linear regression tests between the modified brand personality scales and perceived quality, satisfaction, intention to return and intention to recommend.
**Table 6.4:** Summary of Linear regression: The Modified Brand Personality Scale and Quality, Satisfaction, Intention to Return, and Intention to Recommend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Perceived Quality</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction</th>
<th>Intention to Return</th>
<th>Intention to Recommend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t-value</td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitement</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popularity (constant)</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| F             | 55.10 |         |          | 24.15 |         |          | 9.63  |         |          | 32.14 |         |      |
| P             | .000  |         |          | .000  |         |          | .000  |         |          | .000  |         |      |
The result of linear regression reveals that the modified brand personality scale is statistically significant ($p = .000$) in estimating the perceived quality. The $R^2$ square value of .53 indicates that the brand personality model explains 53% of the variance in perceived quality. 'Sincerity' has the largest beta coefficient (.38) followed by 'excitement' (.36) and 'popularity' (.15). This means that 'sincerity' made the strongest unique contribution to explaining the perceived quality of restaurant brands. However, all of the three dimensions were found to make significant contributions to the degree of perceived quality of restaurant brands ($p=.000$) (Pallant, 2001).

The second regression model assessed the relationship of the modified brand personality scale and customers' overall satisfaction. The linear regression suggested that the modified brand personality scale is statistically significant at the level of .000 in estimating customers' overall satisfaction. The $R^2$ suggests that 33% of variance in overall satisfaction could be explained by the scale. 'Sincerity' ($\beta = .39$) and 'excitement' ($\beta = .22$) dimensions were found to make statistically significant unique contributions ($p < .05$) in estimating overall satisfaction. However, the 'popularity' dimension ($\beta = .07$) was not a significant predictor of overall satisfaction. In terms of the relative importance, 'sincerity' was again found to make the strongest contribution.

In the examinations of the relationship between the brand personality scale and the measure of behavioural intentions, the $R^2$ value indicates that the brand personality scale explains 16% of variance in the scale of customer's intentions of returning. That was found statistically significant at the .000 level. The results indicate that 'sincerity' and 'excitement' were significant dimensions in predicting customers' intention to return. This finding reveals that the 'popularity' dimension does not have any significant influence on customers' revisiting to the restaurant.

The table also shows that 40% of the variance in the intention to recommend scale was explained by the brand personality scale. This result was found as statistically significant ($p = .000$). All three dimensions were found to make significant contributions in estimating consumers' intention to recommend ($p < .05$).
In summary, the modified brand personality scale with three dimensions and 16 items was found to be statistically significant in explaining all the dependent variables (overall quality, satisfaction, intention to return and intention to recommend). These results support the criterion related validity of the scale.

6.5.3 Reliability of the Modified Brand Personality Scale

Reliability refers to “the stability and consistency with which the instrument measures the concept and helps to assess the goodness of the measure” (Sekaran, 2000, p.204). The reliability of the scale was assessed by using the internal consistency. Table 6.5 shows the reliability of the scale.
Table 6.5: Reliability of the Modified Brand Personality Scale (n=152)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.D.</th>
<th>Item to total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha (α)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excitement</td>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spirited</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charming</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daring</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper class</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wholesome</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comfortable</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popularity</td>
<td>Popular</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colourful</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.5 summarises the findings of the internal consistency reliability for the three dimensions of the modified brand personality scale. The Cronbach's alpha coefficients of 'excitement' and 'sincerity' were both found to be .85. These alpha values exceed the recommended threshold of alpha scores (>0.70). Although 'popularity' did not meet the
sufficient value, the dimension was retained since the value was at .68 which is only marginally below the recommended threshold.

Item to total correlation of the 'excitement' dimension ranged from .53 to .63 while 'sincerity' and 'popularity' ranged from .62 to .70 and .30 to .38 respectively. Although there was a possibility of improving the scale reliability by removing the 'popular' item of 'popularity' dimension, no item was rejected due to the meaningfulness of the dimension.

In summary, the results support that the modified brand personality scale (with 3 dimensions and 16 items) is valid and reliable in the context of restaurant brands. The present study confirmed three dimensions of restaurant brand personality namely; 'sincerity', 'excitement' and 'popularity'. From the five dimensions of brand personality suggested by Aaker (1997), only two dimensions, 'sincerity' and 'excitement' were confirmed as valid and reliable. The 'sophistication' dimension of Aaker's was merged into the 'excitement' dimension in this application.

6.6 An Examination of the Non-Personality Attributes

Another objective of this study is to investigate the relationship between personality attributes and the other part of brand image which is not associated with human personality characteristics. The examination of this relationship is important since it is closely related to the understanding of why and when consumers use personality cues (versus other functional and utilitarian cues) in their evaluation of a brand.

The 18 non-personality attributes were factor analysed in order to find possible emerging dimensions among non-personality attributes and develop a valid and reliable scale to measure non-personality attributes of brand image.
6.6.1 Construct Validity of the Scale

Like the previous analyses, the principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation was performed. Initially, the KMO test and Bartlett's test of sphericity were conducted and found sufficient (0.799; p<0.0005). The examination of MSA also showed that no variable fell in the unacceptable range (Hair et al., 1998). These results indicated that the non-personality attributes were appropriate for factor analysis.

The initial outcome of eigenvalue and amount of variance suggested a five factor solution. However, considering the result of the scree plot, several factor solutions with differing numbers of factors were examined, since the number of factors are critically interrelated with an assessment and interpretation of the structure (Child, 1990; Kline, 1997; Hair et al., 1998). Variables were deleted and analyses were performed again until the rigid and clear factor solution was reached. Table 6.6 shows the final outcome of the analysis.
Table 6.6: Factor Analysis Results of the Non-Personality Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>Communalities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasty food</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visually appealing interior</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visually appealing facility</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean environment</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neat employees</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutritious food</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient portion</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for Money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheap</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expensive</td>
<td>-.74</td>
<td></td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Variance</td>
<td>40.10</td>
<td>19.48</td>
<td>Total: 59.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax rotation
Item loading less than .40 omitted.

As can be seen from Table 6.6, a two factor solution representing 60% of the total variance was extracted from the analysis. All the variables loaded significantly on only one of the two factors and both factors' eigenvalues were greater than 1.0. Moreover, shape of the scree plot clearly supported the two factor solution. These results support the construct validity of the non-personality attributes scale (Churchill, 1979).

Factor 1 was named 'benefits' since all the variables retained seem to be related to the common basic benefit being used by customers when they evaluate restaurants. Factor 2 was labelled 'value for money' as the dimension consisted of the monetary aspect of restaurant brand image.
6.6.2 Criterion Related Validity of the Scale

As the next stage, multiple regression analyses were performed to examine the contributions of the non-personality scale in predicting the external measures (i.e. perceived quality, satisfaction, intention to return and intention to recommend) and also provide the criterion related validity of the scale. Table 6.7 summarises the results of the linear regression tests between the non-personality scale and the four external scales.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Perceived Quality</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction</th>
<th>Intention to Return</th>
<th>Intention to Recommend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t-value</td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>12.36</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for Money (constant)</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>82.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.7: Summary of Linear Regression: The Non-Personality Scale and Quality, Satisfaction, Intention to Return, and Intention to Recommend
The results of the regression test show that the non-personality scale was statistically significant in estimating perceived quality at .000 levels. The R square indicates that 53% of variance in the perceived quality scale could be explained by the non-personality scale. The result also revealed that the 'benefits' dimension ($\beta = .70$) had stronger contribution to explaining perceived quality than the 'value for money' dimension ($\beta = .13$). However, both of the dimensions were found to be statistically significant predictors.

The non-personality scale was also found to be significant in estimating overall satisfaction ($p = .000$) with 36% of explanatory power ($p = .000$). However, the 'value for money' dimension was found not to make a significant contribution to the model ($p = .211$), while the 'benefits' factor, again made a very significant contribution in predicting overall satisfaction ($\beta = .58$, $p = .000$). This result indicates that the 'value for money' dimension is not closely related to consumers' overall satisfaction.

The regression on behavioural intentions (intention to return and intention to recommend) revealed that the non-personality scale was statistically significant ($p = .000$) in predicting both customers' intention to return and recommend. The R square value accounts for 18% and 36% of the total variance for the prediction of customers' intention to return and recommend respectively. Both dimensions were found statistically significant in predicting intention to return. However, only the 'benefits' dimension was found to have significant unique contribution in explaining intention to recommend ($\beta = .58$, $p = .000$).

Overall, the non-personality scale is statistically significant in predicting all the dependent variables. These results support the criterion related validity of the scale. In addition, the results revealed that the non-personality scale makes as much contribution as the brand personality scale makes in predicting all the dependent variables. In particular, the 'benefits' dimension of the non-personality scale was found to be the strongest predictor among all the personality and non-personality dimensions.
6.6.3 Reliability of the Scale

The reliability test, which measures the internal consistency of a scale was conducted to examine the reliability of the non-personality scale. Table 6.8 summarises the result of the reliability test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.D.</th>
<th>Item to total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha (α)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Clean environment</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tasty food</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neat employee</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sufficient portion</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visually appealing</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visually appealing</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nutritious food</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for</td>
<td>Expensive*</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>Value for money</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheap</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: re-coded item

Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of the ‘benefits’ and ‘value for money’ dimensions were found to be .86 and .71 respectively. These values exceed the minimum criteria in establishing the scale reliability.

The results of item to total coefficients suggest that each item has a significant contribution to the measurement of the relevant construct. Coefficients of the ‘benefits’
dimension ranged from .51 to .74, while the 'value for money' dimension ranged from .44 to .62. Therefore, the restaurant non-personality scale with two dimensions is deemed reliable (Churchill, 1979).

As a result, the non-personality attributes scale with two dimensions seems valid and reliable for the evaluation of restaurant brands. Construct validity and criterion validity of the scale were supported by the factor analysis and linear regression test. Cronbach's alpha coefficient also supported the reliability of the two dimensions.

6.7 The Brand Image Scale

As mentioned before, one of the aims of this study is to investigate the relationship between personality attributes and non-personality attributes of brand image (as well as the relationship between brand personality and brand image). In order to examine their relationship, another exploratory factor analysis was conducted. All personality and non-personality variables retained from the previous factor analyses were subjected to the principal component factor analysis. By combining two elements of brand image; personality and non-personality attributes, this analysis may be able to help 1) better understand the relationship of brand personality and brand image as well as the relationship between personality and non-personality attributes and 2) develop the brand image scale, which includes both personality and non-personality elements of brand image as a better measure for consumers' perception of a brand.

6.7.1 Construct Validity of the Brand Image Scale

A total of 26 attributes (16 personality and 10 non-personality attributes) were subjected to the factor analysis. The same assumptions and processes were applied as in the previous analyses. Table 6.9 summarises the final outcomes of the analysis.
Table 6.9: The Result of Factor Analysis for the Personality and the Non-Personality Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Communalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean environment</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neat employees</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesome</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasty food</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient portion</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutritious food</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excitement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daring</td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirited</td>
<td></td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td></td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charming</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper class</td>
<td></td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Popularity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colourful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value for Money</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expensive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.66</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigenvalue  7.67  2.63  1.80  1.41  
% of Variance 33.33 11.42 7.82 6.14  Total: 58.71

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax rotation. Item loading less than .40 omitted.
From the analysis, a four factor solution with 23 items, representing 59% of total variance was extracted. The retained four factors were supported by the following criteria: 1) all the variables retained significantly loaded on one factor; b) sufficient eigenvalues for each retained factor and relatively low value of the fifth factor (.10); c) meaningfulness of the factors, d) shape of the scree plot begins to straighten out after third factor, e) reasonable amount of variance (%) explained by the four factors. Therefore, these findings provide the construct validity of the brand image scale with four dimensions (Churchill, 1979).

Three factors out of the four confirmed are identical to the ‘excitement,’ ‘popularity’ and ‘value for money’ dimensions confirmed in the earlier analyses. Therefore, two dimensions from the modified personality scale (‘excitement’ and ‘popularity’) and one dimension from the non-personality scale (‘value for money’) were again confirmed valid. However, unlike the other factors identified, factor 1 labelled ‘service quality’, was generated by the combination of the two dimensions (sincerity and benefits) from the different scales.

These findings indicate that the two concepts, brand personality and non-personality parts of brand image, may not be the same constructs and represent two different concepts. However, a considerable level of overlap exists between these two constructs which may suggest that these two construct are closely related to each other. The interpretation of this finding, however, must be cautious and further investigation is deemed necessary.

6.7.2 Criterion Related Validity of the Brand Image Scale

Further to the factor analysis, linear regression analyses were conducted to investigate the relationship of the brand personality scale and the four external measures of overall impression and behavioural intention. The results of the four regression tests are summarised in Table 6.10.
### Table 6.10: Summary of Linear Regression: The Brand Image Scale and Quality, Satisfaction, Intention to Return, and Intention to Recommend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Perceived Quality</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction</th>
<th>Intention to Return</th>
<th>Intention to Recommend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t-value</td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Quality</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitement</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popularity</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for Money</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>50.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in the table, the brand image scale was found statistically significant (p = .000) in estimating the perceived quality (p = .000). The R square value of .58 indicates that 58% of the variance in perceived quality can be explained by the brand image scale. ‘Service quality,’ ‘excitement’ and ‘popularity’ are the three dimensions found to make statistically significant contributions to explaining perceived quality. Among them, the ‘service quality’ dimension was found to make the strongest contribution (β = .46, p = .000). However, the ‘value for money’ dimension was found not to have significant power in explaining perceived quality.

The second regression model assessed the relationship of the brand image scale and overall satisfaction. The result suggests that the scale is statistically significant in estimating customer’s overall satisfaction at the level of .000. The R square suggests that 38% of variance in overall satisfaction scale can be explained by the model. Again, ‘service quality’ dimension was found as the strongest contributor in estimating the overall satisfaction. ‘Popularity’ and ‘value for money’ were not found as significant contributors.

In the examination of the relationship of the brand image scale and the measures of behavioural intention, the R square value represents that the scale explains 19% of variance in the scale of intention to return and 39% of variance in intention to recommend. Both of them are statistically significant at the level of .000. Interestingly, the ‘service quality’ dimension was not found to make a significant contribution in explaining customers’ intention to return. The ‘excitement’ and ‘value for money’ dimensions were found to be strong predictors of intention to return.

In summary, the brand personality scale was found statistically significant in estimating overall impression and behavioural intention of customers. This finding supports the criterion related validity of the brand image scale in the context of restaurant brands.
6.7.3 Reliability of the Brand Image Scale

To examine the reliability of the brand image scale, Cronbach's alpha coefficient was measured. Table 6.11 summarises the findings of the internal consistency reliabilities for the four dimensions of the brand image scale.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.D.</th>
<th>Item to total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha (α)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Quality</strong></td>
<td>Clean environment</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tasty food</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sufficient portion</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neat employees</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wholesome</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comfortable</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nutritious food</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excitement</strong></td>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spirited</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charming</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daring</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper class</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Popularity</strong></td>
<td>Popular</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colourful</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value for Money</strong></td>
<td>Expensive*</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value for money</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheap</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: re-coded item
Cronbach's alpha coefficients for 'service quality,' 'excitement,' and 'value for money' were found to be .90, .83 and .71 respectively. These values exceed the recommended internal consistency threshold (.70). Although 'popularity' held an alpha coefficient of less than .70, it was retained because the value was at .68 which is only marginally below the recommended threshold. Item to total correlation coefficients for the scales ranged from .30 to .74. Therefore, there was no need to eliminate any item. These results indicate that the brand image scale is reliable.

As a result, the brand image scale with four dimensions and 23 items seems valid and reliable in the context of restaurant brands. Construct validity and criterion validity of the scale were supported by the factor analysis and linear regression analysis. Cronbach's alpha coefficient also supported the reliability of the four dimensions.

6.8 Further Investigation for the Relationship of Personality and Non-Personality Attributes

The results of regression tests suggest that the brand image scale is superior in estimating consumers' overall impressions and behavioural intentions to other scales of the brand personality scale and non-personality scale. Table 6.12 compares predictive power of the three scales.
Table 6.12: Comparison of Each Scale's $R^2$ on Overall Impression and Behavioural Intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R square ($R^2$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brand Personality Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Quality</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Return</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Recommend</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All the $R^2$ values are significant at the level of .000

Table 6.12 represents $R$ squares of each scale on customers' overall impressions and behavioural intentions. The brand image scale achieved an $R$ square value of .58 on customers' perception of overall quality, while the brand personality scale and the non-personality attributes scale had .53. This means that the brand image scale explains 58% of the variance in perceived quality while the other scales explain only 53%. Similarly, the brand image scale consistently achieved the highest $R$ square values among the three scales across all the dependent variables; namely overall satisfaction, intention to return and intention to recommend.

These results suggest that the brand image scale is statistically more significant in estimating and predicting customers' overall impression and behavioural intention than the other two scales, and thus it is a superior measure for the perception of a restaurant brand to the other scales, therefore researchers may need to consider both personality and non-personality components of brand image in order to better understand and measure consumers' perceptions of brands. This finding, however, is confined to the present study and further investigation is deemed necessary.

For the further examination of the relationship between personality attributes and non-personality attributes, a Pearson correlation test was performed. The dimensions of both
personality and non-personality scales and the four external measures were subjected to the analysis. Table 6.13 shows the result of the Pearson correlation test.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sincerity</th>
<th>Excitement</th>
<th>Popularity</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Value For Money</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Intention to Return</th>
<th>Intention to Recommend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitement</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popularity</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value For Money</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Return</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Recommend</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** : Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level. * : Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level
As shown in Table 6.13, relatively high correlations were found among the personality and the non-personality dimensions (inside the dot line). As expected by the previous factor analysis, the two dimensions; 'sincerity' and 'benefits' showed very significant relationships (.77). The 'sincerity' dimension was found to have moderate to strong correlations with all other dimensions. The other dimension of brand personality, 'excitement' also showed relatively strong correlations with the 'benefits' dimension of the non-personality scale (.66). However, the 'value for money' dimension seems only moderately related to the 'sincerity' dimension of the personality scale (.29) and did not show any significant relationship with other dimensions. The 'popularity' dimension was found moderately related to the 'sincerity' (.36), 'excitement' (.22) and 'benefits' (.36) dimensions but no significant relationship was found with 'value for money' (.05). The 'benefits' dimension of the non-personality scale showed moderate to strong correlations (.36 to .77) with all three dimensions of brand personality.

The 'benefits' dimension was also found to have the strongest relationships with consumers' overall impressions and behavioural intentions among all the dimensions of personality and non-personality attributes. This result may imply that 'benefits' dimension could be the most important cue when consumers evaluate restaurant brands and suggests that non-personality attributes of brand image may also need to be considered in understanding consumers' perception of a brand.

The above findings are consistent with the results of the factor analysis suggesting that brand personality and non-personality attributes are not the same constructs and represent two different concepts, although these two attributes are very closely related to each other. This result may confirm the proposition that brand personality is part of brand image (along with non-personality attributes) and not the same construct. (see Figure 6.8)
Figure 6.8 represents the relationship of brand personality, non-personality attributes and brand image in restaurant brands. The figure shows that two elements of brand image; brand personality and non-personality components, are not the same constructs, but different constructs having independent dimensions (i.e. ‘excitement,’ ‘popularity’ and ‘value for money’). However, the model also suggests that there is a degree of overlap between the two concepts (i.e. ‘sincerity’ and ‘benefits’).

The present study suggests that brand personality and non-personality attributes are separate elements of brand image although there is a degree of overlap and the two concepts are closely related to each other. This finding is consistent with Aaker’s (1996) assertion that product related attributes of a brand influence the perceived brand personality, while brand personality influences the perception of functional attributes of the brand. In addition, this study also suggests that researchers may need to consider both
personality and non-personality components of brand image to better understand consumers' perception of brands.

6.9 Summary

This chapter assessed validity of the concept of brand personality in restaurants by validating the brand personality scale and the related scales. To do so, a four step procedure was followed. First, it examined the generic quality of Aaker's five brand personality dimensions using 15 facets of brand personality. Secondly, the modified brand personality scale was examined in the context of restaurant brands. In the next stage, 18 identified non-personality attributes of brand personality were subjected to analysis to find possible emerging dimensions. Lastly, both personality and non-personality components of brand image were factor analysed at the same time to investigate the relationship between the two components of brand image and develop the brand image scale, which can better represent consumers' perception of brands.

The analysis findings revealed that the brand personality scale is valid and reliable in the context of restaurant brands. Three dimensions of brand personality were confirmed valid and reliable (i.e. 'sincerity'; 'excitement'; 'popularity'). However, the original five dimensions of BPS can not be replicated in this application. Only two dimensions, 'sincerity' and 'excitement', out of the five were found rigid throughout the study. In the case of the non-personality component of brand image, two dimensions; 'benefits' and 'value for money' were found to be valid and reliable.

The brand image scale, which combined the two scales (brand personality and non-personality), was found to be valid and reliable with four dimensions. In addition, the linear regression test revealed that the brand image scale had the most significant power
in predicting consumers' overall impressions (perceived quality and satisfaction) and behaviour intentions (intention to revisit and recommend) among the three scales. In the examination of the relationship between personality and non-personality attributes, the results suggest that brand personality and non-personality attributes of brand image are not the same construct. This finding may support the proposition that brand personality is part of brand image (along with non-personality attributes), but not the same construct. However, the findings also suggest that brand personality and non-personality attributes are closely related and share some common ground of the non-personality component and brand personality. The chapter concluded by suggesting four dimensions of restaurant brand image. They are 'excitement', 'popularity', 'service quality' and 'value for money'. Among them, the 'service quality' dimension was found to be a combination of personality and non-personality components of restaurant brand image.
CHAPTER 7
CHAPTER SEVEN

STUDY II: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY II - AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF BRAND PERSONALITY IMPORTANCE

7.1 Introduction

This study (Study II) is concerned with developing a theoretical framework of brand personality that provides insight into how brand personality operates when consumers choose brands. In doing so, relevant literature from the field of consumer marketing and social psychology will be reviewed according to its implication for the study. The results of the previous study (Study I) provide the basis for the present study.

This chapter presents the methodology of the second study explaining (1) how objectives of the second study is identified and operationalised, (2) how the findings of the first study were used to design the experimental conditions for this study and (3) how the suggested theoretical framework is developed.
This study aims to test, under different conditions, the causal relationship between brand personality and non-personality components, (on the one hand), and consumer choice intention, (on the other). To achieve this objective, experimental conditions in which consumers have to evaluate designed sets of restaurant, are designed using the findings from the first study. The restaurants are described as a combination of personality and non-personality attributes using a conjoint methodology. Two situational factors are also experimentally manipulated; (1) levels of involvement (high/low) and (2) types of involvement (high emotion/low emotion). This is done by varying the task instructions across the respondents.

Figure 7.1 summarises the research process for Study II.
Figure 7.1: Process of the Study II
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Conclusions & Suggestions
The main objective of the second study is to test how the two situational factors impact on the relationship between brand personality and restaurant brand choice. The hypothesis is that the situational factor (i.e. levels and types of involvement) moderate the effect of brand personality on consumers intention to choose restaurant brands.

For the purpose of the study, four situational conditions are generated based on levels and types of involvement. Using conjoint analysis methods, descriptions of hypothetical restaurants are generated to vary the brand personality and non-personality attributes. Respondents evaluate these restaurants under the different situation conditions. This chapter discusses the experimental design and questionnaire development. The findings of Study II will be presented in Chapter 8.

7.2 The Conceptual Framework of the Study

The importance of brand personality has been recognised by a wider community of marketing practitioners and academics (e.g. Plummer, 2000; Olson and Allen, 1995; Aaker, 1996). Advocates of brand personality claim that the concept is one of the most universally mentioned features of a brand (Phau and Lau, 2000). Brand personality is believed to increase preference, usage, emotional time, trust, loyalty and decreased vulnerability to competitive marketing actions (Aaker, 1997; Keller, 1998). The result of our Study I revealed that perceived brand personality is a significant predictor of perceived quality, satisfaction and consumers’ behavioural intentions (i.e. intention to return and recommend) (for details see Chapter 6).

Despite the importance of brand personality, however, few studies seem to have succeeded in providing a conceptual framework. Therefore, the concept still remains vague and elusive (Aaker and Fournier, 1995). Study II aims to develop a conceptual
frame that outlines when and why consumers perceive brands as personalities. In particular, it investigates the conditions under which consumers use personality cues (versus non-personality cues) to evaluate a brand. To achieve this goal, three brand personality ('reliable', 'charming' and 'cheerful') and three non-personality ('tasty', 'clean', and 'value for money') attributes were identified. In addition, two situational conditions were adopted as moderator variables namely, levels of involvement and types of involvement. The research framework is depicted in Figure 7.2
Figure 7.2: The Conceptual Framework

BP = Brand Personality Component, NP = Non-Personality Component.
Figure 7.2 represents the research model for Study II. Levels of involvement (high/low) and types of involvement (high emotion/low emotion) were hypothesised as moderator variables, which control the relative importance of brand personality (or non-personality) attributes on consumer brand choice intention.

7.3 Study Hypotheses

7.3.1 The Relationship between Brand Personality and Non-Personality, and Choice of Brands

One of the aims of this research was to examine the premise that brand personality influences consumers' brand choice. The findings of Study I (Chapter 6) revealed that both brand personality and non-personality components have a significant influence on perceived service quality, satisfaction and consumers' behavioural intentions. Study II aims to test the causal relationship of brand personality and non-personality with choice of restaurant brand in order to re-confirm the findings of Study I. The following hypotheses are generated to achieve this goal:

$H_1$: 'Reliable' attribute of brand personality has a positive effect on customers intention to choose restaurant brands.

$H_2$: 'Charming' attribute of brand personality has a positive effect on customers intention to choose restaurant brands.

$H_3$: 'Cheerful' attribute of brand personality has a positive effect on customers intention to choose restaurant brands.

$H_4$: 'Tasty' attribute of non-personality has a positive effect on customers intention to choose restaurant brands.

$H_5$: 'Clean' attribute of non-personality has a positive effect on customers intention to choose restaurant brands.

$H_6$: 'Value for money' attribute of non-personality has a positive effect on customers intention to choose restaurant brands.
7.3.2 Involvement as Situational Factors: Moderator Variables

7.3.2.1 Situational factors

Situation has been accepted as an important variable in understanding consumer behaviour (Filiatrault and Ritchie, 1988). Consumption situations are especially considered to be the most fundamental from the perspective of building situational effects into a more general theory of consumer decision making (Lutz, 1980). Solomon (1999) defines consumption situations as "factors beyond characteristics of the person and of the product that influence the buying and/or using of products and services." A considerable body of literature has underlined the important influence that situational variables can have on consumers' evaluation of product attributes and choice behaviour (e.g. Bagozzi, Wong, Abe, and Bergami, 2000; June and Smith, 1987; Belk, 1974).

According to Cote (1986), situational factors are external to the individual and thus can be manipulated and controlled in experimental settings, since they can, at certain level, be objectively defined. Although a variety of factors which characterise situations exist, Belk (1975, p.159) suggested five dimensions of a situation:

(1) **Physical surroundings** are the most readily apparent features of a situation and include geographical and institutional location, sounds, décor, aroma, lighting, weather and visible configurations of merchandise or other material surrounding the stimulus objects.

(2) **Social surroundings** provide additional depth to a description of a situation. This dimension includes other persons present, their characteristics, their apparent roles and interpersonal interactions.
(3) **Temporal perspective** is a feature that could be defined as time such as time of the day, a day of the week or season of the year. It may also be measured relative to some past or future events for the situation participant.

(4) **Task definition** refers to a situation that includes an intent or requirement to select, shop for or obtain information about a general or specific consumption. In addition, a task may reflect different buyer and user roles anticipated by the individual.

(5) **Antecedent state features** include momentary moods (e.g. anxiety, pleasantness, hostility and excitation) or momentary conditions (e.g. cash on hand, fatigue and illness) rather than chronic individual traits.

From the five dimensions of a situation, it has been proposed that the first two, physical surroundings and social surroundings, tend to be of primary salience when considering a particular situation and its behavioural norms (Aaker, 1995). Indeed, Belk (1975) suggests that the best way to manipulate and describe a situation is by combining a written description of the physical characteristics of the situation with visual input of the social environment.

In the service industry, the influence of situational factors on the evaluation of attribute levels in the consumer decision process is argued to be more salient, because of such characteristics as intriability (Andreasen, 1983) and intangibility (Wyckham, Fitzroy, and Mandry, 1975). Prior empirical studies also suggest that the importance level of each attributes differ significantly across different situations in fast-food outlets and dining restaurants (Filiatrault and Ritchie, 1988). Based on these arguments, it can be assumed that the importance accorded to restaurant brand attributes may be significantly different across different consumption situations.
7.3.2.2 Emotional Involvement

The relationship between involvement and consumers' reaction has been studied extensively by consumer researchers (Solomon, 1999; Schiffman and Kanuk, 2000). Although consensus is yet to be reached in defining the constitutive meaning of the involvement construct (Park and Young, 1983; 1986), it is generally believed that a consumer's level of involvement depends on the degree of relevance and importance that the product or service holds for that consumer (Schiffman and Kanuk, 2000).

Involvement can be defined as "the level of perceived personal importance and/or interest evoked by a stimulus (or stimuli) within a specific situation" (Solomon, 1999, p.111). When consumers find products personally relevant or important, they are expected to devote considerably more attention in evaluating the products and to process information at a deeper level than they would have when they do not find the products important. For instance, the purchase of automobile and cosmetics may be categorised as high involvement, due to the high perceived financial risk of automobiles and the high perceived social risk of cosmetics.

It is generally believed that there are at least two different kinds of involvement. One is item-specific and the other is purchase situation-specific (Belk, 1982). The item-specific form of involvement is also called product involvement (Clarke and Belk, 1979; Zaichkowsky, 1986). The essence of the construct involved in this form of involvement is that the consumer who is high in purchase item-specific involvement cares more about that item and is more interested in the purchase outcome. The other form of involvement is situational involvement (Zaichkowsky, 1987; 1994) or task involvement (Belk, 1982). This form of involvement arises from the consumer's goals in a particular consumption situation rather than attaching to a particular product.

For many years, involvement research has focused on the level of involvement (i.e. high and low involvement). However, Park and Young (1986) argue that the type of involvement should be considered along with the level of involvement. They suggest that
it might be more appropriate to examine the motives underlying personal relevance, to have a proper perspective on the effects of involvement. Specifically, one may be involved functionally in a purchase to satisfy utilitarian motives, whereas others may be involved emotionally in a purchase to satisfy emotional or symbolic motives. Indeed, these two different types of needs; functional and emotional, have been well recognised by a number of researchers (e.g. Park, Jaworski and MacInnis, 1986; Johar and Sirgy, 1991; Bhat and Reddy, 1998; Solomon, 1999; Schiffman and Kanuk, 2000). Given that Park and Young (1986) concluded that utilitarian motives lead to cognitive involvement while emotional motives lead to emotional/affective involvement. Therefore, types of involvement involve the basis of the motives or the reasons underlying involvement while levels of involvement represent the strength of involvement.

Vaughn (1980; 1986) supports this notion that there are different types of involvement. He outlined a theoretical perspective for viewing product categories by using both types (cognitive and emotional) and levels (high and low) of involvement. He suggested a matrix with four quadrants in categorising products. The vertical side displays the notion of high and low involvement, while the horizontal side shows the notion of cognition and emotion (see Figure 7.3)
As shown in Figure 7.3, Vaughn suggests four different categories of products. According to him, the first quadrant; high involvement/thinking, implies a large need for specific information about a product due to the importance of the product and thinking issues related to it. In the second quadrant, the decision is involving, but specific information is less important than an attitude or holistic feeling towards the product. In the third quadrant, product decisions are hypothesised to require minimal thought and a tendency towards buying habits for convenience. The fourth quadrant is low involvement/affective and is reserved for those products that satisfy personal tastes (Vaughn, 1980).

Although the above study is based on product categories (i.e. item-specific involvement), it is plausible to expand our view to consumption situations since we accepted the notion of two different kinds of involvement; item-specific and situation-specific (Belk, 1982). Moreover, this situational involvement concept has been well recognised and accepted.
both conceptually and empirically by a number of researchers (e.g. Clarke and Belk, 1979; Belk, 1982; Zaichkowsky, 1987). From these arguments, one can easily notice that situations can be classified into four different categories of involvement; 1) cognitive/high involvement, 2) emotional/high involvement, 3) cognitive/low involvement and 4) emotional/low involvement.

Based on these preceding discussions it can be expected that the importance accorded to restaurant brand attributes differs by type and level of involvement.

The literature survey suggests that people can have emotional relationships with inanimate objects (possessions). Based on the above arguments, it seems reasonable that consumers can have emotional relationships with brands too and thus perceive brands as part of their extended self (Belk, 1987; 1988). Once consumers form an emotional relationship with a brand and consider it as part of their extended self, they tend to project and reinforce their personality onto the brands (de Chernatony and McEnally, 1999; Phau and Lau, 2000; 2001). It seems plausible to assume that if a person regards a brand or a product as part of their extended self, he/she describes the brand or the product using his/her own personality characteristics. Indeed, this notion was supported by the empirical research conducted by Phau and Lau (2001). In a study using a beer brand, they revealed that consumers having a strong relationship with the brand actually project their own personality characteristics onto the brand.

Based on the above discussions, it is assumed that a consumer who has a stronger relationship with a brand is more likely to use brand personality in his/her evaluation of the brand. In addition, as previously mentioned, the above notion could be expanded from brands to consumption situations (Belk, 1982; 1988). In this sense, situations in which they are highly and (or) emotionally involved, consumers are more likely to perceive objects (brands) and communicate about those objects in personality/relationship terms than in situations in which they are less and (or) less emotionally involved. Thus, more personality characteristics could be used when they evaluate the situations. Consequently, personalities of brands become more important to consumers when they choose a brand.
in those specific situations. Based on this discussion, it could be hypothesised that
consumers with high and (or) emotionally involved situations are more likely to exert
brand personality when they evaluate brands.

Therefore, the following hypotheses are generated:

\( H_7 \): Levels of involvement (high versus low) moderates the effect of 'reliable' attribute of brand personality on intention to choose restaurant brands.

\( H_8 \): Levels of involvement (high versus low) moderates the effect of 'charming' attribute of brand personality on intention to choose restaurant brands.

\( H_9 \): Levels of involvement (high versus low) moderates the effect of 'cheerful' attribute of brand personality on intention to choose restaurant brands.

\( H_{10} \): Levels of involvement (high versus low) moderates the effect of 'tasty' attribute of non-personality on intention to choose restaurant brands.

\( H_{11} \): Levels of involvement (high versus low) moderates the effect of 'clean' attribute of non-personality on intention to choose restaurant brands.

\( H_{12} \): Levels of involvement (high versus low) moderates the effect of 'value for money' attribute of non-personality on intention to choose restaurant brands.

\( H_{13} \): Types of involvement (high emotion versus low emotion) moderates the effect of 'reliable' attribute of brand personality on intention to choose restaurant brands.

\( H_{14} \): Types of involvement (high emotion versus low emotion) moderates the effect of 'charming' attribute of brand personality on intention to choose restaurant brands.

\( H_{15} \): Types of involvement (high emotion versus low emotion) moderates the effect of 'cheerful' attribute of brand personality on intention to choose restaurant brands.

\( H_{16} \): Types of involvement (high emotion versus low emotion) moderates the effect of 'tasty' attribute of non-personality on intention to choose restaurant brands.

\( H_{17} \): Types of involvement (high emotion versus low emotion) moderates the effect of 'clean' attribute of non-personality on intention to choose restaurant brands.

\( H_{18} \): Types of involvement (high emotion versus low emotion) moderates the effect of 'value for money' attribute of non-personality on intention to choose restaurant brands.
7.4 Study Approach

In conducting research, selecting and designing the appropriate methodology is a crucial factor determining the potential of accomplishing the purpose and objectives of the study. In this study, conjoint analysis is preferred as one of the methodologies for examining the hypotheses suggested. Conjoint analysis is considered one of the most popular methodologies for identifying how consumers make trade-offs among competing attributes and assessing the relative importance of attributes (Green, Krieger and Wind, 2001; Oppewal and Vriens, 2000). In this sense, since the aim is to assess the relative importance of brand personality attributes (versus non-personality attributes) under different situational factors, conjoint analysis could be a very useful method for the present study.

Conjoint analysis is a multivariate technique used specifically to understand how consumers develop preferences for products or services (Hair et al., 1998). Traditional research techniques in assessing consumer preference tend to treat each attribute independently. Consumers, however, do not consider each attribute of a product or service individually when making a choice. Rather consumers consider the whole range of products or services in an holistic manner. Conjoint analysis, which engages the respondents in a more realistic judgement stance than does traditional research methods, can better predict the overall consumer preference through aggregating the utility scores of all individual product attributes (Koo, Tao and Yeung, 1999). Utility, which is the conceptual basis for measuring value in conjoint analysis, is a subjective preference judgement by a respondent representing the holistic worth of a specific object (Hair et al., 1998). In conjoint analysis, importance of an attribute is assumed to be formed by the combination of each utility value given to each level of an attribute.
7.4.1 Basic Assumptions of Conjoint Analysis

Two essential assumptions are made in conjoint analysis. First, a product or service can be described as a combination of levels of a set of attributes. Second, these attribute levels determine consumers’ overall judgement of the product or service. Therefore, conjoint analysis allows researchers to identify, 1) which level of an attribute is most preferred by consumers; 2) the importance of each attribute relative to the others and to consumers’ decision by calculating a utility score (or part worth) for each level of each attribute; 3) an overall utility of a product by summing up the utility scores for each attributes. Generally, the product or service with the highest overall utility is the most preferred (Hair et al., 1998; Koo et al., 1999).

7.4.2 Conjoint Analysis Methodologies

One of the fundamental questions in conducting conjoint analysis is choosing the right methodology for the study being applied. There are three basic conjoint methodologies: 1) traditional conjoint; 2) adaptive conjoint; 3) choice-based conjoint (Hair et al., 1998). The most basic and popular method is traditional conjoint analysis. This method adopts the classic principle of conjoint analysis. It is usually characterised by using an additive model of consumer preference and full profile or pair-wise method of presentation. This method is usually suggested to be suitable for analysing up to 9 attributes (Hair et al., 1998).

Although the traditional method has been the main stream of conjoint analysis for a long period of time, two additional methodologies have been developed to solve certain design issues (Hair et al., 1998). The adaptive conjoint method was developed to overcome the issue that the traditional method can handle only a limited number of attributes at a time (usually up to 9) in analysing data. The adaptive conjoint method usually allows researchers to use up to 30 stimuli at the same time, which would not be feasible using...
The traditional method. This method conducts an analysis that relies on information from the respondents to adapt the conjoint design to make the task simpler. Self-explicated and hybrid models are popular examples of the adaptive conjoint method (Hair et al., 1998).

The choice-based conjoint method is an alternative form of collecting responses and estimating the conjoint model. It applies a unique form of presenting stimuli, asking respondents to select a full profile stimulus from a set of stimuli known as a choice set, rather than rating or ranking each profile one by one. This method is believed to be more representative of the actual selection process of a product from a set of competing products. Furthermore, the choice-based method provides a no-choice option in the choice set. Whereas traditional conjoint method assumes respondents’ preferences will always be allocated among the set of attributes, the choice-based approach allows for market contraction if all the alternatives in a choice set are unsatisfactory. However, this method is usually able to handle only up to 6 attributes and has to be estimated at the aggregate level (Hair et al., 1998)

### 7.4.3 Presentation Methods of Conjoint Analysis

In conjoint analysis, respondents are usually asked to indicate their preference for a series of hypothetical multi-attribute alternatives, which are typically presented as profiles of attributes. Then the responses to the profiles are analysed to assess the relative importance of the attributes (Oppewal and Vriens, 2000). There are three general approaches of stimuli presentation; trade-off, full profile and pair-wise comparison (Hair et al., 1998). The trade-off method ranks all combinations of levels of two attributes in a matrix. It has the advantage of being simple and easy to administer for the respondent. In addition, this method avoids information overload by presenting only two attributes at a time. However, this method is now rarely used due to its limitations, such as lack of realism from using only two factors at a time and the need for a large number of judgements.
The full profile presentation method, which is the most popular method, is more realistic as all factors are considered and evaluated at the same time. In this approach, respondents are asked to rate or rank a set of profiles according to their preferences. On each profile, all factors are presented and a different combination of factor levels appears.

The pair-wise comparison method is the combination of the two previous methods. The pair-wise comparison method is a comparison of two different profiles, with the respondent usually using a rating scale to indicate strength of preference of a profile. However, in the pair-wise method, the profile does not usually contain all the attributes, as does the full profile method, but instead only a few selected attributes are used in generating profiles. It is similar to the trade-off method in that pairs are evaluated, but in the case of the trade-off method, the pairs being evaluated are attributes, whereas the pairs are profiles in the pair-wise comparison method (Hair et al., 1998).

7.4.4 Factors and Levels

Conjoint analysis’s experimental foundations place great importance to the selection of the stimuli. The design of stimuli is concerned with specifying the conjoint variate by choosing the appropriate factors and levels to be included in generating the stimuli (Hair et al., 1998). Factor levels are specific values of the factors, such as cheap, once a week and blue, while factors are the general attribute categories of a product or service such as, in the above case, price, frequency and colour.

On many occasions, the possible combination of all factor levels become too large for respondents to rate or rank in a meaningful way. For example, if the researcher wants to assess the impact of five factors with four levels for each factor, 1024 profiles ($4^5$: $4 \times 4 \times 4 \times 4 \times 4$), which is far too many for one respondent to evaluate, would be created. Therefore, in the full profile method, fractional factorial design is commonly used for defining a subset of profiles for evaluation (Louviere, 1988).
7.5 Questionnaire Design

The design of the questionnaire involves choosing an appropriate conjoint method for this study, creating a factorial design for the conjoint analysis and generating four situational conditions.

7.5.1 The Conjoint Design

As previously mentioned, conjoint analysis is preferred as one of the methodologies to examine the hypothetical conditions suggested in this study, since the technique is considered as a very useful methodology in identifying how consumers make trade-offs among competing variables (Green et al., 2001). This section discusses the steps in designing a conjoint analysis as described by Hair et al. (1998).

7.5.1.1 Identifying factors and levels

The factors for the conjoint study were based on the attributes that were generated in the first study (Study I). They include personality and non-personality attributes. The followings are the criteria used to select the attributes; 1) meaningfulness as a restaurant choice attributes, 2) avoidance of conceptual overlap between attributes, 3) for personality factors, attributes suggested by Aaker’s (1997) BPS were preferred. In addition, a maximum of six attributes (an equal number of personality and non-personality attributes) were selected to allow use of a small experimental design.

Considering the above criteria, the following 6 attributes were selected as factors: reliable, clean, value for money, tasty, cheerful and charming. The three factors; reliable, cheerful and charming were identified from the brand personality attributes. All of these three factors were validated in the first study of this research and included in Aaker’s original
brand personality facets. To represent the diversity of brand personality, the three factors were selected from the different dimensions of brand personality. 'Reliable' represents 'competence' dimension of brand personality while 'charming' and 'cheerful' represent 'sophistication' and 'sincerity' dimensions respectively (Aaker, 1997).

The three factors, clean, value for money and tasty, represent the non-personality attributes of brand image. Among the attributes identified from the two dimensions of non-personality attributes of brand image, the factors deemed important for the evaluation of restaurant brands were selected. 'Value for money' was selected from the 'value for money' dimension of non-personality component. Both 'tasty' and 'clean' were chosen from the 'benefits' dimension.

Considering the nature of factors, a linear relationship was assumed between the levels of the attributes and the dependent variable. At the next stage, therefore, each factor was divided into two levels. Table 7.1 presents the factors and factors levels identified for this study.
Table 7.1: Factors and Levels Identified for the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Factor Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Reliable | a. The restaurant is described as ‘reliable’  
               b. The restaurant is described as ‘not reliable’ |
| 2. Clean  | a. The restaurant is described as ‘clean’  
               b. The restaurant is described as ‘not clean’ |
| 3. Value for Money | a. The restaurant is described as ‘value for money’  
                           b. The restaurant is described as ‘not value for money’ |
| 4. Tasty  | a. The restaurant is described as ‘tasty’  
               b. The restaurant is described as ‘not tasty’ |
| 5. Cheerful | a. The restaurant is described as ‘cheerful’  
                        b. The restaurant is described as ‘not cheerful’ |
| 6. Charming | a. The restaurant is described as ‘charming’  
                           b. The restaurant is described as ‘not charming’ |

Table 7.1 represents the 6 factors (3 personality attributes and 3 non-personality attributes) with 2 levels each identified for the present study.

7.5.1.2 Selecting a conjoint analysis methodology

After determining factors, a researcher should decide which conjoint analysis methodology should be used. In this study, the traditional conjoint analysis was applied as the primary analysis method since the study has only six attributes and will adopt a simple additive model. However, the study will be carried out at an aggregate level rather than an individual level, which is common in the traditional conjoint method (Hair et al., 1998) since the study seeks to identify the overall consumer preference for each attribute in different situations through aggregating the utility scores from each situation.
simple additive model refers to a type of composition rule. This model is also known as a ‘main effects’ model. In a simple additive model, researchers assume that individuals just add up the part-worths to calculate a total utility. This model is based on the assumption that there is no interaction among attributes.

7.5.1.3 Choosing a part worth relationship

There are three basic types of relationship between factor levels and the dependent variable in conjoint analysis; a) linear model, b) quadratic or ideal model, and c) part-worth model (Hair et al., 1998). The linear model is the simplest yet most restricted form since it estimates only a single part-worth. The quadratic model does not have strict linearity assumption and thus it can have a simple curvilinear relationship. Lastly, the part-worth model allows separate estimation for each level and thus each level can have a separate part-worth estimate.

As mentioned earlier, the present study adopted the linear model which assumes that a simple linear relationship between two levels of each of the six factors.

7.5.1.4 Selecting a presentation Method

As previously mentioned in this chapter, there are three general presentation methods for conjoint analysis; trade-off, full profile and pair-wise comparison (Hair et al., 1998). In this study, the most popular method, the full profile presentation, was adopted. The full profile presentation method is considered as a more realistic description of profiles in terms of levels for each factor, demonstrating the trade-offs among factors and the existing environmental correlations among the attributes, since all factors are considered and evaluated at the same time. In the full profile method, all factors on each profile are presented and a different combination of factor levels appears and then respondents are asked to rate or rank a set of profiles according to their preference.
7.5.1.5 Creating the stimuli

As previously shown, in the present study we have 6 factors with 2 levels each. That means that a full factorial design using two levels of each factor would involve 64 runs \((2^6)\), which in most cases are too many for one person to complete. However, to reduce the possible number of profiles of the factors, a fractional factorial design can be used.

In general, all fractional designs involve some loss of statistical information, and the information loss can be large if there is not a sufficient number of stimuli. Curry (1997) suggests the following equation for the minimum required number of stimuli.

\[
N_{[C]} = N_{[L]} - N_{[A]} + 1
\]

Where,
- \(N_{[C]}\) represents the minimum number of profiles needed
- \(N_{[L]}\) is the total number of levels across all factors and
- \(N_{[A]}\) indicates the total number of factors in the study.

Therefore, this study needs to include at least 7 stimuli \((12 - 6 + 1 = 7)\) out of 64 possible stimuli. Accepting the above recommendations, 8 profiles are used for this study. Therefore, from the 64 possible stimuli, 8 were selected by using a fractional factorial design. As mentioned earlier, this study adopts the additive model and thus only the main effects for each factor with no interactions were assessed. Table 7.2 shows orthogonal (i.e. no correlation among levels across attributes) and balanced (i.e. each level in a factor appears the same number of times) combinations of levels for the profiles used in the study.
Table 7.2: Combination of Levels for the 8 Profiles (Main Effects Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile 1</th>
<th>Profile 2</th>
<th>Profile 3</th>
<th>Profile 4</th>
<th>Profile 5</th>
<th>Profile 6</th>
<th>Profile 7</th>
<th>Profile 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'+1' represents Level 'a', '-1' represents Level 'b'

Table 7.2 shows a factorial design of 8 profiles (main effect only) which is sufficient for the minimum number of stimuli (i.e. 7 = 12 – 6 + 1). '+1' and '-1' represent levels of factors. For instance, in the first factor ('reliable'), '+1' represents level a, which means that the restaurant is described as 'reliable', while '-1' represents level b, which indicates that the restaurant is described as 'not reliable.'

From the above design, the order of factors was randomly distributed within the profile in order to avoid a possible order bias. Based on this, 8 hypothetical restaurant profiles were generated. Table 7.3 represents one of the restaurant profiles (profile 1) used in this study.
Table 7.3: A Sample Profile of a Restaurant Used in the Study (profile 1)

Restaurant C is described as

- not reliable
- Tasty
- not clean
- Cheerful
- not good value for money
- Charming

Although the factorial design was optimal, the profiles were examined again with the aim to detect possible unrealistic profiles that could occur with stimuli containing all levels. However, none of the profiles was found unacceptable. Lastly, the researcher generated two different versions of the questionnaire in terms of ordering profiles in order to avoid order of profiles affecting the evaluation.

7.5.1.6 Selecting a measure of consumer preference: The dependent variable

The next stage of designing conjoint analysis involves selecting the measure of preference. A researcher should decide the type of measure for consumer preference. The full profile presentation method can evaluate preference by using both ranking and rating methods (Hair et al., 1998). In this study, obtaining a rating of preference on a metric scale was preferred to a ranking method for the following reasons: 1) rating measures are easily analysed and administered, 2) it allows conjoint estimation to be performed by multivariate regression (Hair et al., 1998), 3) it copes with other scales in the study, enabling the researcher to compare with them. In the questionnaires, respondents were given a 7 point rating scale ranging from 1 to 7. Respondents were asked to rate their choice preference of the described restaurant under the allocated situation from '1' representing 'extremely unlikely' to '7' representing 'extremely likely to choose'.
7.5.2 Definitions of the Situations

One of the principle goals and outcomes of this study is to empirically demonstrate that in particular situations, customers are more likely to use human personalities for evaluating restaurant brands.

In the preceding discussions, involvement situation was defined by types and levels of involvement. Based on that, four involvement situations for the study were identified. They are 1) low emotion/high involvement, 2) low emotion/low involvement, 3) high emotion/high involvement and 4) high emotion/low involvement. The next phase was to select four dining situations that accurately elicit one of the four involvement situations. The selection of these situations is important, since the determination of the interaction between subjects’ self and situation can only be determined if the ‘objective’ situation is clearly defined and understood.

Therefore, all the four dining situations need to be designed as relatively ‘strong’ situations, which refer to objective situations where most to all individuals interpret the situation in the same way (Aaker, 1995). To generate the four dining situations, two characteristics of dining situations were used; 1) the physical environment of the dinner (i.e. the type of dining, such as an important dinner) and 2) the social environment of the dinner (i.e. who was there, such as a key client) (Belk, 1975; Aaker, 1995). The four dining situations were generated using the above two characteristics. The four dining situations generated for one of each involvement situation are shown in Figure 7.4.
As represented in Figure 7.4, each situation defined was based on a 2 (levels of involvement: high vs. low) × 2 (types of involvement: high emotion vs. low emotion) factorial design. The high involvement/ low emotion situation (Situation A) was specified as ‘a business dinner with your key client.’ The low involvement/ low emotion situation (Situation B) was selected as ‘a typical and normal lunch meeting with your colleague.’ The high involvement/ high emotion situation (Situation C) was represented by ‘a wedding anniversary dinner with your spouse.’ The low involvement/ high emotion situation (Situation D) was represented by ‘a normal and typical lunch with one of your best friend’ situation.

The next stage involved the operationalisation of the four dining situations. The written descriptions of each situation are as follows:

**Situation A: A Business Dinner with Your Key Client:** Imagine that you are about to have a dinner meeting with one of your key clients. You know that this dinner could
result in the success of a crucial business deal since the client is considering placing a large order with your company.

**Situation B: A Typical and Normal Lunch Meeting with Your Colleague:** Imagine that you are about to have a lunch meeting with one of your colleagues. This is a typical and normal informal meeting. There is no special agenda and you will have a light discussion on your company's routine issues.

**Situation C: A Wedding Anniversary Dinner with Your Spouse:** Imagine that next Friday is your 10th wedding anniversary. You expect to have a fancy dinner with your spouse to celebrate the anniversary. You wish to make this dinner a special, memorable and intimate occasion.

**Situation D: A Normal and Typical Lunch with One of your Best Friends:** Imagine that you expect to have lunch with one of your best friends. This is a typical and normal lunch and nothing special should come to mind.

In this way, respondents imagine themselves in the situation, based on a written description of the situational characteristics and rate the likelihood of choosing a specific restaurant in that particular situation. Based on the above four situations, four forms of questionnaire were generated and distributed. Respondents were allocated and respond to one of the four questionnaire types (i.e. between subjects design). Then, the influence of the situation on a consumer's evaluation of restaurant attributes is assessed by comparing the change in choice likelihood of a particular restaurant under each of the four situational conditions.
7.5.3 Questionnaire Layout

After defining and refining the appropriate analysis methods and study situations to fulfil the research objectives, the survey questionnaires were generated. The questionnaires for this study have four different versions depending on the allocated situation; A) high involvement/low emotion, B) low involvement/low emotion, C) high involvement/high emotion, and D) low involvement/high emotion. Each version of the questionnaire was structured in five parts. In the first part of the questionnaire, respondents were introduced to one of the four situations allocated. Figure 7.5 shows a sample of the situation introduction used in the questionnaires.
INSTRUCTIONS

We would like to know your preferred restaurant for the following given dining situation. To provide you with an overall feel of what the dining situation is like, a brief description is given. The key to the success of this research depends on you really imagining yourself in the situation. Please read the following story carefully and WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO IMAGINE YOURSELF IN THE FOLLOWING SITUATION:

DINING SITUATION
A Business Dinner with Your Key Client

Imagine that you are about to have a dinner meeting with one of your key clients. You know that this dinner could result in the success of a crucial business deal since the client is considering placing a large order with your company. Now, it is your task to select a restaurant for that dinner.

Note: To help you picture this situation, think about what it may feel like to be at a business dinner with your client. What are you thinking about? What are you doing or talking about?

Now, please answer the questions accordingly throughout this questionnaire;

With the questionnaire, respondents were allocated to one of the four situations defined ("a business dinner with your key client," "a typical and normal lunch meeting with your colleague," "a wedding anniversary dinner with your spouse," and "a normal and typical lunch with one of your best friends") with brief instructions.
The next part (section 1) deals with identifying important restaurant attributes when they choose a restaurant for the assigned situation. Respondents were asked to choose three important attributes out of six restaurant attributes under the described situation. In this section, respondents were not given any specific restaurant descriptions, in order not to confine their evaluation of restaurant attributes.

Section 2 of the questionnaires involves a conjoint task. The procedure of the task was explained to subjects with instructions as shown in Figure 7.6. In addition, the assigned situation for the questionnaire was shown again to remind the respondents.

**Figure 7.6: A Sample Direction of Section 2 (Conjoint Design)**

**DIRECTIONS:** In this section, you will see 10 hypothetical restaurants (A to J) in five scenarios. All of the ten restaurants will be described by six criteria (reliability, taste of food, cleanliness, cheerfulness, value for money, and charm). Each restaurant profile has a distinctive combination of these six restaurant features. Please treat each situation as independent (i.e. none of the situations are connected or influenced by each other.)

Please remember, there are absolutely no right or wrong answers to the following questions. It is your impressions and feelings about the restaurant settings that we are interested in. The important thing for you to do is really imagine yourself in the same dining situation described before (A BUSINESS DINNER WITH YOUR KEY CLIENT).

Please read carefully the descriptions of each restaurant before answering the questions. Then, answer the following questions by ticking (✓) an appropriate box for each question.

The section includes five pages each with two profiles (i.e. 10 profiles). Each of the 10 profiles has a distinctive combination of levels of the six restaurant attributes (reliable, cheerful, charming, tasty, clean and value for money) according to the fractional factorial design (for details see Table 7.2). However, the first two profiles were designed as
dummy profiles aimed at helping subjects familiarize themselves with the choice set of profiles and rating scales, before conducting the main conjoint task. Figure 7.7 shows a sample page used in Section 2
Figure 7.7: A Sample Scenario Used for Conjoint Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario 2.</th>
<th>Assume that you have visited the restaurant ‘C’ and ‘D’ before</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restaurant C</strong> is described as</td>
<td><strong>Restaurant D</strong> is described as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reliable</td>
<td>reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasty</td>
<td>not tasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not clean</td>
<td>not clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheerful</td>
<td>not cheerful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not good value for money</td>
<td>not good value for money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charming</td>
<td>charming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please answer the following questions**

How likely are you to select this restaurant for the described business dinner?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely unlikely</th>
<th>Extremely likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Figure 7.7, each profile has a combination of levels of the six restaurant attributes (three personality and three non-personality). In each profile, subjects were asked to rate a 7-point scale on choice preference for the restaurant described.

Section 3 deals with general questions about respondents' restaurant visiting behaviour. This section was designed to identify information such as respondents' preferred restaurant type, average expenditure, frequency of visiting the restaurant and so on.

The last section of the questionnaire includes questions about respondents' socio-demographic profile. Subjects were asked to provide their sex, nationality, age, occupation, education level and average household income. This section is designed to investigate the socio-demographic influences on the perception of respondents.

7.5.4 Pilot Study

It is considered crucial to conduct a pilot study before commencing main fieldwork to help the researcher to identify and eliminate possible problems before the main survey.

7.5.4.1 Stage I: Situation manipulation check

Before conducting the main pilot study, a situation pre-test was conducted to examine if the four situations pre-specified are perceived by respondents as what they are intended to be in terms of the levels and types of involvement. 23 British subjects (female 65%) were used for the test. The levels of involvement were assessed by the word pair, unimportant-important (Schiffman and Kanuk, 2000; Solomon, 1999), while the emotional side of involvement was examined by the word pair unexciting-exciting (Russell, 1983; Zaichkowsky, 1987). Subjects were asked to rate the two 7 point semantic scales for each of the four situations defined. The mean scores for each situation were compared with the mean scores of all the four situations. The results revealed that the subjects did discriminate between the four situations, and the situations described were found to
successfully reflect the levels (high/low) and types (high emotion/low emotion) of involvement assumed. In addition, informal focus groups prior to the main survey also supported that respondents clearly discriminated all four situations.

7.5.4.2 Stage II: Contents of the questionnaire

The main pilot study was conducted in March 2003. The objective of this pilot was to identify and modify any possible comprehension problems in order to enhance the face validity. A total of 27 participants were selected for this study. From the four situations, only one situation (a business dinner with your key client) was used in the pilot study.

The piloting procedure revealed that most of the respondents found no major comprehension problems although there were some drawbacks in understanding the context of some questions. As a result, some of the questions were modified according to the respondents' recommendations to enhance understanding. The final form of the questionnaire is presented in Appendix C.

7.6 Summary

This chapter was concerned with the methodological approach employed in Study II. The objective of this study was to examine the situational factors on the relative importance of brand personality on consumer's brand choice. To achieve this aim, two situational variables (types and levels of involvement) were adopted as moderator variables, which moderate the relative importance of personality and non-personality attributes on consumer brand choice.

In the first part, the study frame was introduced, followed by brief theoretical backgrounds and study hypotheses. Conjoint analysis is one of the most popular
methodologies for identifying how consumers make trade-offs among competing attributes, and assessing the relative importance of attributes, and was therefore adopted as the main data analysis method for the study. Eight hypothetical restaurant profiles were generated by fractional factorial design for the conjoint task.

The next section of this chapter was concerned with selecting appropriate dining occasions that represent one of the four identified involvement situations; 1) low emotion/high involvement, 2) low emotion/low involvement, 3) high emotion/high involvement and 4) high emotion/low involvement. The four dining situations (a business dinner, a lunch meeting, a wedding anniversary dinner and a typical lunch with a friend) were generated and illustrated for the situations. Two characteristics of the situations, the physical environment and the social environment, were used to define the four dining situations. The last part of this chapter outlined and discussed questionnaire layout and how the pilot study was conducted.
CHAPTER 8
CHAPTER EIGHT

FINDINGS OF STUDY II:
AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF
BRAND PERSONALITY IMPORTANCE

8.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present the findings of the second study (Study II). It begins with an overview of the data analysis process. The chapter goes on to present the main data analysis gathered from the survey. Before conducting each analysis, the rationale of the applied techniques is briefly explained. The main analysis section is divided into two parts. The first part explains the main effects involving the impact of personality attributes and other attributes on the choice of restaurant brands across different situations. The second part shows the interactive effects involving two moderator variables (levels of involvement and types of involvement) using moderated regression analysis (Sharma, Durand and Gur-Arie, 1981). The chapter concludes by comparing the findings of the two stages.
8.2 The Process of the Data Analysis

The purpose of Study II is to test the conceptual frame of brand personality. In particular, the conditions under which brand personality attributes (versus non-personality attributes) are used in consumers' evaluation of restaurant brands were examined. Two situational factors (levels of involvement and types of involvement) were set as moderator variables to examine the relationship between the six restaurant brand attributes and the restaurant choice. Figure 8.1 summarised the process of the analysis adopted in this study.
Figure 8.1: The Process of the Data Analysis

**STAGE I**

- **STUDY II:** An Experimental Study of Brand Personality Importance
  - Investigating the importance of personality and non-personality attributes on restaurant choice intention: Conjoint Analysis using Multiple Regression (Chapter 8.4, p. 233)
  - Conjoint Analysis for Each the Four Situations
  - **Situation A:** High Involvement/Low Emotion
  - **Situation B:** Low Involvement/Low Emotion
  - **Situation C:** High Involvement/High Emotion
  - **Situation D:** Low Involvement/High Emotion
  - Comparing the Relative Importance of the Attributes across different Situations (Chapter 8.4.3, p. 242)

**STAGE II**

- Examining the Moderating Effects of LI and TI: Moderated Regression Analysis (Chapter 8.5, p. 250)
  - **MV:** Levels of Involvement (LI)
  - **MV:** Types of Involvement (TI)
  - **MV:** Interaction of LI and TI
  - Comparing the Findings of the Two Stages

228
The model was tested in two stages; first, the relationships between brand personality and non-personality attributes (on the one hand), and restaurant choice intention (on the other) were tested by a conjoint analysis using multiple regression with dummy variables. In addition, the relative importance of the attributes were compared across the four situations; situation A (business dinner), B (lunch meeting), C (wedding anniversary dinner) and D (normal lunch with a friend), which were generated by combining the two situational variables (levels of involvement and types of involvement). To do so, conjoint analyses were conducted for each of the four situations to identify and compare the relative importance of the attributes under each situation.

Secondly, the interactive effects involving two moderator variables (levels of involvement and types of involvement) were examined using moderated regression analysis. At the end, both findings helped to find the influences of the situational factors on the relative importance of brand personality and non-personality attributes in consumers' evaluation of restaurant brands.

8.3 Socio-Demographic Profiles of the Respondents

The field survey was conducted between May and June 2003. The questionnaires were randomly distributed at various places including international airports, high streets, offices and universities. Participants were given one of the four types of questionnaires (Situation A, B, C and D) with a preaddressed freepost envelope. As an incentive, participants were offered a chance to win an oriental souvenir (Korean traditional opera mask) or a £20 gift voucher for a major department store chain (see Appendix D). A total of 800 questionnaires were distributed and 225 usable questionnaires were returned (response rate: 28%). Among the 225 respondents, situation A had 66 respondents while situations B, C and D had 48, 54 and 57 respondents respectively.
The socio-demographic profiles of the respondents are presented below.

**Gender:** Gender of the respondents is shown in Figure 8.2.

*Figure 8.2: Gender of the Respondents (n = 225)*

From the 225 respondents, 143 respondents identified themselves as female and represent 64% of the sample.

**Age Group:** The age group sample was divided into 6 categories. Figure 8.3 represents the distribution of age group according to these categories.

*Figure 8.3: Age Group of the Respondents (n = 223)*

Of the 223 subjects, 33% of the sample were between 16 to 24; 24% of the respondents were between 25 to 34; 12% were between 35-44 and 15% were between 44-55 and 12%
were between 55-64. The figure also shows that more than half of the respondents' age were between 16 and 34 (58%).

**Nationality:** Nationality of the respondents was classified into the five groups; British, American, Canadian, Australian and other native English speakers. Figure 8.4 shows the nationality of the respondents.

*Figure 8.4: Nationality of the Respondents (n = 225)*

![Pie chart showing the distribution of nationalities among respondents.](image)

More than 86% of the respondents identified themselves as British. Americans, Canadians and Australians represent 4%, 2% and 1% of the total sample respectively. The other 7% of the respondents consisted of other native English speakers (e.g. New Zealanders and South Africans)

**Education Level of the Respondents:** Education level was categorised into six groups; GCSE/O-level, GNVQ/A-level, undergraduate, postgraduate, other qualification and no qualification. Figure 8.5 represents the education level of the respondents.
15% of the respondents stated their level of education as being GCSE/O-level, while 22%, 31%, 22% and 8% of the respondents identified GNVQ/A-level, undergraduate, postgraduate and other qualification as their highest education level attained respectively.

Annual Household Income: Average annual household income of the subjects is represented in Figure 8.6

Average annual household income was categorised into five groups. Of the 210 respondents, 41 people responded that their average annual household income is less than £10,000, representing 20% of the sample. More than 30% of the respondents reported that they earn over £40,000 a year.
8.4 The Relative Importance of the Brand Personality and Non-Personality Components

8.4.1 Linear Regression as a Conjoint Model Estimation Technique

The analysis technique used to assess the constructed conjoint model depends highly upon the assumptions underlying the model construction and the method of obtaining the measure of respondents' preference (Hair et al., 1998). In other words, the estimation technique chosen and the interpretation of the findings produced should conform to the conceptual assumptions of the model adopted.

As mentioned in Chapter 7, the present study adopted a traditional conjoint method with additive composition rule and a main effect only model, which refers to each of the attributes having a direct effect on customers' preferences. Therefore, in this study, respondents were assumed to arrive at the total value of the restaurants by summing up the part-worths of one of the two levels of each factor (i.e. attribute) included in each profile. Subjects' choice intention was measured on a 7-point numeric scale.

Considering the conditions of the study, multiple regression analysis was used in order to examine the relative importance of each of the six attributes in the subjects' choice ratings of the restaurant profiles. As discussed in Chapter 7, although the main purpose of multiple regression resides in predicting the dependent variable from the knowledge of a set of weighted independent variables, it can also serve as a means of assessing the degree and relationship between dependent and independent variables by forming the regression equation (Hair et al., 1998).

In addition, multiple regression could also assess the nature of the relationship (e.g. linear or non-linear) between the independent variables and the dependent variable. As already mentioned, the constructed model assumed a linear relationship between the part-worths of the two levels of each factor and a direct effect of each factor on choice rating of the
restaurant profiles. Therefore, the nature of the relationship was already determined and multiple linear regression was used under this condition. The regression linear equation formed is as follows (Hair et al., 1998, p.157):

\[ \hat{Y} = a + b_1V_1 + b_2V_2 + \ldots + b_6V_6 + e \]

Where
- \( \hat{Y} \) = predicted value of the dependent variable (restaurant choice)
- \( a \) = constant value of the dependent variables
- \( b_1, \ldots, b_6 \) = the regression coefficient denoting change in choice rating associated with a unit change in independent variable
- \( V_1, \ldots, V_6 \) = value of 1, 2, \ldots, 6 independent variable
- \( e \) = residual

The basic premise of conjoint analysis is that respondents evaluate the value of the restaurants by summing the individual value from each factor. The analysis aims to assess the importance of each of the 6 attributes relative to other attributes and the overall preference. This relative importance of each factor (attribute) can be assessed by calculating the part-worth for each level of the factors. In this analysis, the value of the independent variable \( (V_1 \ldots V_6) \) is represented by the value of the level in each factor since each attribute has two levels and only one level is presented in each profile. In addition, since a linear relationship between a level's part-worths was assumed, only a single part-worth estimate is needed for each attribute. This single part worth estimate is multiplied by the value of the level to calculate separate part-worths for each level of the factor (Hair et al., 1998). Therefore, the regression coefficients \( (b_1, \ldots, b_6) \) which refer to the estimated change in the dependent variable (restaurant choice rating) for a unit change of each independent variable, multiplied by the level's value of each attribute \( (V_1 \ldots V_6) \) will be the part-worth for each level of the attributes (Louviere, 1988).
8.4.1.1 Dummy variables

In conjoint analysis, the dependent variable can be both metric and non-metric while non-metric categorical variables are usually used for the independent variables. However, in multiple regression, non-metric independent variables need to be converted to metric. In this study, the dependent variable (choice rating) is a metric variable (7 point numeric scale) and the six attributes (independent variables) are non-metric. Therefore, the dummy variable, which can act as a replacement for non-metric independence variables, was used to specify the multiple regression model (Hair et al., 1998).

To account for $N$ levels of the non-metric independent variable, $N - 1$ dummy variables are needed (Hair et al., 1998). Since all six attributes of this study have 2 levels, 1 dummy variable was used ($2 - 1 = 1$) for each attribute. All the dummy variables were coded by using the ‘indicator coding’ method, in which the level is represented by either ‘1’ or ‘0’. Indicator coding, which allows relatively easy direct comparisons between attributes, was preferred to ‘effect coding’ in which the level is represented by either ‘1’ or ‘–1’, in the first analysis since the objective of this analysis is to examine the relative importance of each attribute rather than each level of the attribute. Table 8.1 shows dummy variables used in the study.
Table 8.1: Dummy Variables for Each Level of the Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Factor Levels</th>
<th>Dummy Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reliable</td>
<td>a. The restaurant is described as ‘reliable’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. The restaurant is described as ‘not reliable’</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clean</td>
<td>a. The restaurant is described as ‘clean’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. The restaurant is described as ‘not clean’</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Value for Money</td>
<td>a. The restaurant is described as ‘value for money’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. The restaurant is described as ‘not value for money’</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tasty</td>
<td>a. The restaurant is described as ‘tasty’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. The restaurant is described as ‘not tasty’</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cheerful</td>
<td>a. The restaurant is described as ‘cheerful’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. The restaurant is described as ‘not cheerful’</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Charming</td>
<td>a. The restaurant is described as ‘charming’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. The restaurant is described as ‘not charming’</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above dummy variable coding, the regression coefficient for the variable coded ‘1’ will be the part-worth of factors and will represent deviations from the comparison group (levels that coded ‘0’) on the dependent variable of restaurant choice. These differences can be assessed directly, as the coefficients are in the same units as the dependent variable (Hair et al., 1998). Moreover, since all the comparison groups are coded dummy variable ‘0’, the importance of each factor (i.e. part worth; coefficient * level’s value) can be directly compared to others.

In this study, unstandardised regression coefficient (B) was used instead of ‘Beta’ to compare utilities of variables (although they do not make any difference). The standardised regression coefficients (Beta) are produced when data is transformed into new measurement variables with a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1, in order to
allow direct comparisons between coefficients as to their relative explanation power of the dependent variable. In this study, however, since dummy variables were used with indicator coding, the ‘B’ values are expressed in terms of the units of the associated variables, which are the same, thus they are appropriate for making direct comparisons (Hair et. al., 1998).

8.4.2 Testing of the Relationships between Brand Personality and Non-Personality, and Restaurant Choice

In the previous chapter, the following hypotheses were generated:

\( H_1: \) ‘Reliable’ attribute of brand personality has a positive effect on customers intention to choose restaurant brands.

\( H_2: \) ‘Charming’ attribute of brand personality has a positive effect on customers intention to choose restaurant brands.

\( H_3: \) ‘Cheerful’ attribute of brand personality has a positive effect on customers intention to choose restaurant brands.

\( H_4: \) ‘Tasty’ attribute of non-personality has a positive effect on customers intention to choose restaurant brands.

\( H_5: \) ‘Clean’ attribute of non-personality has a positive effect on customers intention to choose restaurant brands.

\( H_6: \) ‘Value for money’ attribute of non-personality has a positive effect on customers intention to choose restaurant brands.

To test the above hypotheses, a total of 1,800 observations (225 subjects rated 8 profiles each; 225 x 8) were used for linear multiple regression analysis to examine the relative importance of the personality and non-personality attributes. Six restaurant attributes (‘tasty’, ‘clean’, ‘value for money’, ‘reliable’, ‘charming’ and ‘cheerful’) were set as independent variables, while respondents’ restaurant choice rating was used as a dependent variable.
Table 8.2 shows the main part of the results for the linear multiple regression model.

Table 8.2: Summary of Regression Analysis on Restaurant Choice (n = 1,800)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Unstandardised Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardised Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-.84</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>-11.97</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasty (non-personality)</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>31.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean (non-personality)</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>28.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money (non-personality)</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>19.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable (personality)</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>22.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charming (personality)</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>16.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful (personality)</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>15.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² = .65, df (6) = 1764, F = 534.26, p = .000

Table 8.2 shows that the regression model is statistically significant in estimating respondents' restaurant choice. (p = .000). The model explained 65% of the variance. The B coefficients also indicate that all six attributes made significant contributions (p = .000) in predicting the dependent variable. These findings indicate that all six attributes have significant influence on consumers' restaurant choice. Therefore, H1, H2, H3, H4, H5 and H6 were supported: All the attributes, 'reliable', 'charming', 'cheerful', 'tasty', 'clean' and 'value for money', have a significant effect on consumers' restaurant choice intention.

As mentioned earlier, the regression coefficients (B) are the part-worth estimations for each attribute, since under the assumed linear relationship only a single part-worth estimate is needed for each factor. This single estimate of part-worth is multiplied by each level's value to produce the part-worth value for each level of the factor. Table 8.3 represents examples of part-worth values for each level of the factors.
Table 8.3: Examples of Part-Worth Values for the Levels of the Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors and Factor Levels</th>
<th>Regression Coefficients (B)</th>
<th>Part-Worth Of Each Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tasty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The restaurant is described as 'tasty'</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.67*1=1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The restaurant is described as 'not tasty'</td>
<td>1.67*0=0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The restaurant is described as 'reliable'</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.18*1=1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The restaurant is described as 'not reliable'</td>
<td>1.18*0=0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 8.3, a part-worth value for each level of the factors can be calculated by the regression coefficient (B) multiplied by each level value of the factor ($b_n \times V_n$). For example, part worth values for each level of the 'tasty' factor would be 1.67 (1.67 × 1) and 0 (1.67 × 0). Since the comparison groups (or reference groups) received '0' values on the indicator coding for the dummy variables, the part-worths of these levels will be '0' (i.e. $b_n \times 0 = 0$). However, these '0' part-worths do not indicate that those levels have no relative weight. To the contrary, '0' is a coding of the level and represents a point in the range of part-worths between levels of the factor. Therefore, the part-worth of attributes coded level '1', which is the same value as the regression coefficient ($b_n \times 1 = b_n$), would represent the utility of each attribute (factor).

The part worth values of each level of the factors are depicted in Figure 8.7. This figure also allows comparison of the utility of each attribute, since one of two levels of every factor's part-worth value is set as '0'.
As shown in Figure 8.7, the ‘tasty’ attribute has the highest part-worth value (1.67), followed by ‘clean’ (1.54), ‘reliable’ (1.18), ‘value for money’ (1.05), ‘charming’ (0.90) and ‘cheerful’ (0.80). These results indicate changes in utility scores when the levels change. In other words, the scores show the differences in utility scores depending on the levels of each attribute.

The variation accounted for by each attribute, corresponds to the range of utility scores for the attribute. Therefore, in conjoint analysis, the relative importance of each attribute can be expressed as a percentage of contribution to the overall utility by dividing each attribute’s range by the sum of all range values (Hair et al., 1998). Since one level of each attribute has a part-worth of ‘0’, the range of the attributes will equal the sum of the utility scores of the levels coded as ‘1’. Therefore, the relative importance of each attribute will be:

\[
|B_n| / \sum |B| * 100
\]

Where \(|B_n|\) = the absolute part-worth value of the level of the ‘n’th attribute that is coded as ‘1’
\[ \sum |B| = \text{the sum of the absolute values of all the levels of the attributes that received '1'} \]

For example, the relative importance of the 'tasty' attribute would be: \( \frac{|1.67|}{(|1.67| + |1.54| + |1.05| + |1.18| + |.90| + |.80|)} \times 100 = 23.39\% \). Table 8.4 shows the relative importance of the brand personality and non-personality attributes on respondents' restaurant choice intention.

**Table 8.4: Relative Importance of the Brand Personality and Non-Personality Components**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Relative Importance (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Personality Attributes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasty</td>
<td>23.39 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>21.57 (2)</td>
<td>59.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for Money</td>
<td>14.71 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Attributes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>16.53 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charming</td>
<td>12.60 (5)</td>
<td>40.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>11.20 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 8.4 'tasty' was found to be the most important factor in choosing a restaurant, while 'cheerful' was found to be the least important attribute. Non-personality attributes, 'tasty', 'clean' and 'value for money' were ranked as the first, second and fourth important factors while personality attributes, 'reliable', 'charming' and 'cheerful', were ranked as third, fifth and sixth most important factors respectively. The three non-personality attributes account for 60% of respondents' restaurant choice decisions while the three personality attributes account for 42%.
8.4.3 The Relative Importance of the Brand Personality and Non-Personality Components under Different Situations

In the next stage, multiple regression analyses were repeated for each of the four situations (situations A to D). As previously shown, each situation was defined by using levels (high and low) and types (high emotion and low emotion) of involvement. The first situation (A) was described as 'a business dinner with a key client', which represents a low emotion and high involvement situation. The second situation (B) was set as a low involvement and low emotion situation. This situation was represented as 'a typical and normal lunch meeting with a colleague.' Situation C represents a high involvement and high emotion situation, which was typified by 'a 10th wedding anniversary dinner with spouse'. Lastly, situation D was set as a low involvement and high emotion situation. This situation was portrayed as 'a normal and typical lunch with a best friend' situation.

This section deals with presenting the findings of each situation's analysis and comparing the results across the situations. Among the 225 samples, situation A had 66 respondents (female 50%) while Situations B, C and D had 48 (female 69%), 54 (female 57%) and 57 (female 80%) respondents respectively. Four separate multiple regression analyses were conducted. The same as the previous analysis, six restaurant attributes (3 non-personality and 3 personality attributes) using dummy variables were set as independent variables, while restaurant choice ratings under each situation were used as dependent variables. Situation A has 528 (66x8) observations while B, C and D have 384 (48x8), 432 (54x8) and 456 (57x8) observations respectively.

Similar results to the first analysis were found for each of the four situations (see Appendix E for details): 'business dinner' ($R^2 = .66$, $p = .000$), 'lunch meeting' ($R^2 = .61$, $p = .000$), 'wedding anniversary dinner' ($R^2 = .72$, $p = .000$) and 'normal lunch with a friend' ($R^2 = .64$, $p = .000$). The relative similarity and fairly high values of $R^2$'s and high significance levels across the situations suggest the model is reasonably good for explaining restaurant choice intention. In addition, the significance of Beta values for all six attributes in each of the four situations re-confirmed $H_1 \sim H_6$. Table 8.5 shows the
relative importance of brand personality and non-personality attributes on restaurant choice under the four situations.

Table 8.5: Relative Importance of the Personality and Non-personality Attributes under Different Situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Relative Importance (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A: A Business Dinner</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(High Involvement/Low Emotion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 66)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Personality Attributes</td>
<td>Tasty 23.57 (1)</td>
<td>58.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clean 23.01 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value for Money 11.44 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Attributes</td>
<td>Reliable 18.97 (3)</td>
<td>41.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charming 12.41 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheerful 10.60 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: A Lunch Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Low Involvement/Low Emotion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Personality Attributes</td>
<td>Tasty 21.13 (2)</td>
<td>62.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clean 22.92 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value for Money 18.60 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Attributes</td>
<td>Reliable 15.18 (4)</td>
<td>37.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charming 12.65 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheerful 9.52 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: A Wedding Anniversary Dinner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(High Involvement/High Emotion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 54)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Personality Attributes</td>
<td>Tasty 22.61 (1)</td>
<td>56.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clean 21.19 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value for Money 13.18 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Attributes</td>
<td>Reliable 17.18 (3)</td>
<td>43.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charming 13.70 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheerful 12.14 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: A Normal Lunch with a Friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Low Involvement/High Emotion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 57)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Personality Attributes</td>
<td>Tasty 25.65 (1)</td>
<td>61.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clean 19.13 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value for Money 16.96 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Attributes</td>
<td>Reliable 13.92 (4)</td>
<td>38.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charming 11.88 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheerful 12.46 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a 'business dinner', the 'tasty' attribute (24%) was found to be the most important factor in choosing a restaurant brand, while the 'reliable' attribute (19%) was found to be
the most important among the personality attributes. Three personality attributes accounted for 40% of respondents' decision on restaurant choice, while non-personality attributes accounted for 60%.

Under 'lunch meeting' situation, the 'clean' attribute was found to be the most important attribute (23%) in choosing restaurant brands; followed by 'tasty' (21%) and 'value for money' (19%). Among the personality attributes, again 'reliable' was found to be the most important (15%). The personality attributes represented only 37% of the respondents' restaurant choice for a lunch meeting while the non-personality attributes accounted for 63%.

The next situation was described as '10th wedding anniversary dinner with spouse.' Under this situation, the 'tasty' attribute (23%) was found as the most important factor in deciding restaurant choice, while 'cheerful' (12%) was found as the least important one. Non-personality attributes 'tasty', 'clean' and 'value for money' were ranked as first, second and fifth most important factors, while personality attributes, 'reliable', 'charming' and 'cheerful', were ranked as third, fourth and sixth most important factors respectively. The personality attributes presented 43% of the respondents' restaurant choice intention while the non-personality attributes accounted for 57% under this situation.

For the last situation which is 'normal lunch with a friend', again the 'tasty' attribute was found to be the most important attribute (26%) followed by 'clean' (19%). Among the personality attributes 'reliable' was found to be the most important (14%).

8.4.3.1 Comparing the importance of the attributes across the situations

Although in all four situations, respondents placed the greatest importance on food taste ('tasty') and a clean environment ('clean'), it also appears that the relative importance of the restaurant brand attributes are different across the situations. Moreover, the changes in the levels of the attributes induced significant changes in restaurant choice rating.
across the situations since, as previously shown, the relative importance of each attribute was assessed by dividing each attribute's utility score range by the sum of utility values of all attributes. Figure 8.8 compares utility values of each personality and non-personality attribute across the four situations.
Figure 8.8: Utility Values of the Restaurant Attributes in Different Situations

A: Business Dinner (High Involvement and Low Emotion)
B: Lunch Meeting (Low Involvement and Low Emotion)
C: Wedding Anniversary Dinner (High Involvement and High Emotion)
D: Normal Lunch with a Friend (Low Involvement and High Emotion)
Figure 8.8 shows utility values of the six restaurant brand attributes; three non-personality attributes (‘tasty’, ‘clean’ and ‘value for money’) and three personality attributes (‘reliable’, ‘charming’ and ‘cheerful’) across the four situations. As respondents were asked to rate profiles offering different combinations of the two polar levels of each attribute (e.g. ‘tasty’ and ‘not tasty’), the lines connecting the two levels are inferred. Since there are only two levels (and one end of the levels is set as ‘0’), the steeper the slopes are, the greater the utilities are (Dube, Renaghan and Miller, 1994). For example, the ‘tasty’ attribute has a utility score of ‘1.8’ in situations D and C compared to ‘1.4’ in situation B.

It appears that in ‘lunch meeting’ situation, which represents low involvement and low emotion, respondents were less sensitive to the levels of the ‘tasty’ attribute than other situations in their evaluation of restaurant choice rating. The ‘clean’ attribute was found to be more sensitive under situations of ‘business dinner’ and ‘lunch meeting’ (both representing low emotion) than the other two situations (high emotion). In the case of the ‘value for money’ attribute, respondents were found to be more sensitive for ‘lunch meeting’ and ‘normal lunch with a friend’ (both representing low involvement) than ‘business dinner’ and ‘wedding anniversary dinner’ situations (both representing high involvement). This indicates that levels of involvement (high vs. low) seemed to have stronger negative influence on the evaluation of ‘value for money’ attribute than types of involvement (high emotion vs. low emotion).

From the personality attributes, respondents allocated in ‘anniversary dinner’ and ‘business dinner’ situations were found to be more sensitive to the levels of the ‘reliable’ attribute than respondents allocated in the other two situations. This result suggests that levels of involvement have a strong positive influence on the ‘reliable’ attribute. For the ‘charming’ attribute, respondents in ‘anniversary dinner’ were found to be more sensitive to the attribute than the other three situations in their evaluation of restaurant choice. Lastly, in the case of the ‘cheerful’ attribute respondents under ‘anniversary dinner’ and ‘normal lunch with a friend’ situations were found to be more sensitive than respondents under ‘business dinner’ and ‘lunch meeting’ situations suggesting that the ‘cheerful’
attribute was more influenced by types of involvement (i.e. high emotion vs. low emotion) than levels of involvement.

To sum up, levels of involvement (high vs. low) was found to be related to the utility values of ‘value for money’ and ‘reliable’ attributes. It appeared that ‘value for money’ seemed to be negatively related to levels of involvement (i.e. when levels of involvement increase, the utility value of ‘value for money’ decreases), while the utility value of the ‘reliable’ attribute seemed to be positively related. Types of involvement (high emotion vs. low emotion) appeared to be positively related only to the ‘cheerful’ attribute.

As a next step, the relative importance of brand personality and non-personality attributes were compared collectively across the situations. Figure 8.9 shows the relative importance of brand personality and non-personality under each situation.
Figure 8.9 – 8.12: Relative Importance of Brand Personality under the different Situations

Figure 8.9: Business Dinner (High Involvement & Low Emotion)

Figure 8.10: Lunch Meeting (Low Involvement & Low Emotion)

Figure 8.11: Wedding Anniversary Dinner (High Involvement & High Emotion)

Figure 8.12: Normal Lunch with a Friend (Low Involvement & High Emotion)

Figure 8.9 – 8.12 show the relative importance of brand personality (versus non-personality) in relation to choice of restaurant brands for the four different dining situations. It seems that in all four situations, respondents placed greater importance on non-personality attributes than personality attributes when they chose restaurant brands.
However, it also appears that the relative importance of brand personality and non-personality are different across the situations. The importance of brand personality on intention of choosing restaurants was found to be relatively high in 'business dinner' (42%) and 'wedding anniversary dinner' (43%) compared to 'lunch meeting' (38%) and 'normal lunch with a friend' (38%) situations.

8.5 An Examination of the Moderating Effect of Involvement on the Relationships between Brand Personality and Non-Personality, and Choice

8.5.1 The Moderated Regression Analysis (MRA) Model

The statistical significance of the two moderator factors (levels of involvement and type of involvement) on the relative importance of brand personality and non-personality attributes in restaurant choice is examined in this section. To do this, moderator effects of the two variables (levels of involvement and types of involvement) were tested using moderated regression analysis (MRA).

A moderator variable is a variable which interacts with an independent variable to influence the relationship between the independent and a dependent variable. In multiple regression, the moderator effect is represented by a term similar to the 'polynomials' in a nonlinear effect (Hair et al., 1998). To test the moderator effect, a moderator term that is formed as an independent variable, is added to a regression equation. The moderator term is a compound variable formed by multiplying independent variables by the moderator variable (IV × MV) and is inserted into the regression equation. For example, if a variable (Z) moderates the relationship between an independent variable (X) and a dependent variable (Y), the interaction could be expressed as XZ. In the regression equation, the moderated relationship of 'Z' is expressed as.
\[ Y = a + b_1X + b_2Z + b_3XZ \]

Where

- \( a \) = constant value (intercept)
- \( b_1X \) = linear effect of X (independent variable)
- \( b_2Z \) = linear effect of Z (moderator variable)
- \( b_3XZ \) = moderator effect of Z on X

The main effects of the X and Z variables are linearly partialled from the interaction term (XZ) by inserting X and Z variables into the regression equation along with the XZ term. The X, Z and XZ are entered into the equation simultaneously to test the significance of each term. If the interaction is significant, that is if XZ contributes to the prediction of the dependent variable (Y) over and above the other variables in the equation, a moderator relationship is indicated (Villa et al., 2003). To determine whether the moderator effect is significant, 1) first the original equation is to be estimated \( (Y = b_0 + b_1X) \), 2) secondly, the moderator variable (Z) that is formed as an independent variable is added to the original equation \( (Y = b_0 + b_1X + b_2Z) \) and is estimated and 3) lastly, the moderated relationship is estimated \( (Y = b_0 + b_1X + b_2Z + b_3XZ) \). If the change in R\(^2\) between step 2 \( (Y = b_0 + b_1X + b_2Z) \) and step 3 \( (Y = b_0 + b_1X + b_2Z + b_3XZ) \) is statistically significant \( (p < .05) \), then a significant moderator effect is present (Lam, 2003; Hair et al., 1998).

Before conducting moderated regression analysis, since the two moderator variables (levels of involvement and types of involvement) in this study are represented in a non-metric form, the variables should be converted into the metric form (continuous variable). Therefore, the concept of dummy variables using ‘effect coding’, in which the level is represented by either ‘1’ or ‘-1’, was adopted to represent levels of the two moderators (Hair et al., 1998). Table 8.6 shows the dummy coding adopted in this study.
Table 8.6: Coding of the Situations as Moderator Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Levels of Involvement</th>
<th>Types of Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situation A (high involvement/ low emotion)</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation B (low involvement/ low emotion)</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation C (high involvement/ high emotion)</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation D (low involvement/ high emotion)</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 8.6, levels of the two moderator variables are represented by either '+1' or '-1'. High involvement and high emotion levels were coded as '+1', while low involvement and low emotion situations were coded as '-1'. In addition, the levels of the six independent variables which were coded by using the 'indicator coding' method (1 and 0) were recoded to '1' and '-1' in accordance with the moderator variables. Lastly, the moderator term (interaction relationship) variables were generated by multiplying the independent variables (i.e. the six restaurant brand attributes) by the moderator variables. Table 8.7 explains how the variables were generated and coded for the analyses.
As shown in Table 8.7, eighteen moderator term variables were generated for assessing the moderator effects of the two situational factors (levels of involvement and types of involvement). For the two moderator variables, 12 moderator term (interaction relationship) variables were generated by multiplying independent variables by the moderator variables (e.g. levels of involvement × tasty, levels of involvement × clean and etc.). In addition, 6 moderator term variables were generated by multiplying the restaurant attributes by the interaction between the two moderator variables in order to see the influence of the interaction between the two moderator variables.
8.5.2 Testing of the Moderator Effects of Involvement

The study hypotheses were as follows:

\( H_7 \): Levels of involvement (high versus low) moderates the effect of 'reliable' attribute of brand personality on intention to choose restaurant brands.

\( H_8 \): Levels of involvement (high versus low) moderates the effect of 'charming' attribute of brand personality on intention to choose restaurant brands.

\( H_9 \): Levels of involvement (high versus low) moderates the effect of 'cheerful' attribute of brand personality on intention to choose restaurant brands.

\( H_{10} \): Levels of involvement (high versus low) moderates the effect of 'tasty' attribute of non-personality on intention to choose restaurant brands.

\( H_{11} \): Levels of involvement (high versus low) moderates the effect of 'clean' attribute of non-personality on intention to choose restaurant brands.

\( H_{12} \): Levels of involvement (high versus low) moderates the effect of 'value for money' attribute of non-personality on intention to choose restaurant brands.

\( H_{13} \): Types of involvement (high emotion versus low emotion) moderates the effect of 'reliable' attribute of brand personality on intention to choose restaurant brands.

\( H_{14} \): Types of involvement (high emotion versus low emotion) moderates the effect of 'charming' attribute of brand personality on intention to choose restaurant brands.

\( H_{15} \): Types of involvement (high emotion versus low emotion) moderates the effect of 'cheerful' attribute of brand personality on intention to choose restaurant brands.

\( H_{16} \): Types of involvement (high emotion versus low emotion) moderates the effect of 'tasty' attribute of non-personality on intention to choose restaurant brands.

\( H_{17} \): Types of involvement (high emotion versus low emotion) moderates the effect of 'clean' attribute of non-personality on intention to choose restaurant brands.

\( H_{18} \): Types of involvement (high emotion versus low emotion) moderates the effect of 'value for money' attribute of non-personality on intention to choose restaurant brands.

To examine the moderator effects of the two variables, levels of involvement and types of involvement, three moderated regression analysis were conducted. In the first model,
moderator effect of levels of involvement was examined. In the second model, types of involvement was set as a moderator variable. In the third model, the moderator effect of the interaction between levels of involvement and types of involvement (levels of involvement $\times$ types of involvement) was tested. Table 8.8 summarises the results of the three regression models.
Table 8.8: Moderator Effects of the Situational Factors on the Relationships between Restaurant Choice and the Restaurant Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ΔF</th>
<th>Sig. ΔF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choice Intention</td>
<td>Step 1. Restaurant Attributes</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td>(6, 1764)</td>
<td>(534.26)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 2 Levels of Involvement</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>(1, 1763)</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 3 Restaurant Attributes x Levels of Involvement</td>
<td>.650</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>(6, 1757)</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Choice Intention   | Step 1. Restaurant Attributes | .645 | .645 | (6, 1764) | (534.26) | .000    |
|                    | Step 2 Types of Involvement   | .645 | .000 | (1, 1763) | .03     | .853    |
|                    | Step 3 Restaurant Attributes x Types of Involvement | .647 | .002 | (6, 1757) | 1.59    | .146    |

As mentioned earlier, the significance of moderator effects could be indicated by comparing R² values of step 2 (\( Y = b_0 + b_1X + b_2Z \)) and step 3 (\( Y = b_0 + b_1X + b_2Z + b_3XZ \)). If the change in R² is significant, the effect of the moderator variable can be considered as significant. In the first model (levels of involvement as a moderator...
variable), the difference of R squares between step 2 and step 3 was found to be significant (ΔR^2: .005, p = .000). This indicates that the levels of involvement have significant influence on the relationships between the restaurant attributes and choice intention.

However, in the second model (types of involvement as a moderator variable), the moderator terms (step 3) between types of involvement and the six attributes did not yield a significant incremental variance in restaurant choice intention (ΔR^2: .002, p = .146). This result shows that types of involvement which represent levels of emotion in the situations, do not have a significant effect on the relationship between the six restaurant attributes and intention of choosing restaurants in this study.

Lastly, the moderator effect of the interaction between the two moderator variables (levels of involvement × types of involvement) was also examined. As shown in Table 8.8, no significant difference of R^2 between steps 2 and 3 was detected (ΔR^2: .001, p = .53), which suggests the interaction has no significant moderator effect. However, there was a significant difference between steps 1 and 2 (ΔR^2: .008, p = .000). This difference can be interpreted as the effect of the constant value of the interaction indicating that when the values of both levels and types of involvement are high, the average rating of restaurant choice intention is substantially lower than other situations (i.e. one is high and the other is low) and/or when the values of both types and levels of involvement are low, then the average rating is substantially lower.

Among the three models, only levels of involvement was found to have a significant moderator effect. No significant moderator effect was detected for types of involvement. Hence, H13, H14, H15, H16, H17 and H18 could not be confirmed. As a next step, which specific variables were significantly influenced by levels of involvement in determining restaurant choice was examined by beta coefficients. Table 8.9 shows beta coefficients of the six attributes and their interaction with levels of involvement (beta coefficients of the interaction between the attributes and types of involvement are presented in Appendix F).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tasty</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td>31.34</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>28.87</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for Money</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>19.98</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>21.94</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charming</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>16.94</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>15.07</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels of Involvement</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>-1.244</td>
<td>.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels of Involvement × Tasty</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels of Involvement × Clean</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels of Involvement × Value for Money</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>-2.93</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels of Involvement × Reliable</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels of Involvement × Charming</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels of Involvement × Cheerful</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-11.860</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dependent Variable**: Restaurant Choice Intention

All six attributes had a significant unique contribution in explaining the dependent variable; restaurant choice. However, in terms of a moderator effect on levels of involvement, only two moderator terms, levels of involvement × ‘value for money’ and levels of involvement × ‘reliable’, were found to be significant (p = .003 and .001 respectively) among the six moderator terms. These results suggest that levels of involvement only influenced the importance of ‘value for money’ and ‘reliable’ in determining restaurant choice. The negative sign of beta coefficient for ‘value for money’ (beta = -.041) indicates that the ‘value for money’ attribute becomes less important in choosing restaurants when the levels of involvement increase. To the contrary, the positive sign of beta coefficient for the ‘reliable’ attribute (beta = .045) suggests that its
importance increases when the levels of involvement increase. As a result, only $H_7$ and $H_{12}$ were confirmed while $H_8$, $H_9$, $H_{10}$ $H_{11}$ were not confirmed in this study. Figure 8.13 shows the results of hypotheses testing.
Figure 8.13: The Summary of Hypothesis Testing

![Diagram showing relationships between brand personality and product personality dimensions and their impact on consumer involvement and brand choice intention.]

- **BP 1: Reliable**
  - $H_7(\beta = .045)^*$

- **BP 2: Charming**
  - $H_8(\beta = .016)$

- **BP 3: Cheerful**
  - $H_8(\beta = .009)$

- **NP 1: Tasty**
  - $H_9(\beta = .44)^*$

- **NP 2: Clean**
  - $H_9(\beta = .41)^*$

- **NP 3: Value for money**
  - $H_9(\beta = .28)^*$

- **Brand Choice Intention**
  - $R^2 = .65$

- **Levels of Involvement**

- **Types of Involvement**

*Note: $p < .01$. BP: Brand Personality Component, NP: Non-Personality Component.*
In summary, the six attributes model was reasonably good for explaining respondents’ restaurant choice intention across all four situations. All six attributes (‘reliable’, ‘charming’, ‘cheerful’, ‘tasty’, ‘clean’ and ‘value for money’) were found to be significant in predicting consumers’ restaurant choice intention (H1~H6).

The examinations of moderator effects (levels of involvement, types of involvement and interaction between them) suggest that only levels of involvement had a significant moderator effect on the relationship between the restaurant brand attributes and intention to choose restaurants. No significant moderator effect was detected for types of involvement and the interaction between the two situational variables.

Among the restaurant attributes, only two variables, ‘reliable’ (personality attribute) (H7) and ‘value for money’ (non-personality attribute) (H12) were found to be significantly influenced by the moderator effect of the levels of involvement.

However, it is worth noting that the statistical significance of the ‘value for money’ attribute needs to be interpreted with caution. The significance of ‘value for money’ attribute could be solely caused by the unique characteristics of ‘price’ factor since many researchers in the field of marketing suggest that when the levels of involvement increase, consumers tend to emphasise less on ‘price’ and are willing to spend more money (e.g. Clarke and Belk, 1979; Belk, 1982; Zaichkowsky, 1988).

8.6 Summary

The chapter presented the results of an experiment that aimed to examine the influence of situational factors on the influence of situational factors on the relative importance of brand personality in consumers’ restaurant choice intention. Two situational factors (levels of involvement and types of involvement) were adopted as moderator variables.
that moderate the relationship between the restaurant brand attributes and choice intention in order to examine the relative importance of the attributes under different situational factors.

Two analyses were used to examine the framework. First, the relative importance of the brand personality and non-personality attributes was assessed and compared across the four situations (situation A, B, C and D), which had been generated by the combination of the two moderating variables. Conjoint analyses using multiple regression with dummy variables were adopted to identify and compare the relative importance of the attributes under the different situations.

Secondly, the significance of moderator effects for the two moderator variables (types of involvement and levels of involvement) and their interaction (types of involvement × levels of involvement) were examined by moderated regression analysis. Table 8.10 summarises the results of the hypotheses testing.
Table 8.10: Hypotheses Testing Results of the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Beta Coefficients</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Hypothesis Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H_1$: 'Reliable' $\rightarrow$ Choice</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_2$: 'Charming' $\rightarrow$ Choice</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_3$: 'Cheerful' $\rightarrow$ Choice</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_4$: 'Tasty' $\rightarrow$ Choice</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_5$: 'Clean' $\rightarrow$ Choice</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_6$: 'Value for money' $\rightarrow$ Choice</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_7$: LI $\rightarrow$ BP1: Choice</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_8$: LI $\rightarrow$ BP2: Choice</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_9$: LI $\rightarrow$ BP3: Choice</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{10}$: LI $\rightarrow$ NP1: Choice</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{11}$: LI $\rightarrow$ NP2: Choice</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{12}$: LI $\rightarrow$ NP3: Choice</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{13}$: TI $\rightarrow$ BP1: Choice</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{14}$: TI $\rightarrow$ BP2: Choice</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{15}$: TI $\rightarrow$ BP3: Choice</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{16}$: TI $\rightarrow$ NP1: Choice</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{17}$: TI $\rightarrow$ NP2: Choice</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{18}$: TI $\rightarrow$ NP3: Choice</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LI: levels of involvement, TI: types of involvement.

The results of the analyses revealed that the six restaurant brand attributes model (three brand personality attributes and three non-personality attributes) is statistically significant in estimating restaurant choice intention of the respondents ($R^2 = .65$, $p = .000$). Beta coefficients also indicate that all six attributes made statistically significant contributions ($p = .000$) in predicting the dependent variable ($H_1$-$H_6$). Although two non-personality attributes, 'tasty' and 'clean' were found be the most important attributes across the situations, the findings revealed that the relative importance of each attribute vary depending on the situation.
In terms of moderator effects, types of involvement (high emotion vs. low emotion) and the interaction between the two moderator variables were found to have no significant moderator effect for the relative importance of the restaurant brand attributes on consumers' restaurant choice intention.

Only levels of involvement (high vs. low) was found to have a significant moderator effect. However, among the six attributes, it significantly impacts on only two variables, the 'reliable' (brand personality) and 'value for money' (non-personality) attributes. The importance of the 'reliable' attribute on respondents' intention of choosing restaurant brands ($H_7$) was found to have a significant positive relationship with levels of involvement (i.e. when the levels of involvement increases, 'reliable' attribute becomes more important). To the contrary, the relative importance of the 'value for money' attribute ($H_{12}$) was found to have a significant negative relationship with levels of involvement (i.e. when the levels of involvement increases, 'value for money' attribute becomes less important).
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CHAPTER NINE

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

9.1 Summary of Main Conclusions

Although the importance of brand personality has been accepted by a wider community, there remains a lack of consensus amongst researchers as to what the concept really is. Moreover, research has found only limited empirical support for the premise that brand personality influences consumers' attitude and behaviour. This research was concerned with establishing the validity of brand personality in the context of the restaurant industry. Following the provision of theoretical backgrounds of the concept, the present research adopted two complementary studies to achieve this goal. The first study attempted to validate measurements of brand personality and brand image in the context of restaurant brands. The second study reassessed the validity of the concept of brand personality under different situations.
Several significant results were achieved. Some of the findings are in accordance with past research and some are not. The main findings of the research are as follows:

1) From the five dimensions of Aaker’s Brand Personality Scale (BPS), only two dimensions (‘sincerity’ and ‘excitement’) were confirmed as valid in this study.

2) The findings of the research support brand personality as a valid concept in the context of restaurant brands. Three dimensions of restaurant brand personality were identified. They are ‘sincerity’, ‘excitement’ and ‘popularity’.

3) The results of the present study revealed that brand personality component and non-personality component of brand image are not the same construct although there exists a certain degree of overlap between these two components.

4) The brand image scale, which is the combination of the brand personality scale and the non-personality scale, was found to be a superior scale in explaining respondents’ overall impressions of the restaurant and their behaviour intentions.

5) The relative importance of brand personality (versus non-personality attributes) on consumers’ restaurant choice was found to be significantly different across the situations.

6) Levels of involvement (high vs. low) was found to have a significant moderator effect on the relationship between the restaurant brand attributes and restaurant choice. However, among the six attributes, it significantly impacts on only two variables, ‘reliable’ (brand personality) and ‘value for money’ (non-personality) attributes.
9.2 Study I: The Brand Personality Scale

Two of the main objectives of this research were 1) to examine the validity of the concept of brand personality and 2) to investigate the dimensions of brand personality in the context of restaurant brands. The findings of this research suggest that brand personality is a valid concept with three dimensions. These confirmed dimensions were 'sincerity', 'excitement' and 'popularity'. The results of each statistical analysis showed support for construct validity and criterion-related validity of the scale.

However, Aaker's (1997) original five dimensions of brand personality were not replicated in this application. Among the five dimensions, only two dimensions, 'sincerity' and 'excitement', were found to be valid in this research. These findings are consistent with some of the previous studies, which suggest that the dimensions of brand personality may vary across different cultures and brand contexts (e.g. Venable et al., 2002; Ferrandi et al., 2000). Therefore, it can be agreed that the failure to find some dimensions of Aaker's (e.g. 'competence', 'sophisticate' and 'ruggedness') in this study does not infer that the dimensions do not exist at all; rather it is not valid in this context (i.e. restaurant brands). Thus those dimensions could be valid in other situations.

There are several interesting points worth noting. All the traits, which loaded on the 'sophisticated' factor in Aaker's study, loaded on 'excitement' in this research. The 'reliable' trait loaded on 'competence' in Aaker's work, yet loaded on 'sincerity' in this research. Intuitively, these dimensions seem to be relatively similar, so the differences are not that surprising. For example, one can easily notice that the trait, 'reliable' could be used to describe either 'competence' (Aaker, 1997) or 'sincerity' (this study). These findings may support Caprara et al's (2001) assertion that the same personality traits locate under different factors when comparing different brands. They describe this phenomenon as 'brand-adjective interaction', which represents that a personality trait may have different meanings when used to describe different brands (Caprara et al., 2001, p.391). They believe this 'brand-adjective interaction' phenomenon is very similar to 'a concept-
scale interaction' in the semantic differential approach. This refers to the notion that the meaning and relationship of adjectives varies depending on the concept to which the adjectives refer, and is based on the fact that adjectives may have different degrees of relevance in different contexts. Wysong (2000) also found very similar results in his brand personality study. He reported that Aaker's four brand personality traits ('cheerful', 'up-to-date', 'reliable' and 'intelligent') loaded on different factors. He concluded that these differences are idiosyncratic to the respondents or the product category adopted.

Taking into account the findings of the present study, the results suggest that dimensions and (or) traits of brand personality may vary depending on the context of brand applied and thus the dimensions may need to be carefully examined when being applied to different brand contexts.

9.3 Study I: Brand Image and Brand Personality

Since brand personality is part of brand image, it was necessary to distinguish brand personality from the other segment of brand image unassociated with human personality characteristics (i.e. non-personality component of brand image) to examine the relationship between brand personality and brand image, and subsequently dividing the two constructs and examining their relative influence on consumers' perceptions and behavioural intentions.

9.3.1 Non-Personality Attributes

In this research, the non-personality attributes loaded into two factors: 'benefits' and 'value for money'. The 'benefits' dimension was confirmed with seven brand attributes. They were 'tasty food', 'visually appealing interior', 'visually appealing facility', 'clean
environment', 'neat employees', 'nutritious food' and 'sufficient portion'. Each of the seven attributes was already identified as an important restaurant attribute by a number of researchers (e.g. Auty, 1992; Lewis, 1981a). In this study, the seven attributes were merged into one factor, representing the benefits of restaurant products. The validity of the 'benefits' factor was supported by several findings of the study. Overall, the factor loadings of all seven items were relatively high. In terms of criterion validity, the 'benefits' factor was found to make a significant contribution to the model in explaining all the four external measures; perceived quality, overall satisfaction, intention to return and intention to recommend.

The 'value for money' factor comprised three attributes. Similar to the 'benefit' factor, the validity of the 'value for money' factor is supported by a number of previous studies. Many researchers have agreed that 'price' or monetary aspect is one of the most frequently cited factors of restaurant choice (e.g. Clark and Wood, 1999; June and Smith, 1987; Lewis, 1981a). All three attributes of 'value for money' showed relatively high factor loadings. Furthermore, 'value for money' made significant contributions in explaining customers' perceived quality and intention to return.

9.3.2 Relationship between Personality and Non-personality Components

As previously mentioned, one of the aims of this study was to investigate the relationship between brand personality and non-personality components of brand image. The relationship was examined by conducting an exploratory analysis with both brand personality and non-personality attributes.

In the factor analysis, four factors were validated. Three out of the four factors confirmed were found to be identical to the 'excitement' and the 'popularity' and the 'value for money' factors, which were already identified in the earlier analyses. Therefore, two factors from the brand personality scale ('excitement' and 'popularity') and one factor from the non-personality scale ('value for money') were again confirmed valid. However,
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unlike the other factors, the first factor, labelled 'service quality', was generated by the combinations of attributes from the two factors 'sincerity' and 'benefits'.

The Pearson correlation matrix revealed that all the factors were moderately correlated (.22 ~ .66) with the exception of the 'value for money' factor's low relationship with 'excitement' and 'popularity (-.02 and .05 respectively), and the high relationship between 'benefits' and 'sincerity' (.77).

Taking into account the above findings, it can be argued that brand personality and non-personality represent two different components of brand image. However, a certain degree of overlap (i.e. 'service quality' factor) occurs between the two components, suggesting that these two constructs are closely related to each other. This relationship may support Aaker's (1996) assertion that functional attributes of a brand influence the perceived brand personality, while brand personality influences the perception of functional attributes of the brand. Further investigation into this issue seems required.

9.3.3 Brand Image vs. Brand Personality

Throughout the analyses, dimensions of restaurant brand image were identified. The brand image scale, which is the combination of the brand personality and the non-personality scale, was validated with four dimensions. The identified dimensions were: 'service quality', 'excitement', 'popularity' and 'value for money'.

The exploratory power of the three scales (brand image, brand personality and non-personality) on consumers' overall impression and behavioural intention were compared using the four external measures. The brand image scale explains 58% of the variance in perceived service quality while the other two scales, the brand personality scale and the non-personality scale, each explain only 53%. Similarly, the brand image scale consistently achieved the highest $R^2$ values among the scales on all three other dependent variables; namely overall satisfaction, intention to return and intention to recommend.
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These results suggest that the brand image scale is a more powerful predictor of consumers' overall impressions and behavioural intentions than the other two scales and thus is superior as a measure for the perception of restaurant brands.

The above findings may support one of the propositions of this study that brand image has two components: brand personality and non-personality, and thus it may be necessary to understand both components in order to understand the true perception of brands. In addition, the results also suggest that researchers should use both symbolic and functional attributes of a brand when they measure consumers' brand perceptions.

9.4 Study II: Moderator Effects of Situational Factors on the Relative Importance of Brand Personality

The objective of the second study was to develop a theory based frame of brand personality. To date, little research seems to have been conducted to provide a conceptual framework that outlines when and why consumers use brand personalities in their evaluation of brands. The second study in this research was aimed at examining the concept of brand personality under differing situations. The findings of the first study were used to design experimental conditions for the second study.

9.4.1 Relative Importance of Brand Personality Attributes

The regression analysis (3 brand personality and 3 non-personality) revealed that the six attribute model was statistically significant in explaining restaurant choice intention across the four situations (p = .000). The R² value shows that 65 % of variance in restaurant choice intention could be explained by the model. All six attributes made statistically significant contributions in predicting the respondents' restaurant choice intention. These findings were fairly robust across the four situations as no significant differences were
observed among them. The relative similarity and fairly high values of $R^2$s and the high
significance levels across the situations suggest that the model is reasonably good for
explaining respondents' restaurant choice intention. These findings provide further support
for the results of the first study, which revealed that brand personality influences
consumers' behavioural intentions.

Overall, the results of the second study support the premise that brand personality and non-
personality both have a strong influence on consumers' brand choice intention. In terms of
relative importance, it seemed that in all four situations respondents placed greater
importance on non-personality attributes than brand personality attributes in choosing
restaurant brands. However, it is also apparent that the relative importance of brand
personality and non-personality attributes were different across the situations. The
importance of brand personality on restaurant choice was found to be higher in 'business
dinner' (42%) and 'wedding anniversary dinner' (43%) situations compared to 'lunch
meeting' (38%) and 'normal lunch with a friend' (38%) situations.

Comparing the relative importance of each attribute, 'tasty' and 'clean' attributes were
found to be the most important features across the situations when choosing restaurant
brands. However, although these non-personality attributes were found to be the most
important features, caution should be taken when interpreting these findings. As Phau and
Lau (2000) indicate, due to technology advances products and services are becoming
easier to copy and getting functionally more similar to each other; thus consumers do not
see various brands as differing widely with respect to functional attributes.

Most consumers may already believe that the majority of restaurant brands offer
reasonably clean environments and tasty food. Therefore, if these basic attributes are
missing, the consumers may be extremely offended; but if they are present, the brand may
not have special preference or credit. For instance, customers of restaurants may never
revisit the restaurant if they found it dirty, yet a cleaner restaurant may not attract more
customers when other restaurants offer reasonably clean environments.
This notion is very similar to ‘Herzberg’s two-factor theory of motivation’ (Huczynski and Buchanan, 2001, p.255). In a study of employee satisfaction, Herzberg found that factors that lead to satisfaction are different from those which lead to job dissatisfaction. According to the study, the redesign of jobs to increase motivation and performance should focus on the formal factors, known as ‘motivator factors’. Improvement in the latter factors labelled ‘hygiene factors’ will remove dissatisfaction, but will not increase motivation and performance (Cited in Huczynski and Buchanan, 2001, p.255).

9.4.2 Levels and Types of Involvement

The two moderating effects of involvement were examined by moderated regression analysis (Sharma et al., 1981). The results revealed that types of involvement (high emotion vs. low emotion) and the interaction between the two moderator variables (i.e. the combined effect of types of involvement and levels of involvement) had no significant moderator effect on the relationship between the six attributes and consumers’ restaurant choice intention. Only ‘levels of involvement’ (high vs. low) was found to have a significant moderator effect ($\Delta R^2:.005$, $p =.000$). However, amongst the six attributes, levels of involvement significantly influenced only two variables: ‘reliable’ (brand personality) and ‘value for money’ (non-personality).

The importance of the ‘reliable’ attribute on restaurant brand choice intention was found to have a significant positive interaction with levels of involvement. This indicates that the ‘reliable’ attribute becomes more important in choosing restaurants when the levels of involvement increase. In contrast, the relative importance of ‘value for money’ was found to have a significant negative interaction with levels of involvement, indicating that when the levels of involvement increase, ‘value for money’ becomes less important.

The interpretation of these findings should be very cautious. It may be suggested that the statistical significance of the ‘value for money’ attribute could be solely caused by the unique characteristics of the ‘price’ factor, since a number of previous studies suggest that
when the levels of involvement increase, consumers tend to emphasise less on 'price' or monetary factors and are willing to spend more money (e.g. Zaichkowsky, 1988; Belk, 1982; Clarke and Belk, 1979).

Among the personality attributes, only the 'reliable' attribute was found to be statistically significantly influenced by the moderator effect of levels of involvement. This finding may indicate that the interaction of brand personality with situational factors tends to operate not at a global level, but at a trait or dimension level.

This significance of the 'reliable' attribute may be explained by Caprara et al's (2001, p.391) 'brand-adjective interaction' theory. As previously mentioned, they argue that a personality trait may convey different meanings when describing different brands. Similarly some human personality traits may carry different meanings when they are used to describe brands. The attribute 'reliable' seems more appropriated to describe inanimate objects rather than the other personality attributes, 'charming' and 'cheerful'. In other words, a reliable restaurant brand seems more acceptable (or sounds more natural) than a charming or a cheerful restaurant brand. In this sense, it may be necessary to investigate that how various human personality traits are used differently when they describe inanimate brands in a further study.

9.5 Contributions of the Research

This research has attempted to establish the validity of brand personality in the context of the hospitality industry. Two complementary studies were conducted to achieve this goal. The results of this research provide several conceptual and theoretical contributions, as well as practical contributions to managers in the hospitality industry. These are as follows.
9.5.1 Theoretical Contributions

In theoretical terms, it could be argued that the literature demonstrates considerable progress in the study of brand personality, yet still contains the majority of the problems it began with. This research did make some contributions to broadening the understanding of the concept.

First of all, this research provided the validity to the concept of brand personality through empirical studies. Although the concept of brand personality has been believed to have important implications in the field of marketing, only a limited number of studies have attempted to test this premise empirically. The results of this research confirmed the premise that brand personality influences consumers’ brand choice.

This study explored the dimensions of restaurant brand personality (‘excitement’, ‘sincerity’ and ‘popularity’). The identification of restaurant brand personality suggested the possibility that dimensions of brand personality vary depending on the context of brands and thus need to be carefully examined when applied to different brand contexts.

The second contribution of the study is the examination of the relationship between brand personality and the non-personality component of brand image. Traditionally most studies in the field of brand choice have focused solely on the functional or utilitarian attributes of product or services. To the contrary, most studies in brand personality field paid little attention to the influence of functional or product related attributes while focusing on the impact of brand personality on consumer preference. This study successfully integrated and compared these two types of attributes using the concept of brand image. It empirically examined the relationship between the two components of brand image: brand personality and non-personality, and shows that the two components are not the same. This finding enabled the researcher to compare the relative influence of brand personality and brand image on customers’ overall impressions and behaviour intentions on restaurant brand choice.
The superior predictive ability of the brand image scale, which is the combination of the two scales (brand personality and non-personality) suggested that researchers may need to consider both brand personality and non-personality components of brand image to better understand customers' perception of brands. In addition, the identification of the dimensions of restaurant brand image ('service quality', 'excitement', 'popularity' and 'value for money') sheds insight into how hospitality brands (versus manufacturing brands) are represented in consumers’ minds.

Thirdly, this research empirically showed that the relative importance of the attributes (three personality attributes and three non-personality attributes of restaurant brand image) varies depending on the situations applied. This result is consistent with findings by Filiatrault and Ritchie (1988) and June and Smith (1987), that the relative importance of restaurant attributes is significantly influenced by situational definitions. What is an interesting finding to this research is, in fact, an extension of previous findings concerning the influence of situational variables on consumer preference to the field of brand personality. The contribution of this study in this regard, is that it integrated non-product related / symbolic attributes and product related attributes in the study of situational factors. The findings of this research have illustrated the importance of considering situational variables when evaluating brand personality.

Fourthly, this research has tested for developing a conceptual frame that outlines when and why consumers use brand personality. Two variables, levels of involvement (high vs. low) and types of involvement (high emotion vs. low emotion), were set as moderator variables, which influence the relationship between the restaurant brand attributes and restaurant choice. Only levels of involvement were found to have a significant influence on the relative importance of brand personality when choosing restaurant brands.

Therefore, this study suggested that brand personality plays a greater role when the levels of involvement increase regardless of types of involvement. It is recognised that the model presented is not an exhaustive one. However, with limited research of the concept to date, this kind of study, although limited and simple, should first be explored empirically before
other more sophisticated models are advocated. Therefore, the results of this research have implications that deepen the understanding of when and why customers use brand personality when they evaluate brands. Overall, this research is able to contribute to the understanding of perceived brand personality and its relationship with consumer behaviour.

In terms of methodology, this research adopted a decompositional model, named conjoint analysis (in the second study). Traditionally, the evaluation of the decision-making process has long been investigated using a compositional approach, in which the identity and values of the models' components are specified and then combined into an aggregate model. However, in recent decades many marketing researchers have turned to using a decomposition model, which begins with the expressed preference (or observed behaviour) followed by analysis to identify the interior structure of that preference. (Filiatrault and Ritchie, 1988; June and Smith, 1987).

The findings of this research did confirm the assertions made by Dube, Renaghan and Miller (1994) and June and Smith (1987) that a decompositional model, which is commonly referred to as conjoint analysis, is a very useful methodology in identifying how customers make trade-offs among competing attributes, and assesses the relative weights of various restaurant brand attributes on customers brand choice.

9.5.2 Practical and Managerial Implications

The specific results should be used with caution, as the sample on which they are based is not necessarily representative of all restaurant customers. However, several practical implications for all scenarios are related to the findings of this research.

Marketing and advertising practitioners have long argued that the use of a brand with positive personalities can be a strong and effective marketing tool. As previously mentioned, differentiating a brand from its competitors has long been considered as a fundamental and necessary component for successful brands. Brand personality is believed
to be an effective means by which to differentiate one brand from another. Therefore, brand managers have spent millions on creating their brand’s personality in order to ensure their brands are viewed favourably and distinctively in relation to key competitors.

Siguaw et al., (1999) reported that brand personality plays a very important role in differentiating one restaurant brand from another, and some successful restaurant brands already use this strategy well. However, they further argue that the majority of restaurant managers still do not recognise the importance of brand personality, and thus the use of brand personality in their marketing strategy still remains in its infancy.

The present research developed the restaurant brand image scale, which can be used as a reliable means to measure the perception of restaurant brands in customers’ minds. Using the scale, restaurant managers are able to reliably measure the personalities as well as other product related components of a target brand. They are also able to track changes in a brand’s perception due to strategic shifts in the marketing mix variables or particular advertising champagne, and to identify differences in perceptions of a brand by various customer sub-groups (e.g. male vs. female).

In addition, confirmation of the dimensions for restaurant brand personality and brand image allows managers to diagnose their brands’ strengths and weaknesses and thus help to build the right marketing strategy for their brands. For example, if a brand is perceived relatively low on ‘excitement’ dimension, the manager may need to offer more variety of menus and make a stronger and more consistent emphasis on youthfulness in the brand’s advertising and sales promotion effort; evoking a greater sense of excitement among consumers.

This research also demonstrated the impact of situations in the evaluation of brand personality on customers’ restaurant choice. To date, the majority of brand personality studies have focused solely on the profile of the consumers rather than situational factors (e.g. congruency theory). Many suggest that only the personality profile of the target market should be considered when creating a brand personality (Aaker, 1999). However,
the findings of this research suggest that managers should systematically integrate situational variables into the marketing strategy (e.g. TGI Friday is a place for an exciting birthday party) along with the personality profile of the target market (e.g. TGI Friday is a place for young and cheerful people). These findings are consistent with the suggestion made by Aaker (1999) that brand personality studies should integrate the influence of situations on consumer brand choice (Aaker, 1999).

9.6 Limitations of the Research

Although the present research makes important contributions to our understanding of the concept of brand personality, there are several limitations that may need to be taken into account when interpreting the findings.

One of the limitations of this research is the use of non-probability sampling (convenience sample). Moreover, the findings of this research were based only on one product category (i.e. restaurant brands). Therefore, the results of the present research cannot be generalised. Accordingly, future research using a more sophisticated sampling design and brand categories would establish external validity of the findings.

Secondly, as mentioned earlier, the model presented in the second study was not an exhaustive one. This approach was taken in order to demonstrate and understand influences of the situational factors on the relative importance of brand personality (vs. non-personality component of brand image). To achieve this goal while minimising possible biases, a simple model was generated. Therefore, only selected personality and non-personality attributes were used rather than presenting a wider range of attributes.

In addition, only two extreme levels were used for each attribute (e.g. clean – not clean) considering the nature of the attributes. Since the output of conjoint analysis was generated
only from the levels and factors included in the study, it is not possible to make inferences about values between the levels and outside the factors included. In this sense, more controlled and sophisticated experiments must be conducted to further our understanding of the fundamentals of the concept.

Thirdly, while focusing on the influence of product category (i.e. restaurant brands) and situational factors on brand personality, this research paid little attention to the impact of the culture orientation of respondents. Some studies of brand personality in cross-cultural settings suggest that cultural orientation of consumers influences the perceptions of brand personality (e.g. Aaker et al., 2001; Phau and Lau, 2001; Ferrandi et al., 2000). Since no measures of cultural orientation were included in this study, neglecting the cultural effects on the perceptions of brand personality could be a limitation of the present research.

Another possible limitation involves the four situation manipulations (study 2). Some critics may feel that there is not enough variability in the situations. Yet, one of the objectives of this research was to examine the influence of levels of involvement and types of involvement on the relative importance of brand personality. Creating realistic situation manipulations was a challenge. Furthermore, the descriptions needed to be as consistent as possible (with the exception of the manipulation) in order to eliminate any possible biases.

Despite being similar, the four situations did manifest the desired situational variables, as situation manipulation check results revealed that the situations described were found to successfully reflect the levels (high/low) and types (high emotion/low emotion) of involvement assumed (based on mean scores). In addition, informal focus group discussions prior to the research revealed that respondents clearly discriminated all four situations.
9.7 Future Research Suggestions

The findings of this research, as well as the limitations outlined, suggest a variety of areas for future research. Future research areas related to the present research are as follows:

1. Fournier (1994; 1998) suggests that the brand consumer relationship could be recognised as a reciprocal exchange between active and interdependent relationship partners, just like relationships between people. According to Fournier, the perception of a brand in consumers' minds is formed by repeated observation of behaviours enacted by the brand, such as marketing and brand management activities.

In this sense, consumers are able to have emotional attachments to brands. It is believed that once consumers have an emotional relationship with a brand, they tend to project and reinforce their personality on the brands (Phau and Lau, 2000; de Chernatony and McEnally, 1999). This notion is consistent with the suggestion made by Aaker (1996) that the perception of brand personality is significantly influenced by the relationship between the brand and consumers. However, to date, most studies in this field have made little progress in confirming or disconfirming this premise. Future research may need to attempt empirically investigating the relationship between the quality of brand consumer relationship and perceived brand person.

2. The present research compared the impact of brand personality and brand image on consumers' brand choice. Future research may need to be conducted to investigate the influence of these two concepts on consumers' brand choice as well as their relationship using more sophisticated sampling designs and different brand categories in order to establish external validity of the present findings.
3. Another area for future study is to identify the antecedents of brand personality and examine the relative importance of each variable on determining perceived brand personality. Earlier in this dissertation, three antecedents (product related factors, non-product related factors and personality factors) were identified from the literature. However, the extent to which these factors independently or interdependently influence the formation of brand personality has not been empirically determined.

4. The present research provided the conceptual pictures of restaurant brand personality and brand image. However, little is still known about the relationship of brand personality formation with the characteristics of hospitality products, such as intangibility, heterogeneity, the simultaneous consumption and production of service and participation of consumers in the delivery process. A further study may be conducted to investigate how these characteristics of hospitality products influence the formation of perceived brand personality.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A
List of the Personality Traits used for the Preliminary Study
Directions: Most of the following adjectives are about personality traits. Although they are mainly used to describe characteristics of a person in daily life, some of them are also used to describe personality of a brand (e.g. Nike – spirited, stylish, active. The Benetton – trendy, imaginative, unique). From the lists, choose a restaurant brand you are familiar with. We are interested in finding out which of these characteristics, you think, can be used in describing a personality of the brand in everyday life by people (Since this study is not about any specific restaurant, try to think of a brand rather than one specific restaurant). Please print 'Y' (means Yes) if you think that trait can be used to describe a restaurant brand.

Section 1: Name of the Restaurant brand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXTROVERTED</td>
<td></td>
<td>EMOTIONAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVENTUROUS</td>
<td></td>
<td>FAMILY ORIENTED</td>
<td></td>
<td>ENERGETIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFILIATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td>FEMININE</td>
<td></td>
<td>ENTHUSIASTIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGGRESSIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td>FOLLOWER</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXCITING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPREHENSIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td>FORCEFUL</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXTRAVAGANT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSERTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td>FORMAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>PERFECT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHLETIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRIENDLY</td>
<td></td>
<td>PERSONAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSTERE</td>
<td></td>
<td>GLAMOROUS</td>
<td></td>
<td>PLAIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWKWARD</td>
<td></td>
<td>GOOD LOOKING</td>
<td></td>
<td>PLEASANT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOLD</td>
<td></td>
<td>GRACEFUL</td>
<td></td>
<td>POPULAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BORING</td>
<td></td>
<td>HARD</td>
<td></td>
<td>POSITIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS ORIENTED</td>
<td></td>
<td>HARD WORKING</td>
<td></td>
<td>RASH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALM</td>
<td></td>
<td>HONEST</td>
<td></td>
<td>RATIONAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUTIOUS</td>
<td></td>
<td>IMAGINATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td>REAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGEABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td>IMPULSIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td>REBELLIOUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARMING</td>
<td></td>
<td>INCOMPETENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>RELAXED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEERFUL</td>
<td></td>
<td>INDEPENDENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>RELIABLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASSICAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>INDIFFERENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>RUGGED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>INDULGENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>SECURE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLOURFUL</td>
<td></td>
<td>INFORMAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>SELF CONFIDENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLOURLESS</td>
<td></td>
<td>INFORMED</td>
<td></td>
<td>SENSIBLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMFORTABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td>INTELLIGENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>SENTIMENTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMON</td>
<td></td>
<td>INTERESTING</td>
<td></td>
<td>SHY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETITIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td>INTOVERTED</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIMPLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLEX</td>
<td></td>
<td>LEADER</td>
<td></td>
<td>SINCERE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFIDENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>LIBERAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>SMALL TOWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFORMING</td>
<td></td>
<td>LIKABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td>SMOOTH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSERVATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOWER CLASS</td>
<td></td>
<td>SOCIABLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTEMPORARY</td>
<td></td>
<td>LUSH</td>
<td></td>
<td>SOFT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOL</td>
<td>MASCULINE</td>
<td>SOPHISTICATED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOPERATIVE</td>
<td>MATURE</td>
<td>SPIRITED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREATIVE</td>
<td>MISERABLE</td>
<td>SPORTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURIOUS</td>
<td>MODERN</td>
<td>STABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARING</td>
<td>MODEST</td>
<td>STRONG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFENSIVE</td>
<td>NAIVE</td>
<td>SUBDUED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELIBERATE</td>
<td>NEGATIVE</td>
<td>SUBMISSIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELICATE</td>
<td>OLD</td>
<td>SUCCESSFUL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FASHIONED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRTY</td>
<td>ORGANISED</td>
<td>TECHNICAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMINATING</td>
<td>ORIGINAL</td>
<td>TENSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOWN TO EARTH</td>
<td>ORNATE</td>
<td>THRIFTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DULL</td>
<td>ORTHODOX</td>
<td>TIMID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASTERN</td>
<td>OUTDOORSY</td>
<td>TOUGH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMICAL</td>
<td>PASSIVE</td>
<td>TRENDY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFASHIONABLE</td>
<td>UNIQUE</td>
<td>TRUSTWORTHY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNUSUAL</td>
<td>UP TO DATE</td>
<td>UPPER CLASS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN</td>
<td>USUAL</td>
<td>VAIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARM</td>
<td>WEAK</td>
<td>WESTERN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHOLESOME</td>
<td>YOUTHFUL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
Final Questionnaire used in Study I
Dear Sir/Madam,

I am a postgraduate student at the University of Surrey. As a part of my PhD research, I am investigating consumer perception of restaurants. It would be very helpful, if you could fill out the following questionnaire.

The questionnaire takes approximately 10 minutes to complete. The information you provide will only be used for academic purposes and remain strictly confidential.

Thank you very much for your time and co-operation.

Tae-Hwan Yoon
PhD researcher
School of Management Studies for the Service Sector
E-mail: T.Yoon@surrey.ac.uk
SECTION 1: RESTAURANTS YOU KNOW OR VISIT

Direction: Think of your last visit to any of the following restaurants. First, select one restaurant and tick (✓) the box in front of this restaurant. Then try to answer the following questions.

DAngus Steak House 0Cafe Uno 0Little Chef 0TGI Friday
DBurger King 0Garfunkels 0McDonalds 0Rat & Parrot
DBeefeater 0Harvester 0Nandos 0Richoux
DBella Pasta 0Hard Rock Cafe 0Pizza Express 0Yellow River Cafe
DBrowns 0KFC 0Pizza Hut 0Wetherspoon

Q1. How long ago was your last visit to this restaurant?

☐ less than 1 month  ☐ 7 to 12 months
☐ 1 to 3 months  ☐ 1 to 2 years
☐ 4 to 6 months  ☐ 2 years or more

Q2. Who did you go with to this restaurant on your last visit? (tick as many as apply):

☐ partner  ☐ friends
☐ family  ☐ children
☐ relatives  ☐ colleagues  ☐ other: ( )

Q3. How many people were in your party including yourself?

☐ 1  ☐ 4 - 5
☐ 2  ☐ 6 - 7
☐ 3  ☐ 8 and more

Q4. What was your purpose of the visiting this restaurant?

☐ routine lunch  ☐ routine evening meal
☐ family meal  ☐ celebrating an event (birthday, etc.)
☐ business meal  ☐ other: ( )

Q5. How long have you known this restaurant outlet?

☐ less than 1 month  ☐ 1 to 3 years
☐ 1 to 6 months  ☐ 4 to 6 years
☐ 7 to 12 months  ☐ 7 years or more
Q6. On average, how often have you visited this restaurant outlet over the last 6 months?

☐ 2 times a day or more  ☐ once a week  ☐ once every 3 months
☐ once a day  ☐ 2-3 times a month  ☐ once every 6 months
☐ 2 – 3 times a week  ☐ once a month  ☐ less than once every 6 months

Q7. Using the following scale, tell us how familiar you are with this outlet. Please circle an appropriate number. Rating “1” means you are not at all familiar with this outlet and “5” means you are very familiar with this restaurant outlet. If you feel your opinion is between these extremes, please pick a number from some place in the middle of the scale.

not at all familiar                          very familiar

1 ------------------- 2 ------------------- 3 ------------------- 4 ------------------- 5

Q8. On average, over the last 6 months, how often have you visited other outlets, in other locations, that operate under the same name?

☐ None
☐ 2 times a day or more  ☐ once a week  ☐ once every 3 months
☐ once a day  ☐ 2-3 times a month  ☐ once every 6 months
☐ 2 – 3 times a week  ☐ once a month  ☐ less than once every 6 months

Q9. Using the following scale, tell us how familiar in general you are with this name or brand of restaurant? Please circle an appropriate number. Rating “1” means you are not at all familiar with this outlet and “5” means you are very familiar with this restaurant outlet. If you feel your opinion is between these extremes, please pick a number from some place in the middle of the scale.

not at all familiar                          very familiar

1 ------------------- 2 ------------------- 3 ------------------- 4 ------------------- 5
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SECTION 2: YOUR PERCEPTION OF THE RESTAURANT THAT YOU SELECTED IN SECTION 1

Directions: The following is a list of restaurant characteristics. Please rate how descriptive each characteristic is for the restaurant you visited, between (1) and (5). Rating "1" means the characteristic is not at all descriptive and "5" means very descriptive for the restaurant. Please answer all questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This Restaurant</th>
<th>not at all descriptive</th>
<th>very descriptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is down-to-earth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offers nutritious food</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is unimaginative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is popular</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is outdoorsy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is dishonest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offers speedy service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is daring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has neat-appearing employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is unfriendly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is spirited</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has well-mannered staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is charming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is tough</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is conveniently located</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has visually appealing interior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has convenient car park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offers good value for money</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is successful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is wholesome (decent)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is imaginative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has quiet environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has good facilities for children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is cheerful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Restaurant</td>
<td>not at all descriptive</td>
<td>very descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is cheap</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offers variety of menu choice</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is unreliable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is up-to-date</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has clean environment</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is active</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is comfortable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is disorganised</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is sensitive</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offers tasty food</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has visually appealing facilities</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is sociable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is old-fashion</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is modern</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is colourful</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is unsuccessful</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is expensive</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offers sufficient portions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has convenient opening hours</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is unsophisticated</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is intelligent</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is honest</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is reliable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is upper class</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION 3: OVERALL IMPRESSION OF THIS RESTAURANT**

Directions: We would like to know about your overall perception of this restaurant. From the following scales, tick (√) the number that best represent how you feel about this restaurant.
Q1. Overall, how would you describe the quality of this restaurant?

very poor □ 2□ 3□ 4□ 5□ excellent

Q2. Overall, how would you describe your feeling about this restaurant?

very dissatisfied □ 2□ 3□ 4□ 5□ very satisfied
disliked □ 2□ 3□ 4□ 5□ liked
very much

Q3. How likely is it that you would return to this restaurant in the next 4 months?

extremely unlikely □ 2□ 3□ 4□ 5□ extremely likely

Q4. How likely is it that you would recommend this restaurant to your friends?

extremely unlikely □ 2□ 3□ 4□ 5□ extremely likely

SECTION 4: ABOUT YOU. Please tick (✓) or describe

Gender: Female □ Male □

Nationality: ( ) Occupation: ( )

Age Group:  16 – 24 □  35 – 44 □  55 - 64 □
            25 – 34 □  45 – 54 □  65 and over □

The highest level of education you attained:

GCSE □ GNVQ / NVQ □ Postgraduate Degree □
A-Level □ Undergraduate Degree □ Other: ( )

Thank you very much for your help
APPENDIX C
A Sample of the Questionnaires used in Study II
Dear Sir/Madam,

I am a postgraduate student at the University of Surrey. As part of my PhD research, I am investigating consumer perception of restaurants. It would be very helpful if you would fill out the following questionnaire.

The questionnaire takes approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. The information you provide will only be used for academic purposes and remain strictly confidential.

Your thoughtful input to the study is greatly appreciated and will be of substantial value to me. If you have any questions during the study, please contact the researcher.

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation.

Tae-Hwan Yoon
PhD researcher
School of Management
E-mail: T.yoon@surrey.ac.uk
INSTRUCTIONS

We would like to know your preferred restaurant for the following given dining situation. To provide you with an overall feel of what the dining situation is like, a brief description is given. The key to the success of this research depends on you really imagining yourself in the situation. Please read the following story carefully and WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO IMAGINE YOURSELF IN THE FOLLOWING SITUATION:

**DINING SITUATION**

A Business Dinner with Your Key Client

Imagine that you are about to have a dinner meeting with one of your key clients. You know that this dinner could result in the success of a crucial business deal since the client is considering placing a large order with your company. Now, it is your task to select a restaurant for that dinner.

Note: To help you picture this situation, think about what it may feel like to be at a business dinner with your client. What are you thinking about? What are you doing or talking about?

Now, please answer the questions accordingly throughout this questionnaire;
SECTION 1: The Type of Restaurant You are Looking For

DIRECTIONS: In the event that one of your colleagues was designated to select the restaurant for your business dinner, advise this person on the type of restaurant you require. Please tick (✓) three characteristics only from the following list of characteristics to indicate what type of restaurant you are looking for:

- □ Reliable
- □ Cheerful
- □ Tasty
- □ Charming
- □ Clean
- □ Good value for money
SECTION 2: Your Restaurant Preference

**DIRECTIONS:** In this section, you will see 10 hypothetical restaurants (A to J) in five scenarios. All of the ten restaurants will be described by six criteria (reliability, taste of food, cleanliness, cheerfulness, value for money, and charm). Each restaurant profile has a distinctive combination of these six restaurant features. Please treat each situation as independent (i.e. none of the situations are connected or influenced by each other.)

Please remember, there are absolutely no right or wrong answers to the following questions. It is your impressions and feelings about the restaurant settings that we are interested in. The important thing for you to do is really imagine yourself in the same dining situation described before (A BUSINESS DINNER WITH YOUR KEY CLIENT).

Please read carefully the descriptions of each restaurant before answering questions. Then, answer the following questions by ticking (✓) an appropriate box for each question.
**Scenario 1.**

Assume that you have visited the restaurant 'A' and 'B' before

### Restaurant descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Restaurant A</strong> is described as</th>
<th><strong>Restaurant B</strong> is described as</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>reliable</td>
<td>not reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tasty</td>
<td>not tasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clean</td>
<td>not clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheerful</td>
<td>not cheerful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good value for money</td>
<td>not good value for money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charming</td>
<td>not charming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Now please answer the following question

How likely are you to select this restaurant for the described business dinner?

<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>extremely unlikely</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How likely are you to select this restaurant for the described business dinner?

<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>extremely unlikely</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Scenario 2.
Assume that you have visited the restaurant ‘C’ and ‘D’ before

#### Restaurant descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restaurant C is described as</th>
<th>Restaurant D is described as</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not reliable</td>
<td>reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasty</td>
<td>not tasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not clean</td>
<td>not clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheerful</td>
<td>not cheerful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not good value for money</td>
<td>not good value for money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charming</td>
<td>charming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Please answer the following questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How likely are you to select this restaurant for the described business dinner?</th>
<th>How likely are you to select this restaurant for the described business dinner?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Scenario 3. Assume that you have visited the restaurant ‘E’ and ‘F’ before

**Restaurant descriptions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restaurant E is described as</th>
<th>Restaurant F is described as</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not reliable</td>
<td>reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not tasty</td>
<td>tasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clean</td>
<td>clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheerful</td>
<td>not cheerful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not good value for money</td>
<td>not good value for money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not charming</td>
<td>not charming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please answer the following questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How likely are you to select this restaurant for the described business dinner?</th>
<th>How likely are you to select this restaurant for the described business dinner?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 [ ] extremely unlikely</td>
<td>1 [ ] extremely unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 [ ]</td>
<td>2 [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 [ ]</td>
<td>3 [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 [ ]</td>
<td>4 [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 [ ]</td>
<td>5 [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 [ ]</td>
<td>6 [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 [ ] extremely likely</td>
<td>7 [ ] extremely likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Scenario 4.

Assume that you have visited the restaurant ‘G’ and ‘II’ before

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restaurant descriptions</th>
<th>Restaurant II is described as</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restaurant G</strong> is described as</td>
<td><strong>Restaurant II</strong> is described as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not reliable</td>
<td>reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tasty</td>
<td>not tasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not clean</td>
<td>not clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not cheerful</td>
<td>cheerful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good value for money</td>
<td>good value for money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not charming</td>
<td>not charming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Please answer the following questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How likely are you to select this restaurant for the described business dinner?</th>
<th>How likely are you to select this restaurant for the described business dinner?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Scenario 5.

Assume that you have visited the restaurant ‘I’ and ‘J’ before

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restaurant descriptions</th>
<th>Restaurant J is described as</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not reliable</td>
<td>reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not tasty</td>
<td>tasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clean</td>
<td>clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not cheerful</td>
<td>cheerful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good value for money</td>
<td>good value for money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charming</td>
<td>charming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please answer the following questions

| How likely are you to select this restaurant for the described business dinner? |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 □ extremely unlikely            | 1 □ extremely unlikely   |
| 2 □                                | 2 □                       |
| 3 □                                | 3 □                       |
| 4 □                                | 4 □                       |
| 5 □                                | 5 □                       |
| 6 □                                | 6 □                       |
| 7 □                                | 7 □                       |

Please answer the following questions

| How likely are you to select this restaurant for the described business dinner? |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 □ extremely unlikely            | 1 □ extremely unlikely   |
| 2 □                                | 2 □                       |
| 3 □                                | 3 □                       |
| 4 □                                | 4 □                       |
| 5 □                                | 5 □                       |
| 6 □                                | 6 □                       |
| 7 □                                | 7 □                       |
SECTION 3 : About Your Restaurant Choice

How often do you eat out in a typical year?

☐ 2 times a day or more  ☐ Once a week  ☐ Once every 3 months
☐ Once a day  ☐ 2-3 times a month  ☐ Once every 6 months
☐ 2-3 times a week  ☐ Once a month  ☐ Less than once every 6 months

What kind of restaurant do you usually prefer to visit? Please select only one.

☐ Burger restaurant  ☐ Casual dining restaurant  ☐ Ethnic restaurant
☐ Pizza & Pasta restaurant  ☐ Pub restaurant  ☐ Other
☐ Premium restaurant  ☐ Steak house  ☐ Theme restaurant
☐ Roadside restaurant  ☐ Steak house  ☐ Theme restaurant
☐ Other

In this kind of restaurant (selected above), on average how much money do you spend on each occasion?

About £____ per person

How important is the following items when you are choosing a restaurant? Please rank from 1 (most important) to 6 (least important).

Quality of service ____  Brand name ____  Price ____
Convenient location ____  Quality of food ____  Physical atmosphere ____

SECTION 4 : About You

Gender:  ☐ Female  ☐ Male

Nationality: ( )  Occupation: ( )

Age Group:  ☐ 16 - 24  ☐ 35 - 44  ☐ 55 - 64
☐ 25 - 34  ☐ 45 - 54  ☐ 65 and over

The highest level of education you attained:

☐ GCSE/O-Level  ☐ Undergraduate Degree  ☐ No Qualification
☐ GNVQ/A-Level/NVQ  ☐ Postgraduate Degree  ☐ Other: ( )

Average annual pre-tax household income:

☐ Less than £10,000  ☐ £20,000 to £29,999  ☐ £40,000 to £49,999
☐ £10,000 to 19,999  ☐ £30,000 to £39,999  ☐ over £50,000

Thank you very much for your help
APPENDIX D
Participants Prize Draw Entry Slip for Study II
You can get this Authentic Oriental Mask!!

Dear Participants

As a token of thanks for completing the questionnaire, we will enter you into a prize draw for an actual size Yangban (The Aristocrat, £40 worth) Ha-Hoe mask or one of 10 pairs of ‘Yangban and Kaksi (The Bride) masks’ (smaller size, £20 worth) each beautiful crafted as worn in traditional Korean opera OR £25 worth of an M&S Gift Voucher.

To be entered into the draw, please complete the slip at the end of this letter and return it with your questionnaire via provided FREE POST envelop by 10 July.

Be assured that the slip and your questionnaire will be separated immediately on receipt and stored apart.

Prize Draw Entry Form

For your chance to win a prize, please fill in this slip and return it with your completed questionnaire via provided FREE POST envelop by 10 July.

Your choice of prize: Masks □ M&S Gift voucher □

Name: ________________________________
Contact details: _______________________

Wooden masks used in Hahoe Pyolshin-Gut T'al-nori (Hahoe Mask Dance Drama) were first made in the middle period of the Korea dynasty (c.12 C) and have been designated as National Treasure (No. 121). The distinctive characteristics of the Ha-hoe masks are of formative beauty. Fixed features of the Masks convey the expressions of joyful and pleasant feelings, and of the angry and grievous emotion. Thus, they are recognised as prominent masterpieces throughout the world. (For more details see http://www.tal.or.kr/)

Prize Draw Entry Form

For your chance to win a prize, please fill in this slip and return it with your completed questionnaire via provided FREE POST envelop by 10 July.

Your choice of prize: Masks □ M&S Gift voucher □

Name: ________________________________
Contact details: _______________________
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APPENDIX E
The Results of Linear Regression Analyses and Utility Scores of the Attributes for Each of the Four Situations
**Situation A: Business Dinner** (n = 66)

Results of Linear Multiple Regression: Situation A (528 observations; 66 × 8))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Unstandardised Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardised Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-.741</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>-5.73</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasty (non-personality)</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>17.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean (non-personality)</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>16.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money (non-personality)</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>8.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable (personality)</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>13.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charming (personality)</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>9.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful (personality)</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>7.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R^2 = .66 \quad \text{df (6, 510)} \quad F = 164.22 \quad p = .000 \]

Utilities of the Six Attributes under Situation A

![Attribute Utilities Graph](image-url)
Situation B: Lunch Meeting ($n = 48$)

Results of Linear Multiple Regression: Situation B (384 observations; $48 \times 8$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Unstandardised Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardised Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-.777</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasty (non-personality)</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>12.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean (non-personality)</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>13.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money (non-personality)</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>10.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable (personality)</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>8.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charming (personality)</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>7.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful (personality)</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>5.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .61$  
$df = (6, 372)$  
$F = 97.17$  
$p = .000$

Utilities of the Six Attributes under Situation B

![Utilities of the Six Attributes under Situation B](image-url)
**Situation C: Wedding Anniversary Dinner** (n = 54)

**Results of Linear Multiple Regression: Situation C** (432 observations; 54 x 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Unstandardised Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardised Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>-10.20</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasty (non-personality)</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>17.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean (non-personality)</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>16.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money (non-personality)</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>10.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable (personality)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>13.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charming (personality)</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>10.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful (personality)</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>9.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² = .72  \( df = (6, 414) \quad F = 173.62 \quad p = .000 \)

**Utilities of the Six Attributes under Situation C**

![Utility Graph](image)
**Situation D: Normal Lunch with a Friend** (n = 57)

**Results of Linear Multiple Regression: Situation B** (456 observations; 57 x 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Unstandardised Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardised Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasty (non-personality)</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean (non-personality)</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>12.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money (non-personality)</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>11.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable (personality)</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>9.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charming (personality)</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>7.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful (personality)</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>8.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² = .64  
\[ df = (6, 447) \]  
F = 131.95  
p = .000

**Utilities of the Six Attributes under Situation D**

![Attribute Utilities Graph](image)
APPENDIX F
Results of the Beta Coefficients of the Six Attributes and their Interaction with Types of Involvement
### Beta Coefficients of the Six Restaurant Attributes and the Moderator Term with Types of Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tasty</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td>31.33</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>28.91</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for Money</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>19.74</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>22.09</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charming</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>16.92</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>15.09</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Involvement</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-.186</td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Involvement × Tasty</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Involvement × Clean</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Involvement × Value for Money</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Involvement × Reliable</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.666</td>
<td>.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Involvement × Charming</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.635</td>
<td>.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Involvement × Cheerful</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-11.996</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dependent Variable: Restaurant Choice*
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